

# Assessing the Risks of Pre-Analytical Errors in Diagnostic Testing in Laboratory

Ayat Matook Bokhari <sup>1</sup>, Hanan Abdallah Jambi <sup>2</sup>, Aldhafeeri, Sanaa Sanad <sup>3</sup>, Abdullah Aloqayli Hutail Alanazi <sup>4</sup>, Hamoud Kassar Mahjaa Al-Anzi <sup>5</sup>, Fadi Abdullah Alsabi <sup>6</sup>, Jomanh Hiddeb Alamri <sup>7</sup>, Sabah Ghazi Bargotah <sup>8</sup>, Juaidan Ali Juaidan Alhazmi <sup>9</sup>, Qasem Ali Hussain Alsharif <sup>10</sup>

- 1- laboratory specialist, King Fahd General Hospital, Jeddah, Saudi Arabia
- 2- laboratory specialist, King Fahd General Hospital, Jeddah, Saudi Arabia
- 3- Laboratory Technician, Maternity and Children's Hospital in Hafar Al-Batin, Saudi Arabia
- 4- Laboratory Technician, Maternity and Children's Hospital, Arar, Saudi Arabia
- 5- Laboratory Technician, Forensic Medical Services Center Arar, Saudi Arabia
- 6- Laboratory Technician, Al-Juraif Primary Health Care Center, Al-Rass, Saudi Arabia
- 7- Laboratory Technician, King Fahd General Hospital, Jeddah, Saudi Arabia
- 8- Laboratory Technician, King Fahd General Hospital, Jeddah, Saudi Arabia
- 9- Laboratory Technician, Jadidat Arar Hospital, Saudi Arabia
- 10- Laboratory Technician, Bagedo Health Center, Al-Madinah, Saudi Arabia

## Abstract:

Assessing the risks of pre-analytical errors in diagnostic testing is essential for ensuring the accuracy and reliability of laboratory results. Pre-analytical errors can occur at various stages, including patient preparation, sample collection, transportation, and processing. Factors such as improper patient identification, inadequate sample volume, incorrect labeling, and handling delays can compromise sample integrity, leading to erroneous test results. By systematically evaluating these risks, laboratories can implement strategies to minimize the likelihood of errors, such as standardizing procedures, enhancing staff training, and utilizing technology for improved sample tracking and management. Moreover, organizations must foster a culture of quality and continuous improvement in laboratory practices. Regular audits and risk assessments play a crucial role in identifying potential vulnerabilities in the pre-analytical phase. By employing root cause analysis when errors occur, labs can develop targeted corrective actions and preventive measures. Ultimately, the goal is to create robust processes that safeguard against pre-analytical errors, thereby enhancing patient safety and ensuring accurate diagnoses, which are critical for effective clinical decision-making.

**Keywords:** pre-analytical errors, diagnostic testing, risk assessment, laboratory quality, sample integrity, patient identification, sample collection, transportation, standardization, training, audits, continuous improvement, root cause analysis, patient safety.

## Introduction:

In the realm of clinical diagnostics, a multitude of factors influences the accuracy and reliability of test results. While the focus often rests on post-analytical phases—those steps following analysis, such as interpretation and reporting—there exists a critical and equally significant phase that warrants diligent attention: the pre-analytical phase. The pre-analytical phase encompasses all activities that occur before the actual analytical testing of biological specimens, including patient preparation, specimen collection, transportation, and processing. Collectively, these steps play an essential role in ensuring the integrity of diagnostic testing

outcomes. However, the intricacies of these procedures introduce numerous opportunities for error, commonly referred to as pre-analytical errors. These errors can have profound implications for patient care, often leading to misdiagnoses, inappropriate treatments, and ultimately affecting patient safety and healthcare costs [1].

Pre-analytical errors are not merely an administrative inconvenience; they pose significant risks within the continuum of care and can compromise the reliability of critical diagnostic information. Research suggests that an astonishing proportion of laboratory errors—estimated to be between 70% to 80%—occur during this

preliminary phase. Such statistics underscore a compelling need for healthcare stakeholders to better understand and actively mitigate these risks. Factors contributing to pre-analytical errors are varied and multifaceted, encompassing human factors, environmental influences, and variations in procedural standardization. Furthermore, as the healthcare landscape increasingly incorporates technology into laboratory operations—through automation, electronic health records, and other innovations—new types of errors are emerging that necessitate continual assessment and adaptation of established protocols [2].

The complexity of the healthcare ecosystem mandates an approach that prioritizes thorough risk assessment and quality improvement strategies with respect to pre-analytical processes. A comprehensive examination of these pre-analytical pitfalls not only supports enhanced patient outcomes but also optimizes laboratory operations through increased efficiency and reduced costs. Among the elements that warrant investigation include patient-related factors such as age, gender, fasting status, and medications, all of which can influence specimen quality. Moreover, operational considerations—ranging from the training and competency of laboratory personnel to the adequacy of storage conditions during specimen transport—can greatly impact the likelihood of error [3].

Moreover, the growing emphasis on patient-centered care adds a layer of complexity that laboratories must navigate. With an increasing number of patients engaging in direct-access testing and self-collection procedures, laboratories must establish rigorous standards to ensure that these novel processes do not introduce additional pre-analytical risks. Understanding the unique challenges presented by diverse patient populations, including vulnerable groups, is critical in mitigating risks associated with pre-analytical errors. As patients take a more active role in their healthcare journey, laboratories must also adapt their protocols to facilitate effective communication and education regarding specimen collection and handling [4].

To effectively address the risks associated with pre-analytical errors, it is essential for laboratories to implement structured quality management programs that prioritize error prevention through robust risk assessment frameworks. The application of quality improvement methodologies—such as the Plan-Do-Study-Act (PDSA) cycle—can provide laboratories with systematic approaches to identifying, tracking,

and rectifying sources of pre-analytical errors. Engagement in continuous professional development and training for laboratory personnel is equally critical in fostering an environment of accountability, vigilance, and best practices [5].

### **Identifying Common Sources of Pre-Analytical Errors:**

In the field of laboratory medicine, the accuracy and reliability of test results are paramount for effective patient management and diagnosis. Pre-analytical errors, which occur before the actual analysis of specimens, account for a significant proportion of diagnostic inaccuracies. Understanding these errors is essential for healthcare professionals striving to enhance the quality of laboratory services and improve patient outcomes [6].

