Letters in High Energy Physics
ISSN:2632-2714

Volume 2023
Issue 2

Strategies for Improving Laboratory Turnaround Times in Internal Medicine

Rami Salem Saleh Jarallah[1], Naif Bakheet M Aljohani[2], Samiah Fahad Duhayman Alfuhigi[3], Mamdouh Hamoud Alruwaili[4], Khulud Odayhim Aqeel Aldhafeeri[5], Sarah Haqil Silfiq Aldhafeeri[6], Fardoos Yones Fellath[7], Turkey Eissa H Alhdirees[8], Abdullah Alhumaidi Hamed Alreshidi[9], Angham Mohammed Abduallah Alkhnani[10].

[1] Lab Technician, Alwajh General Hospital, Alwajh, Tabuk Region, Saudi Arabia.

[2] Laboratory Microbiology Technician, Aseer Regional Laboratory, Abha, Aseer Region, Saudi Arabia.

[3] Specialist - Laboratory, Al-Jouf Subcentral Blood Bank, Sakaka, Al-Jouf Region, Saudi Arabia.

[4] Medical Laboratories, Prince Abdulaziz bin Musaed Hospital, Arar, Northern Borders Region, Saudi Arabia.

[5] Lab Specialist, Maternity and Children Hospital, Hafr Al-Batin, Eastern Region, Saudi Arabia.

[6] Lab Technician, Maternity and Children Hospital, Hafr Al-Batin, Eastern Region, Saudi Arabia.

[7] Laboratory Technician, Madinah Regional Laboratory, Madinah, Madinah Region, Saudi Arabia.

[8] Laboratory Specialist, Al Sumaira General Hospital, Hail, Hail Region, Saudi Arabia.

[9] Specialist - Laboratory, Aga Hospital for Long-Term Care and Medical Rehabilitation, Hail, Hail Region, Saudi Arabia.

[10] Technician - Laboratory - Clinical Biochemistry, Alwajh General Hospital, Tabuk Health Cluster, Alwajh, Tabuk Region, Saudi Arabia.

Abstract:

Improving laboratory turnaround times in internal medicine is crucial for enhancing patient care and optimizing clinical workflows. One effective strategy is the implementation of streamlined processes through automation and technology. By adopting advanced laboratory information systems (LIS) and integrating them with electronic health records (EHR), laboratories can significantly reduce the time taken for sample processing and result reporting. Automation of repetitive tasks, such as sample sorting and analysis, minimizes human error and accelerates throughput. Additionally, employing real-time tracking systems allows healthcare providers to monitor the status of tests and communicate results more efficiently, ensuring timely decision-making for patient management. Another key strategy involves fostering collaboration between laboratory personnel and clinical staff. Regular interdisciplinary meetings can help identify bottlenecks in the testing process and develop solutions tailored to specific departmental needs. Training staff on the importance of timely specimen collection and handling can also improve turnaround times. Establishing clear communication channels between physicians and laboratory technicians ensures that urgent requests are prioritized and any issues are promptly addressed. Ultimately, a culture of continuous improvement, supported by data analytics to monitor performance metrics, can lead to sustained enhancements in laboratory turnaround times, benefiting both patients and healthcare providers.

Keywords: Laboratory turnaround times, Internal medicine, Automation, Laboratory information systems (LIS), Electronic health records (EHR), Real-time tracking, Interdisciplinary collaboration, Bottlenecks, Specimen collection, Continuous improvement, Data analytics

Introduction:

In the realm of internal medicine, laboratory turnaround time (TAT) is a critical metric that significantly influences patient care, clinical decision-making, and healthcare system efficiency. Laboratory turnaround time refers to the duration from the moment a test is ordered to the point when the results are reported back to the healthcare provider. This metric encompasses various stages, including specimen collection, processing, analysis, and reporting. In an era where timely diagnosis and treatment are paramount, particularly in acute care settings, optimizing laboratory TAT has emerged as a focal point for improving healthcare delivery [1].

The importance of laboratory TAT cannot be overstated. Delays in obtaining laboratory results can lead to prolonged patient anxiety, increased hospital stays, and, in some cases, adverse clinical outcomes. For instance, in emergency departments, rapid turnaround times are essential for the timely

management of critical conditions such as sepsis, myocardial infarction, and stroke. Moreover, extended TATs can contribute to inefficiencies within healthcare systems, resulting in increased operational costs and resource allocation challenges. As the demand for high-quality care intensifies, healthcare institutions are compelled to explore innovative strategies to streamline laboratory processes and enhance TAT [2].

Several factors can contribute to delays in laboratory TAT, including pre-analytical, analytical, and post-analytical phases. Pre-analytical delays may arise from issues such as improper specimen collection, transportation delays, or inadequate patient preparation. Analytical delays can stem from equipment malfunctions, reagent shortages, or staffing shortages in laboratories. Post-analytical delays often relate to the reporting process, including the time taken to interpret results and communicate them to the clinical team. Understanding these multifaceted factors is crucial for developing targeted interventions aimed at reducing TAT [3].

In response to the growing recognition of the need for improved laboratory efficiency, numerous strategies have been proposed and implemented across various healthcare settings. These strategies can be broadly categorized into process optimization, technology integration, staff training and engagement, and data-driven decision-making. Process optimization involves the standardization of workflows, the implementation of Lean methodologies, and the establishment of clear communication channels among laboratory staff and clinical teams. Technology integration encompasses the adoption of automated systems, laboratory information management systems (LIMS), and point-of-care testing (POCT) to facilitate rapid testing and result reporting. Staff training and engagement focus on fostering a culture of continuous improvement and empowering laboratory personnel to take ownership of their roles in the TAT process. Finally, data-driven decision-making involves the use of analytics to monitor TAT performance, identify bottlenecks, and inform strategic interventions [4].

This research aims to explore the various strategies for improving laboratory turnaround times in internal medicine, examining both the theoretical underpinnings and practical applications of these approaches. By synthesizing existing literature and case studies, this study will provide a comprehensive overview of effective interventions that have been successfully implemented in diverse clinical settings. Furthermore, it will highlight the importance of a multidisciplinary approach that involves collaboration among laboratory personnel, clinicians, and administrative leaders to achieve sustained improvements in TAT [5].

Current Challenges Impacting Laboratory Efficiency in Internal Medicine:

Laboratories play a crucial role in the field of internal medicine, providing essential diagnostic information that guides clinical decision-making. As healthcare systems evolve, the demand for efficient laboratory services has intensified. However, several challenges currently impede laboratory efficiency in internal medicine, ranging from technological limitations to regulatory hurdles [6].

