OBAT: Jurnal Riset Ilmu Farmasi dan Kesehatan
Volume 3, Number 4, July 2025
e-ISSN: 3031-0148, p-ISSN: 3031-013X, Page. 08-14
DOI: https://doi.org/10.61132/obat.v3i4.1435
Available Online at: https://journal.arikesi.or.id/index.php/OBAT

The Impact of Laboratory Staff Training on Reducing Error Rates in Clinical Laboratories

Zainab Kamil Chassab Abd Alhuseen[1*], Noor Hamza Hussein Kazim[2], Ayat Mohammed Nahi Brih[3], Ola Shaheed Abed Arkan[4]
[1,2,3,4]University of Karbala, College of Applied Medical Sciences, Department of Pathological Analysis، Iraq.

Corresponding author: researcheriraqi@gmail.com

Abstract. Laboratories play a crucial role in ensuring patient safety, with approximately 80–90% of clinical diagnoses relying on laboratory test results. Despite their importance, laboratory errors are reported to occur in about 0.012% to 0.6% of all tests conducted. Patient safety is fundamentally a managerial responsibility that can be improved through the implementation of robust systems aimed at detecting and addressing quality deficiencies. A reactive approach to this involves incident reporting followed by root cause analysis, which helps uncover and rectify weaknesses in existing policies and procedures. Alternatively, a proactive strategy such as Failure Mode and Effects Analysis (FMEA) focuses on evaluating the entire testing process, anticipating potential adverse events, and taking preventive measures before such issues arise. This method is particularly effective for prospective risk assessment in high-risk procedures, thereby minimizing the likelihood of errors within laboratories and other areas of patient care.

Keywords: Diagnostic errors, Failure mode and effect analysis (FMEA), Clinical laboratories, Quality failure

1. INTRODUCTION

Medical laboratories play a critical role in modern healthcare, as approximately 70–80% of clinical decisions are based on laboratory results. Despite advances in diagnostic technologies, errors still occur across the pre-analytical, analytical, and post-analytical phases of laboratory testing. These errors can compromise patient safety, delay treatment, and increase healthcare costs. One of the key strategies for minimizing such errors is continuous training and development of laboratory personnel. Well-trained staff are more likely to follow standard operating procedures, recognize abnormal results, and handle specimens appropriately.

Training enhances technical skills, reinforces quality assurance practices, and improves familiarity with updated diagnostic protocols and laboratory equipment. Studies have shown that laboratories with ongoing training programs report fewer incidents of mislabeling, contamination, and result misinterpretation. Moreover, training contributes to a stronger safety culture and encourages proactive error reporting. In high-pressure laboratory environments, trained professionals can respond more effectively to unexpected situations and maintain consistency in performance.

Healthcare institutions that invest in structured and regular staff training tend to achieve better diagnostic accuracy and higher patient satisfaction. Therefore, this research aims to examine

Received: April 15, 2025; Revised: April 30, 2025; Accepted: May 23, 2025; Online Available : June 03, 2025;

the extent to which staff training influences the reduction of diagnostic errors in clinical laboratories, using data from practical case studies and performance evaluations in real-world settings.

2. OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

The primary objectives of this study are:

- To evaluate the role of continuous training in reducing diagnostic errors in clinical laboratories.
- To identify the most common types of laboratory errors and how training influences their occurrence.
- To assess the effectiveness of different training methods and their impact on laboratory quality and patient safety.
- To propose recommendations for implementing sustainable training programs in laboratory settings.

3. METHODOLOGY

This study employed a mixed-method approach, combining quantitative and qualitative data collection. A sample of 100 laboratory professionals from three accredited hospitals was selected. Participants were divided into two groups: one that received structured training over a three-month period, and another that did not undergo training during the same period. Data were collected through error incident reports, staff surveys, and interviews with laboratory supervisors.

Quantitative data were analyzed using statistical tools (SPSS), comparing pre- and post-training error rates. Qualitative feedback was used to identify recurring themes in staff perceptions regarding training effectiveness and laboratory practices.

Failure Mode and Effect Analysis (FMEA)

Errors in clinical laboratories can lead to serious and potentially harmful consequences for patients. Laboratory systems are generally built on the assumption that, with sufficient training, education, and orientation, staff will perform their duties accurately and without incident. Many laboratories have procedures in place to detect, evaluate, and investigate deviations from standard practices and protocols, allowing them to monitor and analyze incidents, mistakes, and accidents. However, these measures are primarily reactive and are triggered only after an error has already taken place.

In recent years, there has been a growing acceptance among laboratory and clinical professionals of proactive strategies aimed at minimizing errors through risk management and

continuous improvement. One such proactive method is Failure Mode and Effects Analysis (FMEA), which has gained recognition as an effective approach to identifying potential failure points in a process, assessing their impact, and determining appropriate preventive actions.

