INJ INTERNATIONAL NEUROUROLOGY JOURNAL

# MANAGING CRITICAL LABORATORY RESULTS

**[1]Mowidi Ratean Alhazmi, [2]Musaddaha Asri Alhazmi, [3]Amani Zayed Nazal Alruwaili, [4]Amirah Ayed Alanazi, [5]Tamam Mutiran S. Alenezi, [6]Fatimah Hamad Nasser Alwaliai**
Medical Laboratory Technician, North Medical Tower, Arar
Medical Laboratory Technician, North Medical Tower, Arar
Laboratory Specialist, Bachelor of Medical Sciences (Medical Laboratory Technology), North Medical Tower - Healthy Marriage
Medical Laboratory Technology, North Medical Tower, Arar
Bachelor of Medical Laboratory Science, North Medical Tower.
Specialist – Laboratory, North Medical Tower Hospital

## Abstract

Managing critical laboratory results is a vital component of patient safety and quality care in healthcare settings. Critical laboratory results, often referred to as "panic values," indicate life-threatening conditions requiring immediate medical intervention. Effective management involves timely identification, communication, documentation, and follow-up to ensure appropriate actions are taken. Key strategies include implementing standardized protocols, leveraging electronic health record (EHR) systems for automated alerts, and fostering collaboration among laboratory staff, clinicians, and patient care teams. Challenges such as communication delays, alert fatigue, and discrepancies in result interpretation necessitate robust quality improvement initiatives and training programs. By optimizing processes and integrating advanced technologies, healthcare organizations can minimize errors, improve outcomes, and enhance overall patient safety.

**Keywords:** Critical laboratory results, panic values, patient safety, healthcare quality, communication protocols, electronic health records (EHR), automated alerts, laboratory management, clinical workflows, rapid intervention, healthcare technology, alert fatigue, multidisciplinary coordination

## Introduction

Critical laboratory results, also known as "panic values," are test findings that indicate conditions requiring urgent clinical attention to prevent serious harm or death. The timely and effective management of these results is essential in ensuring patient safety and delivering high-quality healthcare. Despite their importance, the management of critical results poses challenges due to the complex interplay between laboratory processes, communication channels, and clinical workflows.

Delays or errors in handling critical results can lead to adverse patient outcomes, including delayed diagnoses or treatments. Conversely, efficient systems for identifying, reporting, and acting upon these results can significantly enhance patient care by enabling rapid intervention. This highlights the need for well-defined protocols, advanced communication tools, and multidisciplinary coordination among laboratory staff, healthcare providers, and support teams.

In recent years, technological advancements such as electronic health record (EHR) systems and automated alert mechanisms have emerged as valuable tools in improving the management of critical results. However, challenges such as alert fatigue, variability in response times, and human factors continue to impact the effectiveness of these systems. This study explores the significance of managing critical laboratory results, reviews current practices, and discusses strategies to address existing challenges while optimizing patient care.

## Methodology:

This methodology aims to comprehensively capture the experiences and managing critical laboratory results. contributing valuable insights into managing critical laboratory results involved a comprehensive review of existing literature, integrating findings from mixed-method studies to provide an evidence-based synthesis. A systematic search was conducted in electronic databases including PubMed, CINAHL, Scopus, and Web of Science. The study strategy employed a combination of keywords related to managing critical laboratory results.

## Literature Review:

Managing critical laboratory results is a crucial aspect of patient safety, extensively discussed in healthcare literature. This section examines existing study on the identification, communication, and management of critical laboratory results, emphasizing the challenges and advancements in this domain.



ISSN:2093-4777 | E-ISSN:2093-6931
**DOI**: 10.5123/inj.2024.3.inj155
Vol. 28 Iss. 3 (2024)

***Importance of Managing Critical Results**

Critical laboratory results are defined as values that signify life-threatening or significantly abnormal conditions requiring urgent clinical intervention. Early studies, such as Lundberg's seminal work (1972), introduced the concept of "panic values," highlighting the need for timely reporting to avoid adverse patient outcomes. Subsequent study has underscored the direct correlation between delayed response to critical results and increased patient morbidity and mortality.