1. Technological Challenges

One of the most significant challenges facing laboratories in internal medicine is the rapid pace of technological advancement. While the integration of sophisticated diagnostic technologies, such as molecular diagnostics and point-of-care testing, has the potential to enhance laboratory efficiency, it also presents several hurdles [6].

a. Integration of New Technologies

Many laboratories struggle to integrate new technologies into their existing workflows. This integration often requires substantial financial investment, training for laboratory personnel, and updates to information technology systems. Laboratories that cannot keep pace with technological advancements may find themselves at a competitive disadvantage, leading to delays in testing and reporting results. Furthermore, the lack of standardization in new technologies can contribute to variability in test results, complicating clinical interpretation [7].

b. Data Management and Interoperability

The increasing volume of data generated by advanced laboratory technologies poses another challenge. Laboratories must effectively manage and analyze vast amounts of data while ensuring interoperability between different systems. Many laboratories still rely on legacy systems that are not designed to handle the complexities of modern data management. This can lead to inefficiencies, such as delays in data entry, increased chances of errors, and difficulties in sharing information with other healthcare providers. The

inability to seamlessly share data can hinder clinical decision-making and negatively impact patient outcomes [7].

2. Regulatory and Compliance Issues

Laboratories in internal medicine operate within a complex regulatory environment that can significantly impact their efficiency. Compliance with regulations set forth by organizations such as the Clinical Laboratory Improvement Amendments (CLIA) and the College of American Pathologists (CAP) is essential to ensure quality and safety in laboratory testing. However, navigating these regulations can be time-consuming and resource-intensive [7].

a. Burden of Compliance

The burden of compliance can divert resources away from core laboratory functions. Laboratories must allocate time and personnel to ensure that they meet regulatory requirements, which can detract from their ability to focus on improving operational efficiency. Moreover, the constant evolution of regulatory standards means that laboratories must remain vigilant and adaptable, often requiring ongoing training and updates to protocols [8].

b. Impact on Innovation

Regulatory constraints can also stifle innovation within laboratories. The lengthy approval processes for new tests and technologies can delay their introduction into clinical practice, limiting the ability of laboratories to provide cutting-edge diagnostic services. As a result, laboratories may miss opportunities to improve efficiency and enhance patient care through innovative testing methodologies [8].

3. Staffing and Workforce Challenges

The laboratory workforce is another critical area impacting efficiency in internal medicine. The shortage of qualified laboratory personnel is a pressing issue that has been exacerbated by the COVID-19 pandemic. This shortage has far-reaching implications for laboratory operations [9].

a. Recruitment and Retention

Recruiting and retaining skilled laboratory professionals is increasingly challenging. Factors such as competitive salaries, work-life balance, and job satisfaction play a significant role in attracting talent to the field. Laboratories that struggle to maintain adequate staffing levels may experience increased workloads for existing personnel, leading to burnout and decreased productivity. This can result in longer turnaround times for test results and a decline in the quality of laboratory services [9].

b. Training and Development

In addition to recruitment challenges, the need for ongoing training and professional development is essential to ensure that laboratory staff remain proficient in the latest technologies and practices. However, many laboratories lack the resources to provide comprehensive training programs. This can lead to skill gaps among staff, further impacting the efficiency and accuracy of laboratory operations [10].

4. Financial Constraints

Financial pressures are a significant challenge for laboratories in internal medicine, particularly in a healthcare landscape marked by rising costs and shifting reimbursement models.

a. Budget Limitations

Many laboratories operate under tight budgets, which can limit their ability to invest in new technologies, staff training, and process improvements. Budget constraints may force laboratories to prioritize immediate operational needs over long-term strategic investments, ultimately hindering their ability to enhance efficiency [10].

b. Reimbursement Challenges

The evolving reimbursement landscape also poses challenges for laboratory efficiency. Changes in reimbursement rates and policies can impact the financial viability of certain tests and services. Laboratories may be forced to discontinue less profitable tests, limiting the range of services they can offer. This can lead to decreased patient access to necessary diagnostic testing, ultimately affecting patient care [11].

5. Patient-Centric Challenges

As the healthcare industry increasingly shifts toward patient-centered care, laboratories must adapt to new expectations from patients and healthcare providers.

a. Demand for Timeliness and Transparency

Patients and providers alike expect timely and transparent communication regarding test results. Delays in testing and reporting can lead to frustration and anxiety for patients, potentially impacting their

overall satisfaction with the healthcare experience. Laboratories must find ways to streamline their processes to meet these expectations while maintaining accuracy and quality [12].

b. Role of Patient Engagement

Engaging patients in their healthcare journey is becoming increasingly important. Laboratories can enhance efficiency by providing patients with easy access to their test results and educational resources. However, implementing patient engagement strategies requires additional resources and planning, which can be challenging for laboratories already facing numerous operational hurdles [12].

Role of Automation in Enhancing Laboratory Processes:

In recent years, the rapid advancement of technology has introduced significant changes across various fields, one of the most notable being automation. Automation has emerged as a transformative force, especially in laboratory environments where precision, efficiency, and reliability are paramount. The integration of automated systems into laboratory processes has redefined workflows, enhanced productivity, minimized human error, and ultimately paved the way for breakthroughs in scientific research [13].

The Spectrum of Laboratory Automation

Laboratory automation encompasses a broad range of technologies and techniques designed to streamline manual tasks and enhance the accuracy and efficiency of laboratory operations. Automation in laboratories can be divided into several categories, including robotic systems, automated liquid handling, data management systems, and sophisticated analytical instruments [14].

1. **Robotic Systems**: Robotic arms and platforms are increasingly employed in laboratories to perform repetitive tasks such as sample handling, pipetting, and incubation. These systems can operate continuously without fatigue, allowing for increased throughput and reduced turnaround times.
2. **Automated Liquid Handling**: Automated liquid handling systems have revolutionized the way laboratories conduct experiments that require precise liquid transfers. These systems minimize the risk of contamination and human error, ensuring accurate and reproducible results. They can also process multiple samples simultaneously, which enhances productivity.
3. **Data Management Systems**: Laboratory Information Management Systems (LIMS) and advanced data analysis software play a crucial role in managing and analyzing the substantial volumes of data generated in modern laboratories. These systems streamline data entry, facilitate real-time monitoring, and ensure compliance with regulatory requirements, ultimately leading to more informed decision-making.
4. **Analytical Instruments**: High-throughput screening systems, mass spectrometers, and next-generation sequencing technologies are examples of sophisticated analytical instruments that incorporate automation. These instruments can execute complex analyses with minimal human intervention, thus speeding up the research process and improving quality control [14].