Originally developed in the aerospace industry, FMEA is used to systematically evaluate potential vulnerabilities in systems and products. It provides a structured, team-oriented framework for identifying possible failure modes before they occur, enabling the implementation of strategies to either prevent them or reduce their impact. This method not only aids in preventing flaws and enhancing safety but also contributes to higher levels of user satisfaction.

FMEA proves useful not just for improving existing systems but also in assessing the viability of introducing new processes in clinical laboratories. Notably, the Joint Commission on Accreditation of Healthcare Organizations (JCAHO) adopted a leadership standard (L.D. 5.2) in July 2001 that incorporates the FMEA methodology, requiring healthcare leaders to conduct FMEA on at least one critical process annually to promote patient safety.

Calculating the Effectiveness of Corrective Actions

Corrective actions should focus on the most critical issues, as prioritized using scores such as CI, RPN, or RPI. After identifying potential process failures and determining their underlying causes, appropriate redesign strategies can be implemented to reduce or eliminate the risk of major failures.

Generally, three types of improvement strategies are used: the first aims to completely eliminate the possibility of failure; the second is intended to simplify correct actions for staff; and the third focuses on rapid detection of failures and prompt corrective responses.

To measure the success of these actions, the FMEA team can analyze performance data following implementation. A notable decrease in the recalculated RPN indicates that the corrective measures were effective. If the score remains high, it suggests that the action did not adequately reduce the severity, likelihood of occurrence, or ability to detect the failure.

Implementation of FMEA in Laboratory Medicine

While FMEA is commonly utilized across various engineering disciplines, its application in the medical field remains limited, with only a handful of documented cases demonstrating its active implementation. However, the Joint Commission (JCAHO) has highlighted several processes in healthcare that carry significant risk.

Failure mode	Effect	SI	Cause	PI	Control measure	DI	RPI	Proposed action
Malfunction of reagent	Useless result	9	Expired	3	Check expiration date	1	27	None
Malfunction of reagent	Useless result	9	NC storage temperature	6	Visual check of reagent	10	540	Add temperature monitoring system
Malfunction of reagent	Useless result	9	Contaminated	8	QC before run	10	720	Add QC after run
Malfunction of calibrator	Calibration failure	8	Expired	3	Check expiration date	2	48	None
Malfunction of calibrator	Calibration failure	8	NC storage temperature	6	Visual check of calibrator	2	96	None
Malfunction of calibrator	Calibration failure	8	Contaminated	8	Visual check of calibrator	2	128	Freeze single doses and use once

Fig (1): Implementation of FMEA in analytical phase

High-risk clinical practices identified by the Joint Commission include areas such as medication administration, transfusion of blood and its components, the use of physical restraints, and surgical procedures. The implementation of FMEA has contributed to enhancements across multiple laboratory processes, including the validation and comparison of analytical methods, accurate labeling of histological slides and cassettes, manual data entry into laboratory systems for tests lacking interface capability, and procedures for blood cross-matching.

Research indicates that the majority of laboratory-related mistakes are concentrated in the pre-analytical and post-analytical stages of the testing cycle. Among the most vulnerable aspects of the overall diagnostic workflow are ordering inappropriate tests and failing to act upon test results. Southard and colleagues applied a modified Delphi methodology to perform FMEA on the complete testing process with the goal of minimizing clinical errors.

Only a limited number of laboratory medicine areas have documented applications of FMEA in the literature. These include blood cross-matching procedures and analytical steps in common clinical chemistry tests, such as those for glucose, total cholesterol, and total bilirubin. Within these analytical phases, FMEA has been utilized to address issues such as improper storage temperatures, and contamination of both reagents and calibrators.

A study conducted by Capunzo et al. applied FMEA to three analytical workflows in a clinical laboratory glucose, total cholesterol, and total bilirubin testing. The focus was solely on the analytical stage, excluding both pre- and post-analytical phases. All failures and non-conformities associated with the analytes were identified, reviewed, and categorized. The evaluation covered key process components including reagents, samples, calibrators, and

instrumentation. Failures in reagent and calibrator performance were identified as having significant impacts on test results.

A severity index (SI) ranging from 1 to 10 was assigned to each failure mode. For example, a failure in reagent performance received an SI of 9, given its potential to produce clinically unreliable or harmful results if undetected. Calibrator failure was rated with an SI of 8, as it could disrupt the analytical run and prompt operator intervention.

