International Journal of
Medical Science Research and Practice
Vol.**11**, Issue.**3**, pp.**08-12**, September **2024**
E-ISSN: 2349-3186 P-ISSN: 2349-3178
Available online at: www.isroset.org

Review Article

Utilizing Quality Indicators to Detect and Reduce Pre-Analytical Errors in Laboratory Testing

Pawan Kumar[1]

[1]Dept. of Biochemistry, Health Quest Laboratories, Gurugram, Haryana, India

**Corresponding Author: pawangaba@gmail.com*

Received: 22/Jul/2024; **Accepted**: 24/Aug/2024; **Published**: 30/Sept/2024

Abstract— Pre-analytical errors are the most frequent type of errors encountered in clinical laboratory testing, accounting for approximately 46-68% of all laboratory-related mistakes. These errors occur during the stages of patient preparation, sample collection, handling, transport, and processing, often resulting in compromised test accuracy and negatively impacting patient outcomes. The clinical implications of pre-analytical errors can be serious, leading to misdiagnosis, inappropriate treatments, delays in patient care, and increased healthcare costs. The introduction of quality indicators (QIs) offers laboratories a systematic approach to identifying, monitoring, and reducing pre-analytical errors. QIs measure critical aspects of the pre-analytical phase, such as specimen rejection rates, hemolysis index, patient identification accuracy, sample transport conditions, and phlebotomy success rates. By tracking these indicators, laboratories can detect weaknesses in their processes, implement targeted interventions, and ensure consistent improvements in quality. Studies have demonstrated that the implementation of QIs significantly reduces error rates, leading to enhanced diagnostic accuracy and improved patient safety. This review discusses the common pre-analytical errors, the role of QIs in mitigating these errors, and the impact of quality management on overall laboratory performance, with evidence drawn from recent research and clinical practice.

Keywords— Pre-analytical errors, Quality indicators, Laboratory testing, Hemolysis, Diagnostic accuracy, Patient safety

1. Introduction

Laboratory testing is critical for diagnosis, treatment, and monitoring in clinical settings. However, errors can occur during different phases of testing: pre-analytical, analytical, and post-analytical. Among these, pre-analytical errors are most prevalent, constituting 46-68% of total laboratory errors (1). These errors occur before the actual analysis of the specimen, including patient preparation, specimen collection, labelling, transport, and storage. Misidentification, improper handling, and sample contamination can distort results, leading to potential misdiagnoses, delays, and improper treatment (2).

The significance of pre-analytical errors cannot be understated. According to Hawkins (2012), preventing errors in this phase can improve patient outcomes more effectively than reducing errors in the analytical phase (3). To mitigate these issues, laboratories worldwide have adopted quality indicators (QIs) aimed at improving their operations by monitoring, detecting, and correcting pre-analytical errors (4).

2. Common Pre-Analytical Errors

Pre-analytical errors can occur at various stages of sample management, including patient preparation, specimen collection, and sample transport. Some of the most prevalent pre-analytical errors include:

1. **Patient Identification Errors:**
Patient misidentification is a critical issue in laboratory testing. The Clinical and Laboratory Standards Institute (CLSI) mandates the use of two unique identifiers (e.g., name and date of birth) during sample collection (5). Errors in this area can lead to serious consequences, including incorrect diagnoses and inappropriate treatment.

2. **Sample Collection Errors:**
Errors during phlebotomy, such as drawing the wrong volume of blood or using incorrect tubes, frequently compromise sample quality. Insufficient sample volumes (QNS, or quantity not sufficient) prevent accurate testing. Wrong tube selection, such as using an EDTA tube for coagulation tests, leads to erroneous results (6).

3. **Hemolysis:**
Hemolysis is among the most common pre-analytical errors and the leading cause of sample rejection in clinical laboratories, particularly in emergency settings (7). Hemolysis can result from improper venipuncture technique, prolonged tourniquet application, or rough handling during

transport (8). It can falsely elevate parameters such as potassium, LDH, and AST, which may lead to inappropriate clinical interventions (3).

4. **Sample Transport Delays:**
Proper and timely transport of specimens is essential for preserving sample integrity. Delays or incorrect storage conditions can degrade analytes, especially in time-sensitive tests such as coagulation studies and microbiology cultures (9).

5. **Incorrect Use of Anticoagulants and Additives:**
Selection of incorrect anticoagulants or additives, as well as improper mixing of blood with anticoagulants, can lead to clot formation or erroneous test results. For example, failure to use citrate tubes for coagulation tests can alter test outcomes (1).