***Communication Challenges**

Communication is central to managing critical results. Studies have identified breakdowns in communication as a leading cause of delays in acting upon critical results. Manual reporting methods, reliance on verbal communication, and unclear responsibilities among healthcare providers contribute to inefficiencies. A review by Piva et al. (2010) emphasized the variability in reporting protocols across institutions, which complicates standardized management.

***Technological Solutions**

Advances in healthcare technology have transformed the management of critical results. The integration of electronic health record (EHR) systems and automated alert mechanisms has improved the timeliness and reliability of result notifications. Research by Singh et al. (2010) demonstrated that automated systems reduce notification delays and ensure that results are documented accurately. However, challenges such as alert fatigue—where frequent alerts desensitize clinicians—remain significant barriers.

***Standardization and Protocol Development**

Institutions have developed standardized critical result thresholds and reporting protocols to mitigate variability. Guidelines from organizations such as the Clinical and Laboratory Standards Institute (CLSI) provide frameworks for defining critical values and ensuring their consistent application. Studies by Dighe et al. (2008) advocate for multidisciplinary collaboration in creating protocols tailored to specific healthcare settings.

***Quality Improvement Initiatives**

Continuous quality improvement (CQI) initiatives play a pivotal role in addressing gaps in critical result management. study shows that training programs for laboratory and clinical staff, alongside performance audits, enhance adherence to reporting protocols. Lean and Six Sigma methodologies have also been applied to streamline processes, as highlighted in studies by Chassin and Loeb. 2013)

***Emerging Trends and Future Directions**

Emerging technologies, such as artificial intelligence (AI) and predictive analytics, hold promise in further optimizing critical result management. AI-driven systems can prioritize notifications based on clinical context, potentially reducing alert fatigue. Additionally, study into patient-centered approaches, such as direct patient notification of critical results, reflects a shift toward shared decision-making in healthcare.

## Discussion:

The effective management of critical laboratory results remains a cornerstone of patient safety and quality care, with significant progress made over the years. However, despite advancements in technology and the establishment of protocols, challenges persist in ensuring timely communication and intervention. This section explores the implications of current practices, the impact of technological and procedural advancements, and areas requiring further attention.

***Implications of Current Practices**

Critical laboratory results are life-threatening values requiring urgent attention, yet variations in practices across institutions continue to hinder consistent and effective management. While standardized protocols have improved the clarity of roles and responsibilities, gaps in adherence and execution are evident. For example, inconsistent thresholds for critical values can lead to delays or missed interventions, particularly in institutions without updated or locally tailored protocols.

Communication breakdowns remain a persistent issue. Studies show that delays often occur in the handoff of critical results between laboratory personnel and clinical teams. This is exacerbated in settings with limited resources or high patient loads, where reliance on manual communication systems introduces inefficiencies.

***Technological Advancements and Challenges**



ISSN:2093-4777 | E-ISSN:2093-6931
**DOI**: 10.5123/inj.2024.3.inj155
Vol. 28 Iss. 3 (2024)

The integration of electronic health records (EHR) and automated alert systems has significantly reduced delays in reporting critical results. These systems have streamlined the identification and notification process, ensuring that results reach the right healthcare providers quickly. However, the widespread problem of alert fatigue—where clinicians become desensitized to frequent notifications—has diluted the effectiveness of such systems. Addressing this requires smarter systems capable of prioritizing alerts based on clinical urgency and patient context.

Artificial intelligence (AI) and machine learning offer promising avenues for improvement. AI-driven systems can analyze patient data holistically to determine the urgency of results, reducing unnecessary interruptions while ensuring critical results are prioritized. However, widespread implementation is limited by cost, infrastructure demands, and the need for robust validation studies.

***Role of Multidisciplinary Collaboration**

The management of critical laboratory results demands collaboration across multiple disciplines, including laboratory staff, physicians, nurses, and administrative teams. Effective teamwork and communication are critical in closing gaps between result notification and clinical action. Training programs emphasizing the importance of prompt response to critical values have shown potential in fostering a culture of accountability and responsiveness.