Pre-analytical errors encompass a broad range of activities that occur prior to the analysis of biological specimens, such as blood, urine, and tissue samples. These errors can arise from various factors, including patient preparation, specimen collection, handling, transportation, and processing. According to the literature, pre-analytical factors can account for approximately 30% to 75% of total laboratory errors. The ramifications of these errors can lead to misdiagnosis, inappropriate treatment decisions, and increased healthcare costs. Therefore, it is crucial to meticulously identify and mitigate these sources to enhance laboratory performance [7].

### **Common Sources of Pre-Analytical Errors**

#### **1. Patient-Related Factors**

Patient-related factors are pivotal in the pre-analytical phase and can significantly influence test results. Some common sources include:

- **Preparation Instructions:** Patients may not follow pre-test instructions regarding fasting, medication restrictions, or hydration levels, leading to erroneous results, especially in metabolic panels and other sensitive assays. For instance, a patient who consumes food before a fasting blood glucose test may present with falsely elevated glucose levels, prompting unnecessary interventions [8].
- **Physiological Variability:** Factors such as age, sex, ethnicity, and hormonal fluctuations can affect laboratory values. For example, variations in serum creatinine

levels due to muscle mass differences in male and female patients must be taken into consideration during interpretation [9].

- **Behavioral Factors:** Factors such as anxiety or stress experienced by the patient can influence physiological parameters, leading to inconsistencies in results. This variability must be understood and accounted for before testing [10].

## 2. Specimen Collection Errors

Errors during specimen collection are among the most critical sources of pre-analytical variability. These can include:

- **Inappropriate Site Selection:** Choosing the wrong anatomical site for specimen collection can yield unreliable results. For instance, drawing blood from an infected or damaged site can introduce contaminants, altering analyte concentrations [11].
- **Contamination:** Specimens can be contaminated by external factors (e.g., skin flora, environmental contaminants) during the collection process. It is essential to maintain aseptic techniques and use appropriate materials to minimize contamination risk.
- **Collection Device Issues:** The choice of collection devices, such as needles, tubes, or containers, can influence outcomes. For instance, using anticoagulant tubes that are not compatible with the intended analysis can cause erroneous results [11].

## 3. Handling and Transportation

The post-collection handling and transportation of specimens are crucial for ensuring stability and integrity:

- **Delayed Processing:** Specimens that are not processed or analyzed promptly can undergo hemolysis or changes in biochemical composition, leading to unreliable results. For example, blood samples intended for hormonal assays may degrade if not separated from cellular components swiftly [12].
- **Temperature Fluctuations:** Specimens are often sensitive to temperature changes. Exposure to extreme temperatures during

transportation can compromise analyte stability, particularly for enzymes and proteins. Utilizing temperature-controlled transport systems can help mitigate this risk.

- **Labeling Errors:** Mislabeling or incomplete labeling of specimens can lead to confusion and potential misdiagnosis. Implementing barcode scanning or digital labeling systems can reduce the likelihood of errors in this critical step [12].

## 4. Processing Errors

Errors occurring during the initial processing of specimens can further contribute to pre-analytical variability:

- **Incorrect Processing Techniques:** Failure to adhere to specific processing protocols, such as centrifugation speeds and times, can affect sample quality. Each test may require tailored processing, and standardization is essential to minimize variability [13].
- **Sample Volume:** Providing insufficient sample volume for analysis can result in the inability to perform necessary tests, potentially postponing diagnosis and treatment. Laboratories must establish minimum volume thresholds and communicate these effectively to clinical staff [13].

## Mitigating Pre-Analytical Errors

While pre-analytical errors are prevalent, numerous strategies can be implemented to mitigate their occurrence and impact:

1. **Education and Training:** Continuous education and training for healthcare providers involved in specimen collection and handling are vital. Training programs should focus on standardized protocols and the importance of adherence to pre-analytical requirements [14].
2. **Clear Communication:** Providing patients with clear and concise pre-test instructions can help ensure compliance. Educating patients about the rationale behind preparation requirements will increase the likelihood of adherence.

3. **Standardization of Protocols:** Laboratories should develop and implement standardized protocols for specimen collection, handling, labeling, and transport. Regular audits of practices can help identify areas for improvement.
4. **Quality Assurance Programs:** Establishing quality assurance programs within laboratories can facilitate monitoring of pre-analytical processes and the identification of error trends. These programs should include regular performance evaluations and feedback mechanisms.
5. **Utilization of Technology:** Incorporating technological advancements, such as laboratory information systems (LIS) and barcode scanning, can enhance accuracy in specimen tracking, thereby reducing the incidence of labeling and processing errors [14].

#### **Impact of Pre-Analytical Errors on Diagnostic Accuracy:**

In the realm of clinical pathology and laboratory medicine, the accuracy of diagnostic tests is critical not only for clinical decision-making but also for patient safety and treatment outcomes. Among the various factors that can influence the outcome of laboratory tests, pre-analytical errors hold a significant place. Pre-analytical errors refer to mistakes that occur before the analytical phase of testing, including errors related to specimen collection, handling, transportation, storage, and patient preparation. Despite advancements in analytical technologies and methodologies, pre-analytical errors remain a major source of variability in diagnostic results, undermining the reliability of patient diagnoses and treatment plans [15].

The pre-analytical phase encompasses a wide range of activities. It begins with patient identification and extends to the collection of biological specimens, followed by their subsequent handling and transportation to the laboratory. Each step in this process is crucial, as it can directly affect the quality and integrity of the specimens. Some common types of pre-analytical errors include incorrect patient identification, use of improper collection devices, contamination of samples, delays in processing, inappropriate storage conditions, and lack of adequate information about the patient's medication or medical history [16].

A particularly vital aspect of the pre-analytical phase is patient preparation. For many tests, specific preparation guidelines—such as fasting, avoiding certain medications, or timing of specimen collection—must be followed to ensure that the resultant data reflects the patient's physiological state accurately. Failing to adhere to these protocols can lead to misleading results, which may falsely suggest the presence or absence of a disease [17].

Several studies have shown that pre-analytical errors account for a substantial percentage of total errors in the laboratory setting—estimates range from 30% to 70% of all lab errors. This wide-ranging prevalence underscores the critical need for robust procedures and protocols to minimize such mistakes. Frequently cited factors contributing to pre-analytical errors include human factors, such as miscommunication or lack of training, as well as systemic issues, such as inadequate laboratory infrastructure [18].

Additionally, the increasing complexity of diagnostic tests, including advanced molecular techniques and multi-parametric analyses, has magnified the implications of pre-analytical errors. As tests become more complex, the processes leading up to analysis must be followed with greater diligence. Therefore, the emergence of new technologies calls for a parallel enhancement of competency and reliability in pre-analytical practices [19].