3. Quality Indicators for Detecting Pre-Analytical Errors

To reduce pre-analytical errors, clinical laboratories use a variety of quality indicators, which serve as measurable metrics to evaluate and improve processes. The following QIs are among the most effective in detecting pre-analytical errors:

1. **Specimen Rejection Rates:**
Monitoring the number of rejected samples due to pre-analytical errors is one of the most widely used indicators. High rejection rates highlight systemic issues in the collection and handling process. A comprehensive study by Carraro and Plebani revealed that up to 77% of sample rejections were due to pre-analytical factors such as hemolysis, clotting, and mislabeling(6). Regular tracking of rejection rates helps laboratories identify specific weak points, enabling targeted corrective actions (5).

2. **Hemolysis Index:**
Hemolysis index is a critical QI, as it directly reflects the quality of blood collection and handling. Studies have shown that implementing protocols to reduce hemolysis, such as standardizing venipuncture techniques and minimizing transportation disturbances, significantly lowers hemolysis rates (7). Tracking hemolysis rates also allows laboratories to evaluate the effectiveness of training programs for phlebotomists.

3. **Patient Identification Error Rate:**
Monitoring the frequency of misidentification errors is essential for ensuring patient safety. Ambachew et al. found that about 1.1% of laboratory errors in their study were due to misidentification, and the implementation of QIs that focused on correct labeling and the use of barcoding systems significantly reduced these errors (10). Tracking patient identification accuracy ensures compliance with identification protocols and reduces the likelihood of serious clinical errors.

4. **Sample Transport Time and Conditions:**
Time-sensitive tests, such as those for coagulation or microbiology cultures, are highly dependent on sample transport times. Monitoring and reducing delays, as well as ensuring proper temperature control, can improve diagnostic accuracy. Studies indicate that adhering to strict transport times and appropriate storage conditions can decrease the percentage of samples rejected due to degradation (9).

5. Phlebotomy Success Rate:
The number of unsuccessful venipuncture attempts (multiple punctures) can be tracked as an indicator of phlebotomist competency. High rates of unsuccessful venipunctures correlate with increased rates of hemolysis and patient discomfort. Monitoring and improving phlebotomy success rates can enhance sample quality and patient experience (5,12).

6. **Compliance with Correct Use of Tubes and Anticoagulants:**
Proper selection and use of collection tubes are paramount to ensuring reliable results. One study found that improper tube selection accounted for 1.5% of pre-analytical errors (13). Monitoring compliance with correct tube use can minimize these errors and ensure that clinicians receive accurate test results.

4. Impact of Quality Indicators on Laboratory Performance

Implementing QIs for pre-analytical processes leads to improved laboratory efficiency and patient safety. A study conducted by Sciacovelli et al. (4) found that laboratories adhering to QIs showed a significant reduction in error rates, especially regarding hemolysis, patient identification, and sample handling errors. For example, Lippi et al. (1) demonstrated that the use of a structured quality control system reduced hemolysis rates from 3.7% to 0.6% over two years. Similarly, Meier et al. reported a substantial decrease in patient identification errors following the implementation of QIs aimed at improving identification accuracy (11).

Furthermore, the establishment of external quality assessment (EQA) programs that focus on the pre-analytical phase has contributed to harmonization and standardization across laboratories. These programs provide benchmarks for laboratories to compare their performance and identify areas for improvement (4).

5. Challenges in Implementing Quality Indicators

While the implementation of quality indicators (QIs) for detecting pre-analytical errors is essential for enhancing laboratory efficiency and patient safety, several challenges exist that can hinder their successful adoption. These challenges are multifaceted, involving logistical, financial, technological, and human resource-related constraints. Below are the key challenges laboratories may encounter when implementing Q (14).

1. Resource Constraints

One of the most significant challenges is the lack of adequate resources. Many laboratories, particularly in low-resource settings or smaller institutions, struggle with limited funding, staffing, and infrastructure. Quality management systems require continuous monitoring, data collection, and analysis, all of which demand time, personnel, and technology that may not always be readily available. Implementing QIs often involves additional administrative workload for laboratory personnel who are already handling large volumes of tests daily. For example, staff must regularly document and review metrics like specimen rejection rates, hemolysis index, or patient identification errors. Without adequate staffing, maintaining consistent QI monitoring can be difficult, potentially leading to incomplete or inaccurate assessments (2).