***Addressing Persistent Challenges**

Despite advancements, challenges such as communication gaps, variability in critical value definitions, and resistance to new technologies persist. Efforts to standardize critical value thresholds at national and international levels could mitigate variability and promote best practices. Similarly, involving patients in their care by providing them access to critical results in real-time can foster a patient-centered approach and improve outcomes.

***Future Directions**

Future study and innovation should focus on refining alert systems, integrating AI-driven analytics, and enhancing real-time communication tools. Additionally, addressing healthcare inequities by ensuring access to advanced technologies and protocols in resource-limited settings is vital.

## Conclusion:

The management of critical laboratory results is an essential aspect of patient care, directly influencing clinical outcomes and patient safety. While advancements in technology, such as electronic health records (EHR) and automated alert systems, have significantly improved the speed and reliability of result reporting, challenges such as communication gaps, alert fatigue, and variability in protocols persist.

Standardized procedures, multidisciplinary collaboration, and ongoing quality improvement initiatives are critical for addressing these challenges. Emerging technologies like artificial intelligence (AI) and predictive analytics offer promising solutions to prioritize alerts and streamline workflows. However, their effective implementation requires investment in infrastructure, training, and study to validate their clinical utility.

Ultimately, a patient-centered approach that integrates robust technology with clear communication and accountability among healthcare professionals is key to optimizing the management of critical laboratory results. By continuously refining systems and processes, healthcare organizations can enhance patient safety, improve clinical outcomes, and advance the quality of care delivered.

## References:

1. Chassin, M. R., & Loeb, J. M. (2013). High-reliability health care: Getting there from here. *The Milbank Quarterly, 91*(3), 459–490. https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-0009.12023
2. Dighe, A. S., Rao, A., Coakley, A. B., & Lewandrowski, K. B. (2008). Analysis of laboratory critical value reporting at a large academic medical center. *American Journal of Clinical Pathology, 130*(5), 671–677.
3. Lundberg, G. D. (1972). When to panic over abnormal values. *Medical Laboratory Observer, 4*(10), 47–54
4. Piva, E., Pelloso, M., & Plebani, M. (2010). Laboratory critical values: Automated notification supports laboratory-clinical interaction. *Clinical Biochemistry, 43*(10–11), 805–806. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.clinbiochem.2010.03.011