The consequences of pre-analytical errors can be profound and far-reaching. They can lead to misdiagnosis, inappropriate treatment, extended hospital stays, and increased healthcare costs. For instance, elevated liver enzymes detected due to hemolysis of a blood sample might prompt unnecessary further testing and lead to a misdiagnosis of liver disease, resulting in unwarranted anxiety and invasive procedures for the patient. Likewise, incorrect labeling of samples may result in incorrect treatment regimens being administered to patients based on erroneous test results [19].

In some cases, severe pre-analytical errors can have ethical and legal implications. Misdiagnosis can lead to harmful consequences for patients and may expose healthcare institutions to liability. Considerable litigation costs can ensue from cases where patients suffer harm due to errors that could have been avoided had proper pre-analytical procedures been followed [20].

To reduce the occurrence and impact of pre-analytical errors, healthcare institutions can implement a series of interconnected strategies. Firstly, standardization of procedures is crucial. Establishing clear, concise protocols for specimen collection, labeling, handling, and transportation can significantly minimize the chances of human error [21].

Secondly, effective training programs for healthcare professionals involved in specimen collection are essential. Regular training refreshers can help ensure that all personnel are familiar with best practices and the importance of following them meticulously [22].

Thirdly, employing technology can enhance accuracy in the pre-analytical phase. For instance, utilizing electronic order entry systems can reduce miscommunication errors. Barcode scanning of specimens at the time of collection can ensure accurate identification and tracking, thereby minimizing the risk of sample mix-ups [23].

Furthermore, engaging patients in the pre-analytical process can lead to better outcomes. Educating patients about the importance of adhering to pre-testing instructions, including medication management and fasting requirements, can enhance the quality of specimens collected [24].

### **Risk Assessment Methodologies in Laboratory Settings:**

Risk assessment is a critical process in various sectors, especially in laboratory settings where the potential for hazards can be significant. Laboratories are environments characterized by the manipulation of numerous chemicals, biological agents, and complex machinery, all posing various levels of risk to personnel, equipment, and the environment. The aim of risk assessment in laboratories is to identify, evaluate, and mitigate risks associated with these activities [25].

Laboratory safety cannot be overstated, as incidents can result in severe consequences including contamination, injury, or even fatalities. Moreover, regulatory bodies such as the Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) and the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) have established guidelines that require facilities to conduct risk assessments. By identifying potential hazards and implementing control measures, laboratories can promote a safer working environment, protect public health, and adhere to legal requirements [26].

### **Key Components of Risk Assessment**

Risk assessment generally involves four main steps: hazard identification, risk analysis, risk evaluation, and risk control. A thorough understanding of these components is crucial for effective risk management within laboratory settings [27].

1. **Hazard Identification:** This initial step requires identifying any potential sources of harm that could arise from laboratory activities. Hazards can be categorized as physical (e.g., equipment malfunctions), chemical (e.g., toxic substances), biological (e.g., infectious agents), ergonomic (e.g., repetitive strain injuries), and psychosocial (e.g., workplace stress). A comprehensive hazard identification process might include reviewing Material Safety Data Sheets (MSDS), conducting surveys of existing laboratory practices, and engaging in discussions with laboratory staff to gather firsthand information about potential risks [28].
2. **Risk Analysis:** Once hazards are identified, the next step involves analyzing the risks associated with these hazards. This may include assessing both the likelihood of an incident occurring, as well as the potential consequences. Quantitative methods such as statistical analysis or qualitative methods such as expert judgment can be employed to evaluate these risks. For instance, a laboratory handling hazardous chemicals must consider the frequency of chemical spills, the toxicity levels of the chemicals involved, and the vulnerabilities of personnel [29].
3. **Risk Evaluation:** In this phase, the assessed risks are prioritized based on their significance. This assessment often involves comparing the identified risks against established safety standards or tolerable risk levels. This prioritization allows laboratory managers to focus their resources on controlling the highest risks first. For example, if a specific chemical poses a high risk due to its carcinogenic properties, it may necessitate immediate action compared to a lesser risk chemical [29].

4. **Risk Control:** The final step of the risk assessment process involves determining control measures to mitigate the identified risks. This can be achieved through various strategies, including eliminating the hazard, substituting a less hazardous material, implementing engineering controls (such as fume hoods), administrative controls (such as work procedures and training), or providing personal protective equipment (PPE). The hierarchy of controls is often utilized in this context, advocating for the most effective measures to be implemented first [30].

### Common Risk Assessment Methodologies

Several risk assessment methodologies are commonly applied in laboratory settings, each proscribed by specific industries, recognized standards, or tailored to the unique circumstances of a lab.

1. **Qualitative Assessment:** This method involves subjective judgment about the severity and likelihood of risks. It is often used in smaller labs where a formal quantitative analysis might not be feasible. Techniques within qualitative assessments include checklists, brainstorming sessions, and risk matrixing [30].
2. **Quantitative Risk Assessment:** This approach utilizes mathematical models and statistical methods to provide a numerical estimate of risk levels. It is typically employed in large facilities, particularly in industries where precise data on accident probabilities is available. The formal analysis might incorporate tools like fault tree analysis (FTA) and event tree analysis (ETA) [31].
3. **Job Safety Analysis (JSA):** A JSA breaks down each task involved in an experiment into its individual components, identifying hazards associated with each step. This method is useful for ensuring comprehensive scrutiny of all activities conducted in the laboratory.
4. **Failure Mode and Effects Analysis (FMEA):** Tailored for identifying risks related to equipment and processes, FMEA systematically examines potential failure modes, their causes, and effects. The

methodology aids in prioritizing system components that require improvements.

5. **Bow-Tie Analysis:** This visual tool illustrates the pathways that lead to potential adverse events (the knot of the bow tie) and the barriers that can prevent them (the “wings” of the bow tie). Bow-tie analysis provides an easy-to-understand representation of complex risk controls and their interrelationships [31].

### Best Practices for Risk Assessment in Laboratories

Implementing successful risk assessment methodologies in laboratories requires commitment from all levels of personnel. Here are some best practices to consider:

1. **Training and Education:** Regular training sessions on safety practices and risk assessment techniques should be conducted to foster awareness among all laboratory staff [32].
2. **Collaboration:** Engaging various stakeholders, including laboratory personnel, safety officers, and management, promotes a culture of safety and accountability.
3. **Documentation:** Keeping thorough records of risk assessments, control measures, and incident reports helps ensure compliance with regulations and offers a basis for continuous improvement.
4. **Review and Update:** The risk assessment process should not be a one-time activity. Regular reviews should be conducted, particularly when processes, equipment, or personnel change.
5. **Utilization of Technology:** Implementing software tools to assist in risk assessment can enhance efficiency. Technologies that facilitate data collection, incident reporting, and analysis can significantly streamline the assessment process [32].