Benefits of Laboratory Automation

The adoption of automation in laboratories offers a multitude of benefits that extend beyond mere productivity enhancements. Some of the most significant advantages include:

1. **Increased Efficiency**: Automated systems can perform tasks at a speed and accuracy that far exceeds human capabilities. This leads to faster experiment processing times and shorter project durations, enabling researchers to focus more on analysis and interpretation rather than repetitive tasks [15].
2. **Reduction of Human Error**: Human error is an inherent risk in laboratory settings, where minute inaccuracies can lead to significantly skewed results. Automation enhances precision by standardizing processes and reducing variability. As a result, laboratories can achieve higher reproducibility and reliability in their findings.
3. **Enhanced Safety**: The automation of hazardous or labor-intensive procedures lowers the exposure of laboratory personnel to potentially dangerous substances. Systems can handle toxic agents, biohazardous materials, and high-throughput operations while maintaining stringent safety protocols, reducing the likelihood of accidents [15].
4. **Cost Savings**: While the initial investment in automation technology may be substantial, the long-term cost savings can be significant. Automation reduces labor costs, minimizes errors that could lead to

costly re-analyses, and allows for optimal resource usage by streamlining workflows [16].

5. **Scalability**: As research demands increase, laboratories can easily scale their operations with automated technologies. Automated systems can handle growing volumes of samples and data without a proportional increase in personnel or resources, thus facilitating the expansion of laboratory capabilities [16].

Challenges of Implementing Automation

Despite the numerous benefits, the deployment of automation in laboratory settings is not without challenges. Laboratories must carefully navigate various considerations, including the initial investment costs, technical complexities, and the need for ongoing maintenance and training [17].

1. **High Initial Investment**: The capital expenditure required for implementing automation systems can be a significant barrier for many laboratories, especially smaller or underfunded institutions. Budget constraints may inhibit the adoption of sophisticated technologies that could significantly enhance operations.
2. **Technical Expertise**: The successful operation of automated systems requires specialized skills and training. Moreover, the integration of new technologies into existing workflows can present a learning curve for laboratory personnel. Continuous training and development are essential for optimizing the use of automation.
3. **Maintenance and Downtime**: Automated systems, while efficient, are not immune to failures and malfunctions. Routine maintenance and troubleshooting are necessary to ensure their smooth operation. Laboratories must have contingency plans in place to mitigate the impact of device failures on their research timelines.
4. **Data Security and Management**: With increased reliance on digital technologies, laboratories must also contend with concerns related to data security and integrity. Protecting sensitive research data from breaches and ensuring compliance with relevant regulations are critical considerations in the digital age [17].

The Future of Automation in Laboratories

The future of laboratory automation appears promising, with emerging technologies poised to revolutionize laboratory processes further. Advancements in artificial intelligence (AI) and machine learning are enabling systems to not only perform specific tasks but also learn from data patterns, thereby enhancing predictive capabilities and decision-making processes [18].

Moreover, the integration of the Internet of Things (IoT) in laboratory automation allows for real-time monitoring of equipment, conditions, and processes. IoT-enabled devices can communicate and share information seamlessly, creating a connected laboratory environment that fosters collaboration and continuous improvement [18].

In addition, as automation technologies continue to evolve, costs are expected to decrease, making them more accessible to a broader spectrum of laboratories. This democratization of technology could lead to greater innovation and increased contributions to scientific knowledge across the globe [19].

Integration of Laboratory Information Systems and Electronic Health Records:

In an era marked by rapid technological advancements and the increasing complexity of healthcare delivery, the integration of Laboratory Information Systems (LIS) with Electronic Health Records (EHR) has emerged as a pivotal initiative. The healthcare sector is characterized by its reliance on accurate data for clinical decision-making, patient safety, and the overall quality of care. Thus, achieving seamless integration between LIS and EHR is not merely a matter of convenience; it is integral to enhancing patient outcomes, streamlining workflows, and fostering a holistic approach to healthcare management [20].

Understanding Laboratory Information Systems and Electronic Health Records

Before diving into their integration, it is essential to comprehend what LIS and EHR entail. Laboratory Information Systems are specialized software applications designed to manage laboratory processes, from order entry to result reporting. LIS facilitates sample tracking, data management, and quality assurance in laboratory environments, ensuring that laboratory tests are completed efficiently and accurately [20].

In contrast, Electronic Health Records are comprehensive digital versions of patients' paper charts. EHRs are designed to integrate data from various sources, including clinical notes, diagnostic

images, medications, and laboratory results. They provide a complete view of a patient's health history, allowing healthcare professionals to make informed decisions and coordinate care effectively [21].

Importance of Integration

The integration of LIS and EHR is fundamentally important for several reasons:

1. **Improved Data Accessibility and Accuracy**: Integration enables the automatic transfer of laboratory results directly into the patient's EHR. This reduces the likelihood of transcription errors that can occur when results are manually entered and ensures that clinicians have real-time access to the most current and accurate data.
2. **Enhanced Clinical Decision-Making**: With integrated systems, healthcare providers can view laboratory results alongside other critical patient information. This holistic view supports timely and informed clinical decision-making, which is vital for effective diagnosis and treatment [22].
3. **Streamlined Workflows**: The integration of LIS and EHR reduces administrative burdens by eliminating redundant data entry and enabling quicker access to patient information. This optimization not only enhances the efficiency of laboratory operations but also allows healthcare providers to focus more on patient care rather than documentation.
4. **Improved Patient Safety and Outcomes**: Access to timely and accurate laboratory results can significantly impact patient management. Integrated systems facilitate quicker diagnosis and treatment plans, leading to improved patient safety and better health outcomes [22].
5. **Regulatory Compliance and Quality Assurance**: Integrated systems enhance the ability of healthcare organizations to comply with regulatory requirements, such as those set forth by the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act (HIPAA) and the Clinical Laboratory Improvement Amendments (CLIA). Having a centralized system ensures consistent quality assurance practices and audit trails for laboratory processes [22].

Challenges in Integration

While the need for integration is clear, several challenges impede its implementation. These challenges include:

1. **Interoperability Issues**: Diverse healthcare IT systems often lack standardized protocols for data exchange, leading to interoperability challenges. Different LIS and EHR vendors may use various data formats, making it difficult to achieve seamless integration [23].
2. **Cost of Implementation**: The financial investment required for system integration can be substantial. Healthcare organizations must consider not only the direct costs of software and equipment but also the costs associated with training staff and managing change [23].
3. **Resistance to Change**: Stakeholders within healthcare organizations, including clinicians and administrative staff, may resist transitioning to integrated systems due to concerns about workflow disruptions or skepticism regarding the new technologies' efficacy.
4. **Data Privacy and Security**: As patient data is exchanged between systems, concerns related to data privacy and security arise. Healthcare organizations must establish robust cybersecurity measures to safeguard sensitive patient information.
5. **Maintenance and Support**: Integrated systems require ongoing maintenance and support to ensure consistent performance, which can add to the operational complexity for healthcare organizations [23].