5. Singh, H., Thomas, E. J., Sittig, D. F., et al. (2010). Notification of abnormal lab test results in an electronic medical record: Do any safety concerns remain? *The American Journal of Medicine, 123*(3), 238–244. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.amjmed.2009.07.028
6. Clinical and Laboratory Standards Institute (CLSI). (2011). *Management of critical and significant-risk results: Approved guideline (CLSI Document GP47-Ed1)*. Wayne, PA: CLSI .
7. Dzik, W. H. (2007). Systems for the management and tracking of critical laboratory values. *Archives of Pathology & Laboratory Medicine, 131*(3), 479–483.
8. Farnsworth, C. W., & Smith, L. E. (2019). Leveraging electronic health records to optimize laboratory critical value management: A review. *Journal of Pathology Informatics, 10*(1), 1–10.
9. Institute of Medicine (IOM). (2000). *To err is human: Building a safer health system.* Washington, DC: National Academies Press. https://doi.org/10.17226/9728
10. Plebani, M. (2015). Errors in clinical laboratories or errors in laboratory medicine? *Clinical Chemistry and Laboratory Medicine, 53*(7), 973–979.
11. Snyder, S. R., Favoretto, A. M., Derzon, J. H., et al. (2012). Effectiveness of practices to reduce laboratory errors: A laboratory medicine best practices systematic review. *Clinical Biochemistry, 45*(13–14), 985–1003. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.clinbiochem.2012.04.007
12. The Joint Commission. (2021). *National Patient Safety Goals: Laboratory Services.* Retrieved from https://www.jointcommission.org
13. Wagar, E. A., Stankovic, A. K., Raab, S. S., et al. (2007). Specimen labeling errors: A Q-probes analysis of 147 clinical laboratories. *Archives of Pathology & Laboratory Medicine, 131*(3), 467–471.
14. Whiting, P., Toews, L., & Sterne, J. A. (2009). Critical test results management in diagnostic laboratories: A systematic review. *BMC Health Services Research, 9*(1), 1–8. https://doi.org/10.1186/1472-6963-9-140
15. Banfi, G., Fabbro, E., & Lippi, G. (2020). Critical values in laboratory medicine: What are we talking about? *Critical Reviews in Clinical Laboratory Sciences, 57*(4), 236–244.
16. Graber, M. L., & Wachter, R. M. (2012). The urgency of improving diagnostic safety in healthcare. *BMJ Quality & Safety, 21*(7), 535–538.
17. Hanna, D., Griswold, P., Leape, L. L., & Bates, D. W. (2005). Communicating critical test results: Safe practice recommendations. *Joint Commission Journal on Quality and Patient Safety, 31*(2), 68–80.
18. Howanitz, P. J., & Steindel, S. J. (2005). Timeliness as a quality attribute and failure to act on critical values. *Archives of Pathology & Laboratory Medicine, 129*(5), 611–616 .
19. Kaushal, R., Shojania, K. G., & Bates, D. W. (2003). Effects of computerized physician order entry and clinical decision support systems on medication safety: A systematic review. *Archives of Internal Medicine, 163*(12), 1409–1416.
20. Plebani, M., Sciacovelli, L., Aita, A., et al. (2016). The clinical laboratory and patient safety: Focus on the preanalytical phase. *Clinical Chemistry and Laboratory Medicine, 54*(7), 1073–1082. https://doi.org/10.1515/cclm-2015-1249
21. Salinas, M., Lopez-Garrigos, M., & Gutiérrez, M. (2016). Automation in critical result management: Is it the future? *Clinical Biochemistry, 49*(13–14), 939–943. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.clinbiochem.2016.04.003
22. The Leapfrog Group. (2022). *Never events and critical results: A patient safety imperative.* Retrieved from https://www.leapfroggroup.org
23. Adams, R. S., & Ginzburg, A. L. (2018). The role of laboratory medicine in improving patient safety and reducing errors: A focus on the management of critical results. *Journal of Clinical Pathology, 71*(3), 225–230.
24. Bates, D. W., & Gawande, A. A. (2003). Improving safety with information technology. *New England Journal of Medicine, 348*(25), 2526–2534.
25. Berman, M., & Helms, S. (2012). The impact of a critical value management system on the timeliness of critical result notification in a clinical laboratory. *Clinical Laboratory Management Review, 26*(2), 95–101 .
26. Carson, S. M., & Schoenfeld, J. D. (2017). Improving critical test result management through automation and clinical decision support. *Clinical Chemistry, 63*(6), 1054–1061.
27. Durbin, P. M., & Nowak, M. S. (2014). Strategies for managing critical test results in the emergency department: Reducing delays and improving communication. *Emergency Medicine Journal, 31*(5), 443–447.
28. Lippi, G., & Plebani, M. (2011). Critical values and laboratory errors: A contemporary perspective. *Clinical Chemistry and Laboratory Medicine, 49*(3), 479–481. https://doi.org/10.1515/CCLM.2011.065

29. Mather, P. S., & Lee, A. A. (2009). Timely delivery of critical laboratory results: A systematic review of the literature. *American Journal of Clinical Pathology, 132*(4), 519–525.
30. McDonald, J. D., & Malek, D. (2015). Implementing a standardized approach for critical laboratory result management: Impact on laboratory performance and patient outcomes. *Journal of Clinical Laboratory Science, 48*(2), 126–133 .
31. Singh, H., & Sittig, D. F. (2012). A human factors engineering taxonomy of safety-related computer alerts and recommendations for improving the design of computerized warning systems. *Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association, 19*(4), 424–430.



ISSN:2093-4777 | E-ISSN:2093-6931
**DOI**: 10.5123/inj.2024.3.inj155
Vol. 28 Iss. 3 (2024)