### Strategies for Minimizing Pre-Analytical Errors:

Pre-analytical errors represent a significant concern in the field of laboratory medicine, accounting for a substantial portion of inaccuracies that can lead to misdiagnosis and improper patient management. Defined as mistakes that occur before the actual

analysis of biological specimens, pre-analytical errors encompass a range of activities, including patient preparation, specimen collection, handling, and transportation. With the increasing reliance on laboratory data for clinical decision-making, it becomes imperative to establish effective strategies to minimize these errors [33].

### Understanding Pre-Analytical Errors

Before delving into strategies to mitigate pre-analytical errors, it is essential to understand the types of errors that can arise during this phase. Common pre-analytical errors include:

1. **Patient Identification Errors:** Misidentifying patients can lead to incorrect specimen collection, posing significant risks to patient safety [34].
2. **Improper Specimen Collection Techniques:** Inadequate techniques, such as improper phlebotomy or incorrect use of collection tubes, can compromise specimen integrity.
3. **Sample Contamination:** Contaminated samples yield inaccurate results, making it crucial to follow stringent protocols to avoid contamination from various sources.
4. **Inappropriate Specimen Transport:** Transportation of specimens at incorrect temperatures or for extended periods can lead to degradation and altered results.
5. **Lack of Patient Preparation:** Not informing patients about fasting, medication usage, or other preparatory measures can lead to unreliable data [34].

### Strategies for Minimizing Pre-Analytical Errors

To minimize pre-analytical errors, laboratories can adopt a multi-faceted approach targeting each stage of the pre-analytical workflow. Here are several effective strategies:

#### 1. Enhanced Patient Identification and Check-in Procedures

Ensuring accurate patient identification is the cornerstone of minimizing pre-analytical errors. Implementing a robust identification protocol that includes:

- Use of barcodes or RFID tags to scan patients and specimens.

- Verification processes that require two unique identifiers (e.g., name and date of birth) before specimen collection.
- Staff training to emphasize the importance of thorough patient identification.

These measures can significantly reduce the likelihood of errors accompanying specimen collection [35].

#### 2. Standardized Training and Competency Assessments

Lab personnel must be adequately trained and regularly assessed for competency in specimen collection techniques. A structured training program that includes simulations and education on proper venipuncture methods, appropriate collection tube selection, and special considerations for specific tests can enhance the reliability of specimen acquisition [36].

Additionally, laboratories should implement periodic competency assessments to ensure that staff skills remain updated and consistent with industry standards [36].

#### 3. Strict Adherence to Collection Protocols

Developing and distributing clear protocols for specimen collection tailored to particular tests can mitigate errors linked to improper techniques. Laboratories can:

- Create visual aids or quick-reference guides for different procedures.
- Utilize color-coded collection tubes and labels for ease of identification.
- Encourage compliance by making adherence to protocols part of routine quality control measures.

Consistent application of standardized protocols helps eliminate variability in specimen collection [37].

#### 4. Improving Communication with Patients

Clear communication with patients regarding pre-analytical instructions is crucial in avoiding errors due to unpreparedness. Laboratories can:

- Provide written instructions outlining fasting requirements, medication restrictions, and the significance of test preparation [38].

- Implement reminder systems (via text or calls) for scheduled blood draws or specimen collections.
- Employ healthcare providers to explain the testing importance, as well as how and why certain preparations are necessary.

Effective communication fosters patient engagement and compliance, leading to improved specimen quality [38].

### 5. Implementing Quality Control Measures in Sample Handling and Transport

To mitigate errors in sample handling and transport, laboratories can adopt rigorous quality control methods, including:

- Establishing protocols for monitoring environmental conditions (e.g. temperature) during transport and storage [39].
- Designating specific personnel responsible for sample preparation and transport to ensure accountability.
- Utilizing appropriate containers and packaging materials designed to maintain specimen integrity throughout transport.

Regular audits of handling and transport processes can identify areas for improvement and ensure adherence to established protocols [39].

### 6. Automating Workflow Processes

Advancements in technology offer laboratories the opportunity to automate various components of the pre-analytical process. Automation can include:

- Using automated specimen collection devices, such as self-collection kits, that ensure standardized collection methods and reduce human error.
- Implementing laboratory information systems (LIS) that aid in tracking specimens from collection to analysis, enhancing traceability and reducing errors in specimen labeling and record-keeping [40].

By integrating automation, laboratories can enhance efficiency, reduce the potential for human error, and streamline workflow processes.

### 7. Continuous Quality Improvement (CQI) Programs

Instituting Continuous Quality Improvement programs allows laboratories to systematically analyze pre-analytical errors and implement corrective actions. This ongoing process involves:

- Collecting data on errors to identify trends or recurrent issues.
- Engaging teams in root cause analyses to determine the underlying causes of errors.
- Setting measurable goals for error reduction and regularly monitoring progress.

CQI programs foster a culture of accountability and continuous learning within laboratory settings [41].

### Role of Technology in Enhancing Sample Integrity:

In an ever-evolving scientific realm, the focus on integrity during sample collection, handling, storage, and analysis has intensified. Sample integrity is paramount across numerous fields—ranging from pharmaceuticals to environmental science—where the reliability of results directly correlates with the accuracy and efficacy of conclusions drawn from data. Technology, through its diverse applications, has emerged as a linchpin in enhancing and maintaining sample integrity at every stage of the research process [42].

Before delving into the technological advancements that support sample integrity, it is essential to define what sample integrity entails. Sample integrity refers to the preservation of the physical and chemical properties of a sample in its original state until analysis. It encompasses factors such as contamination, degradation, evaporation, and loss during sampling, transportation, and storage. When sample integrity is compromised, it can lead to inaccurate results, invalid conclusions, and ultimately detrimental impacts on decision-making processes [43].

The journey of sample integrity begins at the collection stage. Smart sampling devices are revolutionizing the way samples are acquired. For example, automated sampling systems can minimize human error and ensure the correct volume and composition of samples are collected under controlled conditions. Additionally, portable sensors equipped with IoT (Internet of Things) technology



can monitor environmental conditions such as temperature, humidity, and pressure during the collection process, providing real-time data to ensure optimal sampling conditions [44].

Moreover, advancements in biomaterials are enhancing sample collection techniques. Sterile, disposable collection tools designed from biocompatible materials mitigate contamination risks. In the realm of medical diagnostics, the use of microfluidics technology allows for the precise collection and analysis of biological samples, ensuring that the integrity of critical parameters is maintained right from the outset [45].