2. Training and Competency of Personnel

Effective implementation of QIs requires trained personnel who are knowledgeable in quality management, laboratory processes, and the specific nature of pre-analytical errors. However, many laboratory staff may not have formal training in quality improvement methodologies, and the learning curve can be steep. Consistent education and training are required to ensure that staff members adhere to best practices in specimen collection, handling, and documentation. For example, improper phlebotomy techniques or patient identification protocols can directly increase error rates, undermining the laboratory's quality goals. Developing and maintaining training programs, particularly in high-turnover environments, can be both time-consuming and costly (3) Furthermore, ensuring that all staff members are consistently applying these protocols in a busy laboratory setting is a challenge that requires continuous oversight and reinforcement.

3. Cost of Quality Improvement Initiatives

Establishing a robust quality management system that includes the consistent use of QIs can be expensive. Laboratories may need to invest in new technology, such as automated systems for monitoring hemolysis or electronic barcoding systems for patient identification. In addition, specialized software, such as Laboratory Information Systems (LIS), is often necessary for tracking and analyzing QI data, but these systems require significant financial investment for both initial installation and ongoing maintenance. Smaller or underfunded laboratories may not have the budget to afford such technologies, limiting their ability to effectively monitor pre-analytical errors. Moreover, participating in external quality assessment (EQA) programs, which provide valuable benchmarking and standardization tools, often comes with associated costs, further straining financial resources (2).

4. Data Management and Technological Infrastructure

Successful QI implementation requires a robust data management system capable of collecting, storing, and analyzing large volumes of quality data. Many laboratories rely on Laboratory Information Systems (LIS) to streamline this process, but smaller or older labs may lack the necessary technological infrastructure. In such cases, manual data collection and analysis may be the only option, which increases the risk of human error and can be extremely time-consuming. Even with LIS systems in place, integration with other hospital or healthcare systems can be complex, especially in multi-site institutions where consistent data sharing is crucial. Data security and privacy concerns also need to be addressed, as laboratories handle sensitive patient information, which adds another layer of complexity to implementing automated quality management systems (5).

5. Resistance to Change

Introducing QIs and promoting a culture of continuous quality improvement often face resistance from staff who may be accustomed to long-standing practices. Changing established workflows, even when the changes are aimed at improving quality, can be met with reluctance. This resistance is often due to a lack of understanding about the benefits of QIs or concerns about the additional workload required for tracking and monitoring errors. Staff may perceive QIs as a threat, believing that they will be penalized for errors rather than viewing the indicators as tools for system improvement. Overcoming this challenge requires effective communication and leadership that emphasize the positive outcomes of QI implementation, such as improved patient safety and fewer test rejections (2).

6. Lack of Standardization

There is no universal consensus on which QIs should be used across laboratories. Although various professional organizations have recommended different sets of QIs, there is still variability in their adoption and application. This lack of standardization can lead to discrepancies in how laboratories measure and report pre-analytical errors, making it difficult to compare performance across institutions or to implement benchmarking initiatives. For instance, while some laboratories may prioritize monitoring hemolysis rates, others may focus on specimen rejection rates or patient identification accuracy. Without a standardized approach, it becomes challenging to establish best practices or evaluate the effectiveness of QIs on a broader scale (4).

7. Difficulty in Sustaining Long-Term Improvements

Even after successfully implementing QIs, maintaining the improvements in pre-analytical processes can be difficult over the long term. Quality management requires ongoing efforts to ensure that corrective actions taken in response to QI data are sustainable. This can be particularly challenging in laboratories experiencing frequent personnel changes, heavy workloads, or shifting priorities. Additionally, maintaining the focus on quality may be deprioritized in favor of more immediate operational concerns, such as increasing test throughput or managing budget constraints. Ensuring that quality remains a priority in the face of these pressures requires strong leadership and a commitment to continuous improvement (4).

6. Conclusion

The implementation of quality indicators (QIs) to detect pre-analytical errors in laboratory testing is crucial for improving

the overall quality of laboratory services and ensuring patient safety. Pre-analytical errors, which account for the majority of total laboratory errors, have significant implications for diagnostic accuracy, treatment decisions, and patient outcomes. The adoption of QIs provides a systematic approach to identifying, monitoring, and mitigating these errors, contributing to enhanced diagnostic reliability, reduced turnaround times, and improved patient care.