Benefits of Successful Integration

Despite the myriad challenges, successful integration of LIS and EHR systems yields substantial benefits:

1. **Faster Turnaround Times**: Integration can dramatically improve turnaround times for laboratory results. Physicians can receive test results more quickly, expediting the decision-making process for diagnosis and treatment [24].
2. **Comprehensive Patient Profiles**: Integrated systems create a comprehensive view of patient health, which is particularly beneficial for chronic disease management. Providers can track patient progress over time by having easy access to historical laboratory data.
3. **Enhanced Communication**: Integration fosters improved communication channels among healthcare providers. By sharing important laboratory results within the EHR, interdisciplinary teams can collaborate more effectively, ensuring coordinated care that addresses all aspects of a patient's health [24].

4. **Reduced Errors**: The integration reduces errors associated with manual data entry and fosters a more reliable flow of information throughout the healthcare continuum. This reliability directly translates to improved patient safety.
5. **Analytics and Reporting**: Integrated systems facilitate better data analytics and reporting capabilities. Healthcare organizations can leverage this information to identify trends, monitor performance metrics, and implement quality improvement initiatives [24].

Future Prospects of Integration

The future of healthcare lies in increasingly sophisticated technological integration. Emerging trends that may shape the integration of LIS and EHR include:

1. **Advancements in Artificial Intelligence**: AI systems can enhance the integration process by providing predictive analytics, optimizing workflows, and improving clinical decision support systems. These technologies hold the potential to revolutionize how laboratory data is analyzed and used in patient care [25].
2. **Telemedicine Integration**: As telemedicine continues to gain traction, integrating remote diagnostic tests and laboratory results within EHRs will become crucial for delivering comprehensive virtual care. This integration will enable healthcare providers to monitor and manage patients' health remotely, maintaining continuity of care during virtual consultations.
3. **Standardization Efforts**: Efforts by bodies such as the Office of the National Coordinator for Health Information Technology (ONC) to promote interoperability standards can facilitate more seamless integration between diverse health information systems, including LIS and HER [25].
4. **Cloud-based Solutions**: Increasingly, healthcare organizations are adopting cloud-based platforms that offer scalable solutions for integration. These platforms can streamline data sharing while ensuring security and compliance with regulations.
5. **Patient Engagement Tools**: Future integration efforts are likely to incorporate patient engagement tools that empower patients to access their laboratory results through patient portals. This transparency can lead to greater patient involvement in their healthcare decisions [25].

Best Practices for Specimen Collection and Handling:

Specimen collection and processing play a pivotal role in internal medicine, serving as the bridge between clinical observation and definitive diagnosis. The integrity of the specimens collected and how they are handled significantly influences the accuracy of laboratory results, thereby guiding treatment decisions. With the continuous advancements in medical knowledge and technology, adhering to best practices in specimen collection and processing is crucial for providing high-quality patient care.

The proper collection of specimens ensures that the diagnostic tests performed can yield reliable and reproducible results. Internal medicine encompasses a wide range of conditions, often involving multiple organ systems, which makes the need for accurate specimen handling even more essential. Errors in specimen collection can lead to misdiagnosis, inappropriate treatment plans, and ultimately poorer patient outcomes [26].

Standard Operating Procedures

Developing and instituting standard operating procedures (SOPs) is foundational to achieving best practices in specimen collection and processing. SOPs help establish consistency across all stages of sample handling, ensuring that staff adhere to the same methods regardless of personal preferences or variations in experience.

1. **Training and Competency Assessment**: Regularly training personnel on SOPs, including the reasons behind each step, is vital. This not only reinforces the importance of quality practices but also ensures that staff remain competent in their skills. Periodic competency assessments can help identify areas for improvement and ensure ongoing proficiency in specimen collection methods.
2. **Patient Preparation**: Effective communication with patients is critical for optimal specimen collection outcomes. Providing clear instructions regarding fasting, timing, and medication adjustments prior to specimen collection can minimize variability in test results. Additionally, obtaining informed consent before procedures fosters a respectful relationship and improves patient cooperation [257].

Collection Techniques

Specimen collection strategies vary depending on the type of sample and the specific diagnostic test required [28].

1. **Blood Samples**: Blood draws necessitate a sterile technique to prevent contamination. Utilize single-use, sterile equipment and ensure the correct tube is used for the specific type of test (e.g., serum, plasma, whole blood). Following the draw, immediate and proper labeling of specimens with patient details, date, time, and collector's ID is essential to avoid mix-ups and ensure traceability.
2. **Urine Samples**: For urine collection, instruct patients to use the midstream method to reduce contamination. Utilizing sterile containers and providing clear, concise instructions enhance the quality of the urine specimens collected. Regular quality checks on collection kits can help ensure compliance with hygiene and regulatory standards.
3. **Tissue Biopsy**: For tissue specimens, specific protocols must be followed that pertain to the underlying condition and the type of analysis planned. For example, specimens for histopathological analysis must be preserved correctly, typically in formalin, and promptly delivered to the laboratory to maintain cellular integrity [28].

Handling and Processing Techniques

After collection, the handling and processing of specimens are crucial components that greatly affect laboratory results.

1. **Transport and Storage Conditions**: Specimens should be transported to the laboratory under conditions that minimize degradation. Blood samples may require refrigeration, while certain microbiological specimens should be kept at room temperature to maintain viability. Detailed logs of transport conditions and timelines should be maintained to guarantee adherence to required standards.
2. **Timing of Processing**: Timeliness is critical—from the moment of collection to processing in the lab. Many specimens must be analyzed within a specific timeframe to ensure accuracy; delayed processing can lead to cellular changes that affect test results. Regular audits of processing times can help identify bottlenecks and allow for timely interventions.
3. **Using Quality Control Measures**: Incorporating quality control measures at every stage of the specimen handling process mitigates the risk of errors. Implementing tracking systems that promote accurate specimen identification and barcoding can enhance the overall reliability of results and minimize the risk of specimen misidentification and loss [29].

Infection Control and Safety

In internal medicine, protecting both patients and healthcare workers during specimen collection and processing is paramount. Implementing proper infection control practices is essential to minimize the risk of healthcare-associated infections (HAIs).

1. **Personal Protective Equipment (PPE)**: The use of PPE, including gloves, gowns, masks, and eye protection, should be mandatory during any procedure that involves contact with bodily fluids or tissues. Regular training sessions on PPE use and disposal guidelines enhance compliance and safety.
2. **Essentially Safe Work Environment**: Establishing well-defined areas for specimen collection with clear protocols for waste disposal can prevent cross-contamination. Implementing routine safety audits can further ensure adherence to infection control practices [30].

Documentation and Communication

Effective documentation and communication are crucial for maintaining high standards of specimen collection and processing. Comprehensive documentation aids in tracking specimens through the entire process, an essential feature in clinical governance.