Once samples are collected, the need for maintaining their integrity during transportation and storage arises. Technology offers a range of solutions aimed at minimizing risks during these stages. One of the most significant innovations is the development of smart shipping containers equipped with GPS tracking and environmental monitoring systems. These containers can provide real-time updates on position and prevailing environmental conditions, ensuring that the samples remain within the specified parameters throughout transit [46].

In laboratory settings, advancements in cryopreservation technology have provided new ways of storing biological samples, particularly in biobanks. The use of automated freezers and cryogenic storage systems not only improves temperature regulation but also helps prevent human error during sample retrieval. Automated, user-defined protocols ensure that samples are stored at consistent temperatures, thus averting degradation that could otherwise compromise integrity [47].

Data management plays a crucial role in maintaining sample integrity by providing comprehensive tracking throughout the sample lifecycle. Laboratory Information Management Systems (LIMS) offer robust platforms for managing sample data, linking each sample to crucial metadata (like collection time, method, and condition). This digital oversight helps establish an audit trail, making it easier to identify potential failures in integrity [47].

Additionally, blockchain technology is emerging as a means to secure the chain of custody for samples. By creating an immutable record of every transaction and process a sample undergoes, blockchain can provide unmatched transparency. This can be particularly beneficial in clinical trials, where demonstrable sample integrity is critical for regulatory compliance and ethical standards [48].

The technological landscape further strengthens sample integrity through advancements in analytical methodologies. For example, mass spectrometry and high-performance liquid chromatography (HPLC) require stringent temperature and environmental controls to preserve sample composition throughout the analysis. The integration of modern analytical techniques with automation allows for high-throughput screening processes capable of preserving sensitive samples [48].

Furthermore, methods such as solid-phase microextraction (SPME) are gaining traction in analytical chemistry. SPME minimizes exposure to potential contaminants and reduces the sample handling process, yielding more reliable data [49].

Despite the myriad benefits, several challenges still loom in the domain of maintaining sample integrity through technology. Costs associated with advanced technologies may be prohibitive in resource-limited settings. Furthermore, the training required to operate sophisticated equipment effectively can be a barrier to widespread adoption [50].

Looking ahead, the convergence of artificial intelligence (AI) and machine learning (ML) with existing technologies holds promise. Predictive algorithms could optimize storage conditions and sample analysis protocols dynamically based on real-time data, thus further enhancing integrity. Additionally, the field of nanotechnology may yield extraordinary materials and systems designed to encapsulate or stabilize samples, affording unprecedented protection against degradation [50].

### **Training and Education for Laboratory Personnel:**

In the modern scientific landscape, the role of laboratory personnel is vital for the advancement of research, development, and public health. Laboratory professionals, including laboratory technicians, technologists, scientists, and support staff, are essential in diverse fields such as healthcare, environmental science, pharmaceuticals, and various realms of biochemical research. Their work underpins crucial processes ranging from clinical diagnostics to experimental research and industrial development. Given the fundamental impact of their roles, training and education for laboratory personnel stands as a priority, ensuring that they possess the necessary skills, knowledge, and competencies to carry out their responsibilities effectively and ethically [51].

The landscape of scientific research and laboratory practices is continually evolving, necessitating a commitment to lifelong learning among laboratory personnel. New technologies, regulations, and safety protocols regularly emerge, underscoring the need for ongoing training. Effective training not only enhances individual competencies but also improves overall laboratory productivity, safety, and accountability. Moreover, it plays an essential role in fostering a culture of continuous improvement, encouraging personnel to stay updated with the latest advancements in their respective fields [52].

Training and education serve multiple purposes in laboratory settings:

1. **Scientific Knowledge:** Fundamental training equips personnel with the theoretical foundation required to understand scientific principles underlying laboratory procedures. This includes knowledge of biological processes, chemical reactions, and physical sciences, which is crucial for interpreting experimental results and troubleshooting methodologies [53].
2. **Technical Skills:** Laboratory personnel must acquire specific technical skills relevant to their work. This may include proficiency in operating laboratory instruments, performing procedures appropriately, and adhering to quality control measures. Technical skills are often honed through hands-on training, workshops, and practical assessments.
3. **Regulatory Compliance:** The laboratory environment is subject to a variety of regulations, including those set forth by governmental agencies, such as the Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) and the Food and Drug Administration (FDA), as well as accreditation bodies like the College of American Pathologists (CAP). Comprehensive training ensures that laboratory personnel understand and comply with these regulations, thereby minimizing risks associated with non-compliance [54].
4. **Health and Safety:** Laboratories can pose significant safety risks, particularly when dealing with hazardous materials or equipment. Training on health and safety

procedures is paramount in preventing accidents, ensuring proper emergency protocols are in place, and instilling a culture of safety awareness among all staff [54].

5. **Ethical Considerations:** Ethical training is essential, particularly in areas involving human subjects or sensitive data. Laboratory personnel must be versed in ethical standards related to research integrity, data management, and patient confidentiality. This knowledge is crucial to maintain public trust and uphold the integrity of scientific research [55].

### Strategies for Effective Training and Education

To fulfill the diverse educational needs of laboratory personnel, several strategies can be employed, leveraging both traditional and innovative approaches:

1. **Formal Education:** A solid educational background is often mandated for laboratory professionals. This may include degrees in fields such as biology, chemistry, biomedical sciences, or medical technology. Formal education equips individuals with the fundamental knowledge that serves as the backbone for specialized training [55].
2. **Continuing Education Programs:** As research pushes forward, laboratory professionals must engage in continuing education to stay current with new techniques and discoveries. Many institutions offer workshops, seminars, webinars, and certification programs designed to provide ongoing learning opportunities tailored to specialized fields of laboratory practice [56].
3. **On-the-Job Training:** Mentorship and hands-on training are imperative to effectively transform theoretical knowledge into practical skills. Experienced personnel can mentor new staff, facilitating a learning environment where newcomers can acquire expertise through observation and practice. Structured programs that integrate shadowing experienced professionals can nurture competency and confidence among trainees [56].

4. **Simulation and Virtual Training:** The advent of technology has introduced innovative training methodologies, such as simulation-based training and virtual laboratories. These tools allow personnel to practice skills and learn concepts without the risks associated with working in a live lab. Virtual reality (VR) and augmented reality (AR) technologies offer interactive scenarios that enhance learning experiences [57].
5. **Assessment and Evaluation:** Regular assessment of training outcomes should be performed to evaluate the effectiveness of educational programs. This may include examinations, practical tests, performance evaluations, and feedback mechanisms. Continuous feedback ensures that deficiencies in knowledge or skills are identified and addressed promptly, leading to a cycle of improvement [57].
6. **Collaborative Learning:** Establishing a collaborative atmosphere within the laboratory can enhance the educational experience. Group discussions, lab meetings, and interdisciplinary projects can encourage knowledge sharing and collective problem-solving, enriching the professional growth landscape [58].