Through the use of QIs, laboratories can identify common sources of pre-analytical errors, such as specimen rejection, hemolysis, misidentification, improper use of collection tubes, and delays in sample transport. These indicators serve as actionable metrics, allowing laboratories to evaluate the effectiveness of their processes and implement targeted interventions where weaknesses are identified. Numerous studies have demonstrated that laboratories using QIs experience significant reductions in pre-analytical error rates, particularly in areas like hemolysis and patient misidentification, which are directly linked to patient outcomes. For instance, initiatives to reduce hemolysis by improving phlebotomy techniques have been shown to enhance test result accuracy and reduce unnecessary repeat testing, leading to better clinical decision-making and patient safety.

However, despite these clear benefits, laboratories face several challenges in implementing and sustaining QIs. Resource constraints, such as limited staffing, budgetary pressures, and inadequate technological infrastructure, often hinder the continuous monitoring and reporting required for effective QI use. Laboratories, particularly smaller or resource-limited ones, may struggle to afford the necessary technologies, such as Laboratory Information Systems (LIS), barcoding for patient identification, or automated hemolysis detection systems. Moreover, the need for consistent training and education of personnel presents an ongoing challenge, as high staff turnover and inadequate training can undermine efforts to improve pre-analytical quality.

Another challenge lies in resistance to change among laboratory staff. Implementing QIs often requires alterations to long-established workflows, which can meet with opposition. Successfully overcoming this resistance requires strong leadership, effective communication, and a culture that values continuous quality improvement. Laboratories must also focus on building sustainable quality management systems that continue to prioritize error detection and prevention over the long term. Ensuring that quality remains a focal point amidst shifting operational demands requires ongoing commitment from laboratory leadership and the development of robust processes that are resilient to personnel changes or resource constraints.

Lack of standardization in QI selection and implementation is another critical issue that laboratories face. Without a universally agreed-upon set of QIs, laboratories may employ varying metrics, making benchmarking difficult and hindering broader efforts to harmonize quality management practices across the field. Collaborative efforts by professional organizations, such as the International Organization for Standardization (ISO) and Clinical and Laboratory Standards Institute (CLSI), are essential for driving harmonization and establishing best practices across laboratories globally.

Moreover, the long-term sustainability of improvements in pre-analytical processes remains a concern. Even after successful implementation of QIs, maintaining those improvements requires continuous vigilance and regular assessment of laboratory processes. This can be challenging in fast-paced environments where operational pressures and limited resources may shift focus away from quality improvement initiatives. Therefore, sustained success with QIs requires not only an initial investment in quality management but also a long-term strategy that includes regular audits, continuous training, and consistent leadership support.

In conclusion, while the challenges in implementing QIs are significant, their role in reducing pre-analytical errors and improving patient care is undeniable. By systematically addressing errors in patient identification, sample collection, handling, and transport, laboratories can drastically reduce the potential for diagnostic inaccuracies and adverse patient outcomes. The continued evolution and integration of QIs into laboratory operations—supported by technological advancements, workforce education, and leadership commitment—will be vital in ensuring that laboratories deliver high-quality, reliable, and timely results. Furthermore, collaborative efforts to standardize QIs on a global scale will promote best practices across laboratories, helping to harmonize quality management efforts and further reduce pre-analytical variability. Ultimately, investing in QIs and overcoming the associated challenges is an investment in patient safety, clinical excellence, and the future of laboratory medicine.

Data Availability: None

Conflict of Interest
Authors declare that they do not have any conflict of interest.

Funding Source: None

Authors' Contributions
Dr. Pawan Kumar researched literature and conceived the study and wrote the manuscript. Dr.Pawan Kumar reviewed and edited the manuscript and approved the final version of the manuscript.

Acknowledgements
None

References

[1] Lippi, G., Chance, J. J., Church, S., Dazzi, P., Fontana, R., Giavarina, D..et al., "Preanalytical quality improvement: from dream to reality," *Clinical Chemistry and Laboratory Medicine*, Vol.49, Issue.7, pp.**1113-1126, 2011.** http://dx.doi.org/10.1515/CCLM.2011.600