1. **Accurate Labeling and Logging**: Proper labeling of specimens, accompanied by real-time electronic logging, allows for more straightforward tracking and retrieval. This documentation also plays a critical role in reducing errors and should align with laboratory information systems to maintain continuity of care.
2. **Interdisciplinary Communication**: Regular communication between internal medicine practitioners and laboratory staff is fundamental. Creating channels for discussing any discrepancies in results, handling queries about specimen acceptability, and providing feedback for improvement can foster a collaborative atmosphere that enhances patient care [31].

Continuous Quality Improvement

Embracing a culture of continuous quality improvement (CQI) in specimen collection and processing is essential. Regularly reviewing outcomes, addressing issues, and implementing changes based on findings are all hallmarks of a system committed to providing high-quality health care. CQI should also include continuous engagement with the scientific community to stay abreast of advances in technologies and methodologies that can enhance specimen quality and laboratory results [32].

Interdisciplinary Collaboration: Bridging Gaps Between Clinical and Laboratory Staff:

n the rapidly evolving landscape of healthcare, the pressing need for effective interdisciplinary collaboration has never been more apparent. As healthcare systems become increasingly complex, the interplay between clinical and laboratory staff emerges as a cornerstone for enhancing patient outcomes and driving innovation [33].

Interdisciplinary collaboration signifies a coordinated effort among different professional roles, each contributing their expertise to achieve a commonly shared goal—in this case, improving patient health outcomes. Clinical staff, including physicians, nurses, and allied health professionals, have direct engagement with patients, guiding diagnostics and therapeutic actions. In contrast, laboratory staff, including medical technologists, pathologists, and lab technicians, underpin these efforts with critical diagnostic processing, including biomarker analysis, blood tests, and genetic screenings [34].

The synergy between clinical and laboratory staff results in a holistic approach to patient care. When laboratory results are accurately communicated and understood, clinicians can develop better-informed treatment plans, leading to faster diagnoses and improved prognoses. For example, timely access to laboratory data can alter the course of treatment for patients with infectious diseases; rapid identification of the causative agent enables targeted therapies. Moreover, collaborative efforts can stimulate clinical research, facilitating the translation of laboratory discoveries into practical applications that meet clinical needs—ultimately promoting a culture of innovation within healthcare systems [35].

Despite the evident advantages of interdisciplinary collaboration, multiple barriers hinder the ideal integration of clinical and laboratory teams. One significant challenge is the dichotomy existing within workplace cultures among clinicians and laboratory professionals. Often, these groups operate in silos: clinical staff prioritize patient-facing care, while laboratory personnel concentrate on accuracy and efficiency of diagnostic services. This division can lead to misunderstandings, where clinical staff may underestimate the complexities of laboratory processes, while laboratory personnel may lack awareness of the clinical implications of their work [36].

Communication issues form another formidable barrier. Clinicians and laboratory workers often use specialized terminology that can create confusion or misinterpretation, which may lead to errors in diagnosis or treatment. For instance, if laboratory results are communicated using jargon unfamiliar to clinical staff, pertinent clinical considerations may be overlooked. Additionally, the fast-paced nature of clinical environments means that laboratory findings may not reach providers promptly, exacerbating delays in patient management [37].

Furthermore, varying priorities and incentives between clinical and laboratory staff can stymie collaborative efforts. Clinicians are often assessed on patient outcomes, while laboratory personnel may be evaluated based on turnaround times and accuracy metrics, creating a discord between their respective objectives. Ultimately, these challenges underscore the need for strategic initiatives aimed at fostering collaboration [38].

Strategies for Enhancing Interdisciplinary Collaboration

To bridge gaps between clinical and laboratory staff, healthcare institutions must prioritize several strategic approaches that promote partnership and coalescence.

1. **Establishing Interdisciplinary Teams:** Creating interdisciplinary teams that include both clinical and laboratory staff can cultivate a culture of collaboration. Regular team meetings to discuss cases, present laboratory findings, and share insights foster a shared understanding of each group's contributions. These meetings also allow for transparency in communication and help to break down silos [39].
2. **Cross-Training Programs:** Implementing cross-training initiatives where clinical and laboratory professionals educate one another about their respective roles and workflows can significantly enhance mutual respect and understanding. For

example, lab staff could conduct workshops to demonstrate how specific test results impact clinical decisions, while clinicians could share clinical scenarios that illustrate the relevance of particular laboratory tests [40].

3. **Joint Quality Improvement Initiatives:** Establishing quality improvement projects that require input and collaboration from both clinical and laboratory staff can emphasize the importance of teamwork. Collaborative goals, such as reducing turnaround times for critical laboratory tests or improving the accuracy of test result interpretations, can unite both teams toward a common objective that benefits patient care [41].
4. **Utilizing Technology for Enhanced Communication:** Investment in integrated health information systems, like Electronic Health Records (EHR), can streamline communication between clinical and laboratory teams. With real-time access to lab test results in a user-friendly format, clinical staff can make informed decisions swiftly while maintaining direct lines of communication with laboratory personnel through secure messaging systems [42].
5. **Leadership and Administrative Support:** The commitment of healthcare leadership plays a vital role in fostering interdisciplinary collaboration. Leaders must create an organizational culture that values interprofessional teamwork, offering incentives for collaborative practices and facilitating open channels for dialogue between departments [43].

Utilizing Data Analytics for Continuous Improvement:

The field of internal medicine stands at a transformative juncture, propelled by the burgeoning capabilities of data analytics. As healthcare systems grapple with complex patient needs and ever-increasing operational challenges, harnessing data analytics emerges as a pivotal strategy for continuous improvement [44].

Data analytics in healthcare encompasses the systematic examination of vast datasets to discover patterns, correlations, and insights that can inform clinical practices and operational strategies. In internal medicine, where physicians are often at the forefront of diagnosing and managing a diverse array of medical conditions, analytics offers a unique lens through which to view patient outcomes, treatment efficacy, and resource allocation [44].

The datasets utilized in internal medicine are extensive and varied, including electronic health records (EHRs), laboratory results, imaging data, patient surveys, and billing information. Additionally, external data sources, such as social determinants of health (SDOH), public health records, and genomic databases, can be integrated to provide a holistic view of patient populations. By tapping into these rich datasets, healthcare providers can glean valuable insights that drive continuous improvement initiatives [44].

One of the most promising applications of data analytics in internal medicine is through predictive analytics, which employs historical data to forecast future outcomes. By identifying at-risk patients before they experience severe health crises, healthcare providers can implement preventive measures to enhance patient care [45].

Predictive modeling can be utilized to identify patients at high risk for conditions such as diabetes, heart disease, and chronic kidney disease. For instance, algorithms can analyze EHR data to pinpoint risk factors—such as age, comorbidities, medication adherence, and lifestyle choices. Interventions can then be tailored to these patients, ranging from targeted health education to personalized care plans that incorporate lifestyle changes [45].