#### Case Studies: Lessons Learned from Pre-Analytical Errors:

Laboratory testing is a cornerstone of modern medicine, providing valuable insights critical for diagnosis, treatment planning, and monitoring patient outcomes. However, the integrity of laboratory results is heavily influenced by the pre-analytical phase, which encompasses all activities preceding the actual analysis of the sample. Pre-analytical errors can arise from numerous factors, including specimen collection, handling, transport, and processing. These errors can ultimately lead to incorrect diagnoses or misguided treatments, thereby compromising patient safety and healthcare efficiency. To mitigate the risk of such errors, the implementation of quality indicators can be essential in the detection and improvement of pre-analytical processes [58].

#### Understanding the Pre-Analytical Phase

The pre-analytical phase, often overlooked in discussions surrounding laboratory testing, makes

up approximately 60-70% of all laboratory errors. It includes several stages:

1. **Test Ordering:** This is when a physician decides which tests to perform based on clinical evaluation.
2. **Patient Preparation:** Includes instructions to the patient regarding fasting, medication restrictions, or other preparatory actions necessary for specific tests.
3. **Sample Collection:** The process involves obtaining biological specimens (blood, urine, etc.) from patients, during which correct techniques and aseptic conditions are critical.
4. **Sample Handling and Transport:** Post-collection protocols must ensure specimens are correctly stored and transported to prevent degradation.
5. **Sample Processing:** This includes the preparation of samples before they are analyzed, such as centrifugation or aliquoting [59].

Each of these steps is critical. Any error made can compromise the reliability of test results; thus, identifying and systematically monitoring these stages is imperative for enhancing laboratory quality and patient outcomes [59].

#### Common Sources of Pre-Analytical Errors

Pre-analytical errors can be categorized into several primary sources:

1. **Human Factors:** Errors in patient identification, mislabeling of specimens, incorrect test orders, or inadequate sample collection techniques can lead to significant misdiagnosis.
2. **Technical Factors:** These include improper dilution of samples, inadequate or excessive sample volume, and incorrect storage conditions (temperature and time).
3. **Environmental Factors:** Exposure to extreme temperatures during transport or unstable conditions that lead to hemolysis or leukolysis.
4. **Patient-Centric Factors:** These encompass patient-related issues such as refusal to comply with pre-test instructions, incorrect timing of sample collection in

relation to medication administration, and physiological conditions like dehydration or stress [60].

Given the diversity of these contributing factors, diligent monitoring and assessment are pivotal in addressing pre-analytical errors [60].

### Quality Indicators for Pre-Analytical Error Detection

Quality indicators (QIs) are measurable elements that provide insight into various aspects of laboratory performance, including the effectiveness and reliability of the pre-analytical phase. Indicators can be quantitative, such as the percentage of samples with a specific problem, or qualitative, evaluating compliance with established procedures. Below are some key quality indicators that help to detect pre-analytical errors:

1. **Specimen Rejection Rates:** Monitoring the percentage of specimens rejected due to labeling errors, collection issues, or insufficient volumes. A high rejection rate may point to problems in the specimen collection process that could be targeted for improvement [61].
2. **Turnaround Time (TAT):** Analyzing the time taken for samples to move from collection to results reporting can help identify bottlenecks and inefficiencies in the pre-analytical workflow. Excessively long TATs in the pre-analytical phase may indicate issues in sample handling or transport.
3. **Compliance Rates with Pre-Test Instructions:** The frequency with which patients comply with pre-analytical instructions (e.g., fasting requirements) can serve as an important indicator. Low compliance rates may necessitate improvement in patient education and communication strategies.
4. **Temperature Monitoring:** Continuous monitoring of the temperature of storage and transport conditions is essential. Regular audits checking for compliance with temperature protocols can help prevent specimen degradation.
5. **Clinical Audit of Test Orders:** Regular audits of test orders can reveal inappropriate or redundant requests that

lead to unnecessary blood draws, which can increase the risk of errors. Indicators tracking the appropriateness of ordered tests can enhance decision-making for test selections [61].

6. **Training and Competency Assessments of Personnel:** Regular evaluations of staff competence related to specimen collection and processing are crucial. Performance metrics based on competency assessments can highlight areas where additional training is required to minimize errors [62].
7. **Error Tracking:** Creating a system for recording and analyzing any identified pre-analytical errors is vital. This can facilitate trends identification and help implement targeted interventions effectively [63].

### The Role of Technology in Enhancing Quality Indicators

The rapid advancement of technology in laboratory medicine offers innovative approaches to tracking and mitigating pre-analytical errors. Laboratory Information Systems (LIS) can be utilized to streamline processes, from test ordering to final reporting. Automation and barcode identification systems enhance accuracy in specimen labeling, tracking, and handling, thereby reducing human error [64].

Digital platforms can also facilitate remote patient education tools, offering reminders and guidelines for pre-test preparation through apps and SMS notifications, further enhancing compliance rates. Moreover, the integration of machine learning algorithms within laboratory systems provides powerful predictive analytics capabilities, enabling laboratories to anticipate potential errors based on historical data patterns [65].

### Conclusion:

In conclusion, assessing the risks of pre-analytical errors in diagnostic testing is paramount to improving the accuracy and reliability of laboratory results. This study highlights the multifaceted nature of these errors, which can arise from various stages including patient identification, sample collection, processing, and transportation. The significant impact of pre-analytical errors on clinical outcomes underscores the necessity for laboratories to adopt a proactive approach in identifying and mitigating potential risks. By implementing standardized protocols, leveraging advanced technologies, and

investing in ongoing training for laboratory personnel, organizations can enhance the quality of their diagnostic processes.

Ultimately, fostering a culture of continuous improvement and accountability is crucial in minimizing pre-analytical errors. Regular audits and risk assessments should be integral to laboratory operations, allowing for the swift identification of vulnerabilities and the development of effective corrective measures. By prioritizing the reduction of pre-analytical errors, laboratories can significantly enhance patient safety and ensure that diagnostic testing serves its critical role in guiding clinical decision-making and improving overall healthcare outcomes.

