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Discussants and Agenda

• David Newman-Toker, MD, PhD
• Hardeep Singh, MD, MPH

• Agenda
  ➢ Introduction to the session
  ➢ Questions for panel discussants
  ➢ Questions from audience participants

* Include focus on “cross-cuts”
  ▪ Patient and family engagement
  ▪ Training and education
National Hospital-Acquired Condition (HAC) rate: 2010 to 2014 (interim data)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>All Other HACs</th>
<th>(Post-op) Venous Thromboembolisms</th>
<th>Ventilator-Associated Pneumonias</th>
<th>Surgical Site Infections</th>
<th>Pressure Ulcers</th>
<th>Obstetric Adverse Events</th>
<th>Falls</th>
<th>Central Line-Associated Bloodstream Infections</th>
<th>Catheter-Associated Urinary Tract Infections</th>
<th>Adverse Drug Events</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>49.5</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>48.7</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>41.9</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>40.3</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interim 2014</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>41.4</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PFP HAC Rate Goals</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>40.8</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Unprecedented Improvements in Hospital Safety and Measurable Impact

17% reduction in HACs

87,000 lives saved

2.1 million patient harms avoided

$19.8 billion in savings

What Makes Addressing Diagnostic Error Difficult?

- Notoriously difficult to measure and define.
- Dx involves multiple persons, multiple stages, and multiple exchanges and interpretations of information.
- Variety of patient-, provider-, and system-level challenges can derail the process.
- Dx is not an event; it frequently is an evolving process encumbered with uncertainty and fragmentation.
- Lack of feedback limits providers’ ability to recalibrate their Dx performance.
- Who owns the Dx error problem? Administrators cede Dx matters to physicians; physicians, in turn, cede systems problems to administrators.
The failure to:

(a) establish an **accurate** and **timely** explanation of the patient’s health problem(s)

or

(b) **communicate** that explanation to the patient
4. Develop and deploy approaches to **identify, learn from, and reduce diagnostic errors and near misses** in clinical practice

- **Accreditation** organizations and the **Medicare conditions of participation** require monitoring the diagnostic process.
- **Health care organizations** should include activities as a component of their quality improvement, research, and patient safety programs.
- **Systematic feedback** on diagnostic performance should be provided to individual health care professionals, care teams, and organizational leaders.
- HHS should fund routine **post-mortem examinations** on a representative sample of patient deaths.
- **Health Care professional societies** should identify opportunities to reduce diagnostic errors in their specialties.
Recommendations from the *Improving Diagnosis in Health Care* Report

6. Develop a **reporting environment** and **medical liability system** that facilitates improved diagnosis through learning from diagnostic errors and near misses

- Encourage and facilitate **voluntary reporting**.
- Evaluate the effectiveness of **PSOs as a major mechanism** for voluntary reporting and learning from these events.
- Modify the PSO common formats for reporting of patient safety events to **include diagnostic error and near misses**.
- Promote a **legal environment that facilitates** the timely identification, disclosure, and learning from diagnostic errors.
  - Encourage the adoption of **communication and resolution programs**
  - Conduct demonstration projects of alternative approaches to the resolution of medical injuries, including **administrative health courts** and **safe harbors**
- **Professional liability insurance carriers and captive insurers** should collaborate with health care professionals.
Measuring Diagnostic Error

- Research projects
- Medical liability claims
- Patient safety and quality improvement

- Existing databases can be a source of information about diagnostic errors
  - Identify aggregate number of diagnostic errors
  - Identify specific conditions suggestive of diagnostic errors
  - Monitor progress in reducing diagnostic errors
Aims:

• To examine the frequency of inpatient admissions for related symptoms after discharge from an ED for chest symptoms.

• To identify patient and hospital characteristics associated with these admissions.
Figure 1. Admissions After Discharge from an Emergency Department for Chest Symptoms

- No Admission for Conditions of Interest: 97.0%
- Admission for Acute Myocardial Infarction: 0.2%
- Admission for Other Cardiovascular Condition: 1.7%
- Admission for Respiratory Condition: 0.5%
- Admission for Mental Disorder: 0.6%
Study Conclusions & Implications

- Admission for AMI after discharge from an ED for chest symptoms is rare, but admission for other cardiovascular, respiratory, or mental conditions is not uncommon.
- Results suggest that the following are associated with a potential diagnostic issue based on hospital admission after ED discharge:
  - Patient and geographic characteristics, especially payer and for respiratory and mental conditions
  - Having a cardiac catheterization laboratory seems to reduce the odds of admission for AMI
  - Having a weekend ED visit seemed to increase the odds of admission for other cardiovascular, respiratory, and mental conditions.
- Interventions that target specific patients and EDs may reduce the number of people admitted after discharge from an ED.
Outcomes Stemming from the Diagnostic Process

The work system includes:
- Diagnostic Team Members
- Tasks
- Technologies and Tools
- Organization
- Physical Environment
- External Environment

Patient Outcomes:
- Accurate, Timely Diagnoses
- Diagnostic Errors and Near Misses

System Outcomes:
- Effects on Quality, Safety, Cost, Efficiency, Morale, Public Confidence in the Health Care System
- Learning from Diagnostic Errors, Near Misses, and Accurate, Timely Diagnoses
Some Considerations for Measurement of Diagnostic Error

• WHAT to measure
  ► Care settings
  ► Timing
  ► Clinical conditions
  ► Processes and breakdowns in process
  ► Cognitive factors
  ► Contributing factors
  ► Patient outcomes
  ► Costs
  ► Other?

• HOW & WHY to measure
  ► Methods
    o Reporting
    o Population-based surveillance
    o Analysis of large databases
  ► Data sources
  ► Purpose of measurement
    o Research
    o Quality Improvement
    o Accountability
  ► Data user/audience
    o Clinician
    o Patient
    o Health care system
    o Health plan
    o Accréditeur/Regulator