Furthermore, predictive analytics also aids in refining treatment protocols. By analyzing treatment outcomes and patient responses, data-driven approaches can determine which therapies are most effective for particular patient demographics. This evidence-based refinement enables physicians to optimize their treatment strategies, ensuring that patients receive the most effective interventions for their specific conditions [46].

In addition to enhancing patient outcomes, data analytics plays a vital role in optimizing operational efficiency within internal medicine practices. With mounting pressure to reduce costs and improve care delivery, healthcare organizations must leverage analytics to streamline operations and allocate resources more effectively [46].

Data analytics can support improved resource allocation by providing insights into patient volume trends, staff productivity, and operational bottlenecks.

For example, analyzing patient flow through various stages of care can help identify inefficiencies that may lead to longer wait times for patients. By understanding peak hours of patient visits, practices can better manage staffing schedules, ensuring that adequate resources are available when demand is highest.

In an era focused on value-based care, performance measurement is essential. Data analytics tools can facilitate benchmarking against industry standards and best practices, enabling healthcare organizations to identify gaps in care delivery. Metrics such as hospital readmission rates, patient satisfaction scores, and clinical outcomes can be systematically tracked and analyzed, driving a culture of continuous improvement [47].

The integration of data analytics into internal medicine fosters a culture of evidence-based decision-making, which is crucial for delivering high-quality care. By relying on data-driven insights rather than anecdotal evidence, healthcare providers can make informed choices that enhance clinical practices and patient outcomes [47].

Data analytics can be instrumental in shaping clinical guidelines and protocols. Through the analysis of large datasets, researchers can derive compelling evidence regarding the effectiveness of specific treatments, enabling organizations to establish best practices that are statistically validated. This assimilation of evidence into clinical protocols ensures that physicians have the most relevant and up-to-date information to guide their decision-making [48].

Moreover, the use of data analytics encourages continuous quality improvement (CQI) initiatives within internal medicine practices. By systematically collecting and analyzing data on clinical processes and outcomes, organizations can identify areas for improvement, test new interventions, and measure their impact. This iterative approach to improvement aligns with the principles of Plan-Do-Study-Act (PDSA) cycles, fostering a proactive approach to patient care [49].

While the potential benefits of leveraging data analytics in internal medicine are substantial, several challenges must be addressed to realize its full impact. Issues related to data privacy and security remain paramount, as healthcare organizations must navigate complex regulations governing the use of patient data. Additionally, the integration of disparate data sources poses technical challenges, requiring robust systems to harmonize and analyze diverse datasets effectively [48].

Furthermore, healthcare providers must cultivate a culture that embraces data-driven methodologies. Education and training initiatives are essential for equipping staff with the necessary skills to interpret and utilize data effectively. As physicians and healthcare professionals become more adept at leveraging analytics, the potential for continuous improvement within internal medicine expands exponentially [49].

Case Studies: Successful Implementations and Outcomes:

In the realm of internal medicine, timely and accurate laboratory results are pivotal for diagnosing and managing patient care effectively. Delays in laboratory response times can lead to prolonged hospital stays, increased healthcare costs, and potentially adverse patient outcomes. As healthcare systems strive to enhance operational efficiency and patient care quality, numerous institutions have implemented innovative strategies to improve laboratory response times [50].

Laboratory response times refer to the duration from when a sample is collected to when the results are reported to the healthcare provider. In internal medicine, where timely decisions can significantly impact patient health, these times are critical. Delayed results can hinder the initiation of appropriate treatments, lead to unnecessary tests, and increase the risk of complications. Moreover, prolonged TATs can contribute to patient dissatisfaction and strain the healthcare system.

Improving laboratory response times requires a multifaceted approach, encompassing process optimization, technology integration, and staff training. The following case studies illustrate how various healthcare institutions have successfully tackled this challenge [50].

Case Study 1: Implementation of Lean Methodology at a Tertiary Care Hospital

Background

A tertiary care hospital in the Midwest faced significant challenges with laboratory response times, particularly for critical care patients. The average TAT for routine blood tests was approximately 90 minutes,

and for urgent tests, it could extend to over two hours. Recognizing the impact on patient care, the hospital decided to implement Lean methodology to streamline laboratory processes [50].

Implementation

The Lean approach focused on identifying and eliminating waste within the laboratory workflow. A cross-functional team was formed, including laboratory staff, nurses, and physicians, to map out the existing processes. They identified several bottlenecks, including unnecessary steps in sample handling and delays in test prioritization [50].

To address these issues, the hospital implemented several key strategies:

1. **Standardized Protocols**: The team developed standardized protocols for sample collection, labeling, and transportation to the laboratory. This reduced variability and ensured that samples were processed consistently.
2. **Real-Time Tracking**: The introduction of a real-time tracking system allowed laboratory staff and clinicians to monitor the status of samples throughout the testing process. This transparency reduced anxiety among clinicians and improved communication.
3. **Prioritization System**: A new prioritization system was established to ensure that critical tests were processed first. This included a color-coded system that flagged urgent samples for immediate attention [51].

Outcomes

Following the implementation of Lean methodologies, the hospital observed a remarkable reduction in laboratory response times. The average TAT for routine tests decreased from 90 minutes to 45 minutes, while urgent tests were reported within 30 minutes, down from over two hours. Additionally, patient satisfaction scores improved significantly, and the hospital reported a decrease in the number of repeat tests ordered due to delayed results. The Lean initiative not only enhanced laboratory efficiency but also fostered a culture of continuous improvement among staff [51].

Case Study 2: Integration of Laboratory Information Systems in a Community Hospital

Background

A community hospital in the Southeast faced challenges with laboratory response times, particularly with outpatient testing. The hospital's laboratory information system (LIS) was outdated, leading to frequent errors in data entry and delays in result reporting. To address these issues, the hospital sought to upgrade its LIS and integrate it with electronic health records (EHR) [52].

Implementation

The hospital partnered with a software vendor to implement a new LIS that included advanced functionalities for order management, result reporting, and data analytics. Key steps in the implementation process included:

1. **Training and Education**: Comprehensive training sessions were conducted for laboratory staff, clinicians, and administrative personnel to ensure smooth adoption of the new system [53].
2. **EHR Integration**: The new LIS was integrated with the hospital's EHR system, allowing for seamless communication between the laboratory and clinical departments. This integration facilitated real-time access to results and improved clinical decision-making.
3. **Automated Notifications**: The system included automated notifications for critical results, ensuring that healthcare providers were promptly informed of urgent findings [53].

Outcomes

The integration of the new LIS led to significant improvements in laboratory response times. The average TAT for outpatient tests decreased from 72 hours to 24 hours, and the accuracy of result reporting improved dramatically. Clinicians reported higher satisfaction levels due to the timely availability of results, which allowed for quicker clinical decisions. Additionally, the hospital experienced a reduction in the number of patient callbacks for missing or delayed results, further enhancing the patient experience [53].