#### References:

1. Carraro P, Plebani M. Errors in a stat laboratory: types and frequency 10 years later. *Clin Chem*. 2007;53:1338–42. doi: 10.1373/clinchem.2007.088344.
2. Lippi G, Chance JJ, Church S, Dazzi P, Fontana R, Giavarina D, et al. Preanalytical quality improvement: from dream to reality. *Clin Chem Lab Med*. 2011;49:1113–26. doi: 10.1515/CCLM.2011.600.
3. Plebani M, Laposata M, Lundberg GD. The brain-to-brain loop concept for laboratory testing 40 years after its introduction. *Am J Clin Pathol*. 2011;136:829–33. doi: 10.1309/AJCP28HWHSSDNON.
4. Sciacovelli L, Plebani M. The IFCC Working Group on laboratory errors and patient safety. *Clin Chim Acta*. 2009;404:79–85. doi: 10.1016/j.cca.2009.03.025.
5. Barth JH. Clinical quality indicators in laboratory medicine. *Ann Clin Biochem*. 2012;49:9–16. doi: 10.1258/acb.2011.011126.
6. Plebani M. Errors in clinical laboratories or errors in laboratory medicine? *Clin Chem Lab Med*. 2006;44:750–9. doi: 10.1515/CCLM.2006.123.
7. International Organization for Standardization. ISO 15189:2007: Medical laboratories: particular requirements for quality and competence. Geneva, Switzerland: ISO; 2007.
8. Zaninotto M, Tasinato A, Padoan A, Vecchiato G, Pinato A, Sciacovelli L, et al. An integrated system for monitoring the quality of sample transportation. *Clin Biochem*. 2012;45:688–90. doi: 10.1016/j.clinbiochem.2012.02.013.
9. Shahangian S, Snyder SR. Laboratory medicine quality indicators: a review of the literature. *Am J Clin Pathol*. 2009;131:418–31. doi: 10.1309/AJCPJF8JI4ZLDQUE.
10. Plebani M. The detection and prevention of errors in laboratory medicine. *Ann Clin Biochem*. 2010;47:101–10. doi: 10.1258/acb.2009.009222.
11. Carraro P, Zago T, Plebani M. Exploring the initial steps of the testing process: frequency and nature of pre-preanalytic errors. *Clin Chem*. 2012;58:638–42. doi: 10.1373/clinchem.2011.175711.
12. Sciacovelli L, Sonntag O, Padoan A, Zambon CF, Carraro P, Plebani M. Monitoring quality indicators in laboratory medicine does not automatically result in quality improvement. *Clin Chem Lab Med*. 2011;50:463–9. doi: 10.1515/CCLM.2011.809.
13. Plebani M. Exploring the iceberg of errors in laboratory medicine. *Clin Chim Acta*. 2009;404:16–23. doi: 10.1016/j.cca.2009.03.022.
14. International Organization for Standardization. ISO/PDTS 22367:2008 Medical laboratories – Reduction of error through risk management and continual improvement. Geneva, Switzerland: ISO; 2008.
15. Barth JH. Clinical quality indicators in laboratory medicine: a survey of current practice in the UK. *Ann Clin Biochem*. 2011;48:238–40. doi: 10.1258/acb.2010.010234.
16. Plebani M, Sciacovelli L, Lippi G. Quality indicators for laboratory diagnostics: consensus is needed. *Ann Clin Biochem*. 2011;48:479. doi: 10.1258/acb.2011.011088.
17. Institute of Medicine Committee on Quality of Health Care in America. *To Err Is Human: Building a Safer Health System*. Washington, DC: National Academies Press; 2000.
18. Ente Nazionale Italiano di Unificazione. UNI 11097:2003. Quality management - Quality indicators and quality management synoptical tables - General guidelines. UNI; 2003.

19. Institute of Medicine Committee to Design a Strategy for Quality Review and Assurance in Medicare. Medicare: A Strategy for Quality Assurance. Washington, DC: National Academies Press; 1990.
20. Plebani M. Quality indicators in laboratory medicine: from theory to practice. Preliminary data from the IFCC Working Group Project 'Laboratory Errors and Patient Safety'. Clin Chem Lab Med. 2011;49:835–44. doi: 10.1515/CCLM.2011.128.
21. Plebani M. The brain-to-brain loop concept for laboratory testing 40 years after its introduction. Am J Clin Pathol. 2011;136:829–33. doi: 10.1309/AJCPR28HWHSSDNON.
22. Blood sampling guidelines with focus on patient safety and identification - a review. Cornes M, Ibarz M, Ivanov H, Grankvist K. Diagnosis (Berl) 2019;6:33–37.
23. The effect of biotin interference on the results of blood hormone assays. Ostrowska M, Bartoszewicz Z, Bednarczyk T, Walczak K, Zgliczyński W, Glinicki P. Endokrynol Pol. 2019;70:102–121.
24. Preventing pseudohyponatremia: Intralipid®-based lipemia cutoffs for sodium are inappropriate. Koch CD, Vera MA, Messina J, Price N, Durant TJ, El-Khoury JM. Clin Chim Acta. 2021;520:63–66.
25. Preanalytical challenges - time for solutions. Lippi G, Betsou F, Cadamuro J, et al. Clin Chem Lab Med. 2019;57:974–981.
26. The PRISMA 2020 statement: an updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. Page MJ, McKenzie JE, Bossuyt PM, et al. BMJ. 2021;372:0.
27. Can chewing gum be another source of preanalytical variability in fasting outpatients? Stonys R, Banys V, Vitkus D, Lima-Oliveira G. EJIFCC. 2020;31:28–45.
28. Errors within the total laboratory testing process, from test selection to medical decision-making - a review of causes, consequences, surveillance and solutions. Mrazek C, Lippi G, Keppel MH, Felder TK, Oberkofler H, Haschke-Becher E, Cadamuro J. Biochem Med (Zagreb) 2020;30:20502.
29. Definition of icteric interference index for six biochemical analytes. Cano-Corres R, Sole-Enrech G, Aparicio-Calvente MI. Biochem Med (Zagreb) 2023;33.
30. Variation in laboratory reports: causes other than laboratory error. Pradhan S, Gautam K, Pant V. JNMA J Nepal Med Assoc. 2022;60:222–224.
31. Managing hemolyzed samples in clinical laboratories. Simundic AM, Baird G, Cadamuro J, Costelloe SJ, Lippi G. Crit Rev Clin Lab Sci. 2020;57:1–21.
32. Blood sample quality. Lippi G, von Meyer A, Cadamuro J, Simundic AM. Diagnosis (Berl) 2019;6:25–31.
33. Preanalytical quality improvement - an interdisciplinary journey, on behalf of the European Federation for Clinical Chemistry and Laboratory Medicine (EFLM) Working Group for Preanalytical Phase (WG-PRE) Cadamuro J, Baird G, Baumann G, et al. Clin Chem Lab Med. 2022;60.
34. Standardization of collection requirements for fasting samples: for the Working Group on Preanalytical Phase (WG-PA) of the European Federation of Clinical Chemistry and Laboratory Medicine (EFLM) Simundic AM, Cornes M, Grankvist K, Lippi G, Nybo M. Clin Chim Acta. 2014;432:33–37.
35. The preanalytical phase - past, present and future. Cornes M. Ann Clin Biochem. 2020;57:4–6.
36. Evaluating interference of lipemia on routine clinical biochemical tests. ArulVijayaVani S, Mohanraj PS, Reeta R. J Lab Physicians. 2023;15:269–275.
37. Pseudohyperkalemia: three cases and a review of literature. Saleh-Anaraki K, Jain A, Wilcox CS, Pourafshar N. Am J Med. 2022;135:0–4.
38. The preanalytical phase - from an instrument-centred to a patient-centred laboratory medicine. Cadamuro J, Simundic AM. Clin Chem Lab Med. 2023;61:732–740.
39. Pre-analytical phase in clinical chemistry laboratory. Neogi SS, Mehndiratta M, Gupta S, Puri D. J Clin Sci Res. 2016;5:171–178.
40. Drug interference with biochemical laboratory tests. Katanić J, Stanimirov B, Sekeruš V, Đanić M, Pavlović N, Mikov M, Stankov K. Biochem Med (Zagreb) 2023;33.
41. Joint EFLM-COLABIOCLI recommendation for venous blood sampling. Simundic AM, Bölenius K, Cadamuro J, et al. Ann Biol Clin (Paris) 2019;77:131–154.