[2] Plebani, M., "The detection and prevention of errors in laboratory medicine," *Annals of Clinical Biochemistry*, Vol.**47**, Issue.**2**, pp.**101-110, 2010.** http://dx.doi.org/10.1258/acb.2010.009240
[3] Hawkins, R., "Managing the pre- and post-analytical phases of the total testing process," *Annals of Laboratory Medicine*, Vol.**32**, Issue.**1**, pp.**5-16, 2012.** http://dx.doi.org/10.3343/alm.2012.32.1.5
[4] Sciacovelli, L., Aita, A. i Chiozza, M.L. ., "External quality assessment and quality indicators for harmonizing the pre-analytical phase," *Clinical Chemistry and Laboratory Medicine*, Vol.**58**, Issue.**6**, pp.**920-929, 2020.** http://dx.doi.org/10.1515/cclm-2019-1080
[5] Mehndiratta M, Pasha EH, Chandra N, Almeida EA. Quality Indicators for Evaluating Errors in the Preanalytical Phase. *J Lab Physicians*.; Vol.**13**, Issue.**2**, pp.**169-174, 2021.** doi:10.1055/s-0041-1729473.
[6] Carraro, P., Plebani, M., "Errors in a stat laboratory: Types and frequencies 10 years later," *Clinical Chemistry*, Vol.**53**, Issue.**7**, pp.**1338-1342, 2007.** http://dx.doi.org/10.1373/clinchem.2006.081760
[7] Lippi G, Blanckaert N, Bonini P, Green S, Kitchen S, Palicka V, Vassault AJ, Plebani M., "Hemolysis: An overview of the leading cause of unsuitable specimens in clinical laboratories," Clinical Chemistry and Laboratory Medicine, Vol.**46**, Issue.**6**, pp.**764-772, 2008.** http://dx.doi.org/10.1515/CCLM.2008.170
[8] Lippi, G., Plebani, M., "Laboratory applications for hemolysis detection: Advancements and future directions," *Clinical Biochemistry*, Vol.**45**, Issue.**4**, pp.**273-277, 2012.** http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.clinbiochem.2012.01.003
[9] Aarsand AK, Røraas T, Bartlett WA, Coşkun A, Carobene A, Fernandez-Calle P, Jonker N, Díaz-Garzón J, Braga F, Sandberg S; European Federation of Clinical Chemistry and Laboratory Medicine (EFLM) Working Group on Biological Variation. Harmonization initiatives in the generation, reporting and application of biological variation data. Clinical Chemistry and Laboratory Medicine (CCLM), Sept., Vol.**56**, Issue.**10**, pp.**1629-1636, 2018.** http://dx.doi.org/10.1515/cclm-2018-0058
[10] Ambachew, S., Adane, K., Worede, A., Melak, T., Asmelash, D., Damtie, S., Baynes, H. W., Abebe, M., & Biadgo, B. (). Errors in the Total Testing Process in the Clinical Chemistry Laboratory at the University of Gondar Hospital, Northwest Ethiopia. *Ethiopian journal of health sciences*, Vol.**28**, Issue.**2**, pp.**235–244, 2018.** https://doi.org/10.4314/ejhs.v28i2.15
[11] van Dongen-Lases, Edmée C., Cornes, Michael P., Grankvist, Kjell, Ibarz, Mercedes, Kristensen, Gunn B.B., Lippi, Giuseppe, Nybo, Mads, Simundic, Ana-Maria and on behalf of the Working Group for Preanalytical Phase (WG-PRE), European Federation of Clinical Chemistry and Laboratory Medicine (EFLM), "Patient identification and tube labelling – a call for harmonisation" Clinical Chemistry and Laboratory Medicine (CCLM), Vol.**54**, Issue.**7**, pp.**1141-1145, 2016.** https://doi.org/10.1515/cclm-2015-1089
[12] Bowen RA, Hortin GL, Csako G, Otañez OH, Remaley AT. Impact of blood collection devices on clinical chemistry assays. *Clin Biochem*.; Vol.**43**, Issue.**1-2**, pp.**4-25, 2010.** doi:10.1016/j.clinbiochem.2009.10.001.
[13] Alcantara, J. C., Alharbi, B., Almotairi, Y., Alam, M. J., Muddathir, A. R. M., & Alshaghdali, K. (). Analysis of preanalytical errors in a clinical chemistry laboratory: A 2-year study. *Medicine*, Vol.**101**, Issue.**27**, e29853. **2022.** https://doi.org/10.1097/MD.0000000000029853.
[14] Zaninotto M, Graziani MS, Plebani M. The harmonization issue in laboratory medicine: the commitment of *CCLM*. Clin Chem Lab Med. Vol.**16**; Issue.**61**, pp.**721-731, 2022.** doi: 10.1515/cclm-2022-1111.

AUTHORS PROFILE

Dr.Pawan Kumar Ph.D. did his Ph.D from Delhi University. He is currently working as Head of the Biochemistry Department Health Quest Laboratories, Gurugram , Haryana, India. He is Life member of Indian College of allergy and Applied Immunology and Indian Aerobiological Society He has published more than 12 research papers in reputed International Journals. He has also worked on the development of Immunoassays and Cancer Vaccines. He has 3 years of teaching experience and 14 years of research experience.