Case Study 3: Utilization of Point-of-Care Testing in a Primary Care Setting

Background

A primary care clinic in an urban area sought to improve laboratory response times for common diagnostic tests, such as glucose and lipid panels. The clinic's traditional laboratory processes often resulted

in delays, leading to patient dissatisfaction and missed opportunities for timely interventions. To address these challenges, the clinic decided to implement point-of-care testing (POCT) for select tests [54].

Implementation

The clinic focused on the following key strategies to implement POCT effectively:

1. **Test Selection**: A committee of healthcare providers identified the most critical tests that could be performed at the point of care, prioritizing those that would have the most significant impact on patient management.
2. **Staff Training**: Training sessions were conducted for nursing staff and clinicians to ensure proficiency in using the POCT devices and interpreting results [55].
3. **Patient Education**: Patients were educated about the benefits of POCT, including reduced wait times and immediate feedback on their health status [55].

Outcomes

The introduction of POCT resulted in a dramatic reduction in laboratory response times for the selected tests. Patients received results within minutes rather than days, enabling immediate clinical decisions and interventions. The clinic reported increased patient satisfaction scores and a noticeable improvement in health outcomes, particularly for patients with chronic conditions requiring regular monitoring. Additionally, the clinic experienced a reduction in follow-up appointments for test results, allowing providers to allocate more time to direct patient care [56].

Conclusion:

In conclusion, improving laboratory turnaround times in internal medicine is essential for enhancing patient care and optimizing clinical workflows. By implementing a combination of technological advancements, such as automation and integrated information systems, alongside fostering collaboration between laboratory and clinical staff, healthcare institutions can significantly reduce delays in test processing and result reporting. Best practices in specimen collection and handling, coupled with a culture of continuous improvement driven by data analytics, further contribute to streamlined operations.

The strategies outlined in this study not only lead to more efficient laboratory processes but also support timely clinical decision-making, ultimately improving patient outcomes. As the healthcare landscape continues to evolve, ongoing evaluation and adaptation of these strategies will be necessary to meet the increasing demands for rapid and accurate diagnostic services in internal medicine. By prioritizing these improvements, healthcare providers can enhance their service quality, maintain patient satisfaction, and ensure the effective delivery of care.

References:

1. Turnaround time of surgical pathology reports in a tertiary care teaching hospital. Rizwan M. Pak J Med Health Sci. 2019;13:330–331.
2. Analysis of turnaround time by subdividing three phases for outpatient chemistry specimens. Chung HJ, Lee W, Chun S, Park HI, Min WK. Ann Clin Lab Sci. 2009;39:144–149.
3. Factors affecting turnaround time in the clinical laboratory of the Kathmandu University Hospital, Nepal. Bhatt RD, Shrestha C, Risal P. EJIFCC. 2019;30:14–24.
4. Sensitivity, specificity, and reproducibility of four measures of laboratory turnaround time. Valenstein PN, Emancipator K. Am J Clin Pathol. 1989;91:452–457.
5. Laboratory Medicine: A National Status Report. [Aug; 2022]. 2008.
6. Total automation for the core laboratory: improving the turnaround time helps to reduce the volume of ordered STAT tests. Ialongo C, Porzio O, Giambini I, Bernardini S. J Lab Autom. 2016;21:451–458.
7. Laboratory results. Timeliness as a quality attribute and strategy. Howanitz JH, Howanitz PJ. Am J Clin Pathol. 2001;116:311–315.
8. Clinical audit in the laboratory. Erasmus RT, Zemlin AE. J Clin Pathol. 2009;62:593–597.
9. Determination of delay in burn around time (TAT) of stat tests and its causes: an AKUH experience. Bilwani F, Siddiqui I, Vaqar S. J Pak Med Assoc. 2003;53:65–67.
10. Reducing laboratory turnaround time outliers can reduce emergency department patient length of stay: an 11-hospital study. Holland LL, Smith LL, Blick KE. Am J Clin Pathol. 2005;124:672–674.
11. Analysis of turnaround times in pathology: an approach using failure time analysis. Vollmer RT. Am J Clin Pathol. 2006;126:215–220.

12. Timeliness of automated routine laboratory tests: a College of American Pathologists Q-Probes study of 653 institutions. Steindel SJ, Jones BA, Howanitz PJ. Clin Chim Acta. 1996;251:25–40.

13. Laboratory-based clinical audit as a tool for continual improvement: an example from CSF chemistry turnaround time audit in a South-African teaching hospital. Imoh LC, Mutale M, Parker CT, Erasmus RT, Zemlin AE. Biochem Med (Zagreb) 2016;26:194–201.

14. Determination of turnaround time in the clinical laboratory: "accessioning-to-result" time does not always accurately reflect laboratory performance. Stotler BA, Kratz A. Am J Clin Pathol. 2012;138:724–729.

15. Pre-analytical factors influencing the stability of cerebrospinal fluid proteins. Simonsen AH, Bahl JM, Danborg PB, et al. J Neurosci Methods. 2013;215:234–240.

16. College of American Pathologists Conference XXVIII on alternate site testing: introduction. Handorf CR. Arch Pathol Lab Med. 1995;119:867–873.

17. Reproducibility (precision) in alternate site testing. A clinician's perspective. Watts NB. Arch Pathol Lab Med. 1995;119:914–917.

18. Turnaround time (TAT): difference in concept for laboratory and clinician. Pati HP, Singh G. Indian J Hematol Blood Transfus. 2014;30:81–84.

19. Laboratory turnaround time. Hawkins RC. Clin Biochem Rev. 2007;28:179–194.

20. Therapeutic turnaround times for common laboratory tests in a tertiary hospital in Kenya. Mwogi T, Mercer T, Tran DN, Tonui R, Tylleskar T, Were MC. PLoS One. 2020;15:0.

21. Howanitz PJ, Cembrowski GS, Steindel SJ, Long TA. Physician goals and laboratory test turnaround times. A College of American Pathologists Q-Probes study of 2763 clinicians and 722 institutions. Arch Pathol Lab Med. 1993;117:22–8.

22. Plebani M, Wu A. Foreward. Clin Chim Acta. 2004;346:1–2.

23. Steindel SJ, Howanitz PJ. Changes in emergency department turnaround time performance from 1990 to 1993. A comparison of two College of American Pathologists Q-probes studies. Arch Pathol Lab Med. 1997;121:1031–41.

24. Valenstein P. Turnaround time. Can we satisfy clinicians' demands for faster service? Should we try? Am J Clin Pathol. 1989;92:705–6.

25. Crook MA. Near patient testing and pathology in the new millennium. J Clin Pathol. 2000;53:27–30.

26. Neuberger J, Peters M. The clinical interface - a British physician's view. Clin Chim Acta. 1996;248:11–8.

27. Howanitz JH, Howanitz PJ. Laboratory results. Timeliness as a quality attribute and strategy. Am J Clin Pathol. 2001;116:311–5.