42. Preanalytical errors and their impact on tests in clinical laboratory practice. Naz S, Mumtaz A, Sadaruddin A. *Pak J Med Res.* 2012;51:27–30.
43. Blood sampling guidelines with focus on patient safety and identification - a review. Cornes M, Ibarz M, Ivanov H, Grankvist K. *Diagnosis (Berl)* 2019;6:33–37.
44. Llopis MA, Bauça JM, Barba N, et al. Spanish Preanalytical Quality Monitoring Program (SEQC), an overview of 12 years' experience. *Clin Chem Lab Med.* 2017;55:530–8.
45. Zaini RG, Shesha NT. Identification of the pre-analytical errors among government hospitals at Makkah, Saudi Arabia. *Asian J Res Biol Pharm Sci.* 2016;3:133–9.
46. Tadesse H, Desta K, Kinde S, et al. Clinical chemistry laboratory errors at St. Paul's Hospital Millennium Medical College (SPHMMC), Addis Ababa, Ethiopia. *BMC Res Notes.* 2018;11:789.
47. Kalra J, Kopargaonkar A. Quality improvement in clinical laboratories: a six sigma concept. *Pathol Lab Med Open J.* 2016;1:11–20.
48. Pothula Y, Al-Marzooq YM, Salem RAL, AL-Jasem W, AlHajji A. A retrospective study of quality improvement in clinical biochemistry laboratory. *Int J Clin Biochem Res.* 2019;6:197–9.
49. Grecu DS, Vlad DC, Dumitrascu V. Quality indicators in the preanalytical phase of testing in a stat laboratory. *Lab Med.* 2014;45:74–81.
50. McCaughey EJ, Vecellio E, Lake R, et al. Key factors influencing the incidence of hemolysis: a critical appraisal of current evidence. *Crit Rev Clin Lab Sci.* 2017;54:59–72.
51. Cornes MP, Atherton J, Pourmahram G, et al. Monitoring and reporting of preanalytical errors in laboratory medicine: the UK situation. *Ann Clin Biochem.* 2016;53:279–84.
52. Lippi G, Plebani M, Di Somma S, et al. Hemolyzed specimens: a major challenge for emergency departments and clinical laboratories. *Crit Rev Clin Lab Sci.* 2011;48:143–53.
53. Dikmen ZG, Pinar A, Akbiyik F. Specimen rejection in laboratory medicine: necessary for patient safety? *Biochem Med (Zagreb).* 2015;25:377–85.
54. Najat D. Prevalence of pre-analytical errors in clinical chemistry diagnostic labs in Sulaimani City of Iraqi Kurdistan. *PLoS One.* 2017;12:e0170211.
55. Nguyen A, Wahed A. Sources of errors in coagulation testing. Dasgupta A, Sepulveda JL (eds.). In: *Accurate Results in the Clinical Laboratory.* 2nd ed. Elsevier; 2019:395–9.
56. Codagnone FT, Alencar SMF, Shcolnik W, et al. The use of indicators in the pre-analytical phase as a laboratory management tool. *J Bras Patol Med Lab.* 2014;50:100–4.
57. Baron JM, Mermel CH, Lewandrowski KB, Dighe AS. Detection of preanalytic laboratory testing errors using a statistically guided protocol. *Am J Clin Pathol.* 2012;138:406–13.
58. Hawkins R. Managing the pre- and post-analytical phases of the total testing process. *Ann Lab Med.* 2012;32:5–16.
59. Sharaki O, Abouzeid A, Hossam N, et al. Self-assessment of pre, intra and post analytical errors of urine analysis in clinical chemistry laboratory of Alexandria Main University Hospital. *Saudi J Health Sci.* 2014;3:96.
60. Agarwal R. Measurement of errors in clinical laboratories. *Indian J Clin Biochem.* 2013;28:227–34.
61. Teshome M, Worede A, Asmelash D. Total clinical chemistry laboratory errors and evaluation of the analytical quality control using sigma metric for routine clinical chemistry tests. *J Multidiscip Healthc.* 2021;14:125–36.
62. Zaini RG, Dahlawi HA, Siddiqi A. Identification of the types and frequencies of pre-analytical errors in the clinical biochemistry laboratory: 1-year study at Hera'a General Hospital. *Arch Med.* 2016;8:4.
63. Campana GA, Oplustil CP, Faro LB. Trends in laboratory medicine. *J Bras Patol Med Lab.* 2011;47:399–408.
64. Newman-Toker DE, Makary M. Measuring diagnostic errors in primary care: the first step on a path forward. Comment on "Types and origins of diagnostic errors in primary care settings" [published correction appears in *JAMA Intern Med.* 2013 Apr 8;173(7):599]. *JAMA Intern Med.* 2013;173:425–6.
65. Lippi G, Plebani M, Di Somma S, et al. Hemolyzed specimens: a major challenge for emergency departments and clinical laboratories. *Crit Rev Clin Lab Sci.* 2011;48:143–53.