28. Rollo JL, Fauser BA. Computers in total quality management. Statistical process control to expedite stats. Arch Pathol Lab Med. 1993;117:900–5.

29. Watts NB. Reproducibility (precision) in alternate site testing. A clinician's perspective. Arch Pathol Lab Med. 1995;119:914–7.

30. Steindel SJ, Howanitz PJ. Physician satisfaction and emergency department laboratory test turnaround time. Arch Pathol Lab Med. 2001;125:863–71.

31. Truchaud A, Le Neel T, Brochard H, Malvaux S, Moyon M, Cazaubiel M. New tools for laboratory design and management. Clin Chem. 1997;43:1709–15.

32. Manor PG. Turnaround times in the laboratory: a review of the literature. Clin Lab Sci. 1999;12:85–9.

33. Howanitz PJ, Steindel SJ. Intralaboratory performance and laboratorians' expectations for stat turnaround times. A College of American Pathologists Q-Probes study of four cerebrospinal fluid determinations. Arch Pathol Lab Med. 1991;115:977–83.

34. Hilborne LH, Oye RK, McArdle JE, Repinski JA, Rodgerson DO. Evaluation of stat and routine turnaround times as a component of laboratory quality. Am J Clin Pathol. 1989;91:331–5.

35. Saxena S, Wong ET. Does the emergency department need a dedicated stat laboratory? Continuous quality improvement as a management tool for the clinical laboratory. Am J Clin Pathol. 1993;100:606–10.

36. Fermann GJ, Suyama J. Point of care testing in the emergency department. J Emerg Med. 2002;22:393–404.

37. Hicks JM, Haeckel R, Price CP, Lewandrowski K, Wu AH. Recommendations and opinions for the use of point-of-care testing for hospitals and primary care:

summary of a 1999 symposium. Clin Chim Acta. 2001;303:1–17.

38. Handorf CR. College of American Pathologists Conference XXVIII on alternate site testing: introduction. Arch Pathol Lab Med. 1995;119:867–73.

39. Lundberg GD. Acting on significant laboratory results. JAMA. 1981;245:1762–3.

40. Seamonds B. Medical, economic, and regulatory factors affecting point-of-care testing. A report of the conference on factors affecting point-of-care testing, Philadelphia, PA 6–7 May 1994. Clin Chim Acta. 1996;249:1–19.

41. Howanitz PJ, Cembrowski GS, Steindel SJ, Long TA. Physician goals and laboratory test turnaround times. A College of American Pathologists Q-Probes study of 2763 clinicians and 722 institutions. Arch Pathol Lab Med. 1993;117:22–8.

42. McCarthy ML, Zeger SL, Ding R, Levin SR, Desmond JS, Lee J, Aronsky D. Crowding delays treatment and lengthens emergency department length of stay, even among high-acuity patients. Ann Emerg Med. 2009;54(4):492–503.e4.

43. Asha SE, Chan ACF, Walter E, Kelly PJ, Morton RL, Ajami A, Wilson RD, Honneyman D. Impact from point-of-care devices on emergency department patient processing times compared with central laboratory testing of blood samples: a randomised controlled trial and cost-effectiveness analysis. Emerg Med J. 2014;31(9):714–719.

44. Li L, Georgiou A, Vecellio E, Eigenstetter A, Toouli G, Wilson R, Westbrook JI. The effect of laboratory testing on emergency department length of stay: a multihospital longitudinal study applying a cross-classified random-effect modeling approach. Acad Emerg Med. 2015;22(1):38–46.

45. Casalino E, Wargon M, Peroziello A, Choquet C, Leroy C, Beaune S, Pereira L, Bernard J, Buzzi J-C. Predictive factors for longer length of stay in an emergency department: a prospective multicentre study evaluating the impact of age, patient's clinical acuity and complexity, and care pathways. Emerg Med J. 2014;31(5):361–368.

46. Goodacre S, Bradburn M, Fitzgerald P, Cross E, Collinson P, Gray A, Hall AS. The RATPAC (randomised assessment of treatment using panel assay of cardiac markers) trial: a randomised controlled trial of point-of-care cardiac markers in the emergency department. Health Technol Assess. 2011;15(23):1–102.

47. Kreindler SA, Cui Y, Metge CJ, Raynard M. Patient characteristics associated with longer emergency department stay: a rapid review. Emerg Med J. 2016;33(3):194–199.

48. Morley C, Unwin M, Peterson GM, Stankovich J, Kinsman L. Emergency department crowding: a systematic review of causes, consequences and solutions. PLoS One. 2018;13(8):e0203316.

49. Ha JY, Sung WY. Impact of COVID-19 pandemic on emergency department length of stay and clinical outcomes of patients with severe pneumonia: a single-center observational study. Med (Baltimore) 2022;101(38):e30633.

50. Driesen BEJM, van Riet BHG, Verkerk L, Bonjer HJ, Merten H, Nanayakkara PWB. Long length of stay at the emergency department is mostly caused by organisational factors outside the influence of the emergency department: a root cause analysis. PLoS One. 2018;13(9):e0202751.

51. Florkowski C, Don-Wauchope A, Gimenez N, Rodriguez-Capote K, Wils J, Zemlin A. Point-of-care testing (POCT) and evidence-based laboratory medicine (EBLM) – does it leverage any advantage in clinical decision making? Crit Rev Clin Lab Sci. 2017;54(7–8):471–494.

52. Bernstein SL, Aronsky D, Duseja R, Epstein S, Handel D, Hwang U, McCarthy M, John McConnell K, Pines JM, Rathlev N, et al. The effect of emergency department crowding on clinically oriented outcomes. Acad Emerg Med. 2009;16(1):1–10.

53. Brouns SH, Stassen PM, Lambooij SL, Dieleman J, Vanderfeesten IT, Haak HR. Organisational Factors Induce Prolonged Emergency Department Length of Stay in Elderly Patients--A Retrospective Cohort Study. PLoS One. 2015;10(8):e0135066.

54. Lee-Lewandrowski E, Corboy D, Lewandrowski K, Sinclair J, McDermot S, Benzer TI. Implementation of a point-of-care satellite Laboratory in the Emergency Department of an Academic Medical Center. Arch of Pathol & Lab Med. 2003;127(4):456–460.

55. Lewandrowski K, Flood J, Finn C, Tannous B, Farris AB, Benzer TI, Lee-Lewandrowski E. Implementation of point-of-care rapid urine testing for drugs of abuse in the emergency Department of an Academic Medical

Center: impact on test utilization and ED length of stay. Am J Clin Pathol. 2008;129(5):796–801.

56. Kendall J, Reeves B, Clancy M. Point of care testing: randomised controlled trial of clinical outcome. BMJ. 1998;316(7137):1052–1057.