Each failure effect was linked to its potential causes, which included improper storage conditions and expired or contaminated materials. The probability index (PI), indicating how frequently each failure occurred, was also assigned. The PI for expired reagents was 3, owing to internal policies ensuring disposal prior to expiration. Conversely, the PI for contamination was rated 8, based on a roughly 1% occurrence rate in their review.

Following this, control measures were evaluated, and a detectability index (DI) between 1 and 10 was assigned. This index reflected the likelihood of a failure being detected before affecting the end user. Lower values indicated higher detectability, while a DI of 10 implied that the failure was likely to go unnoticed.

Finally, the Risk Priority Number (RPN) was calculated by multiplying the severity, probability, and detectability indices (RPN = SI × PI × DI). The study found that RPN values ranged from 27 to 720, reflecting a wide variation in risk across different failure modes.

4. RESULTS

The findings of this study demonstrated a significant positive impact of continuous laboratory staff training on reducing error rates in clinical laboratories. Quantitative data analysis, conducted using SPSS software, revealed a marked decline in the incidence of errors among the group that received structured training over a three-month period, compared to the control group that did not undergo training.

Pre-training error rates in both groups were relatively comparable. However, post-training measurements showed a reduction of approximately 35% in reported errors within the intervention group. The most notable decreases were observed in pre-analytical errors, such as specimen mislabeling and improper sample handling. Analytical errors, including incorrect reagent usage and equipment calibration issues, also declined, albeit to a lesser extent.

Furthermore, the frequency of post-analytical errors such as delayed reporting or transcription mistakes dropped significantly among trained staff, reflecting improved familiarity with

standard operating procedures and data entry protocols. The statistical analysis indicated that these improvements were statistically significant ($p < 0.05$), supporting the hypothesis that training leads to measurable enhancements in laboratory quality.

Qualitative data collected from staff surveys and interviews reinforced the quantitative findings. Participants reported increased confidence in task execution, a deeper understanding of error prevention strategies, and a heightened sense of accountability and professionalism. Supervisors also noted enhanced adherence to safety protocols and more proactive behavior in identifying and addressing potential risks.

In terms of Failure Mode and Effects Analysis (FMEA), the Risk Priority Number (RPN) scores calculated post-training showed a downward trend in most assessed failure modes. This indicates that the likelihood of error occurrence, the severity of their consequences, and the difficulty of detection were all positively impacted by the training interventions.

These results underscore the value of regular and structured training programs in fostering a culture of safety and quality within clinical laboratories. They also highlight the importance of investing in human resource development as a critical component of laboratory risk management and performance improvement.

5. CONCLUSION

Medical laboratories are essential to the accurate diagnosis and effective management of patient care. With an estimated 60–70% of clinical decisions depending on laboratory findings, any lapse in quality can significantly compromise patient safety. Consequently, laboratories have taken a leading role in initiatives aimed at improving patient outcomes.

Over the past decade, greater automation has led to a decline in the rate of quality-related issues, particularly within the analytical phase of testing. However, technological advancement alone is not sufficient. Continued vigilance by laboratory personnel is necessary, especially in promptly identifying and reporting potential quality concerns for further investigation.

A comprehensive approach that focuses on identifying weaknesses throughout the entire testing cycle and making necessary adjustments to policies and procedures requires a culture of transparency and collaboration, rather than assigning blame to individual staff members.

It is therefore crucial for laboratories to systematically detect and document quality failures, categorize them based on their origin (pre-analytical, analytical, or post-analytical), and assess the severity of each issue. This classification not only helps pinpoint which stage of the process

needs further evaluation but also facilitates performance monitoring. Additionally, grading the severity supports prioritization of corrective actions, enhancing overall quality management in laboratory medicine.

REFERENCES

M. Plebani and P. Carraro, "Mistakes in a stat laboratory: types and frequency," *Clin. Chem.*, vol. 43, pp. 1348–1351, 1997.

S. Woodhouse, B. Burney, and K. Costie, "To err is human: improving patient safety through failure mode and effect analysis," *Clin. Leadersh. Manag. Rev.*, vol. 18, pp. 32–36, 2004.

M. Capunzo et al., "A FMEA clinical laboratory case study: how to make problems and improvements measurable," *Clin. Leadersh. Manag. Rev.*, vol. 18, pp. 37–41, 2004.

International Organization for Standardization, *ISO/PDTS 22367:2008: Medical laboratories—reduction of error through risk management and continual improvement*, Geneva: ISO, 2008.

Joint Commission on Accreditation of Health Care Organizations, *2002 Comprehensive Accreditation Manual for Hospitals*, Oakbrook Terrace, IL: JCAHO, 2001, pp. 200–201.

M.T. Oldenhof et al., "Consistency of FMEA used in the validation of analytical procedures," *J. Pharm. Biomed. Anal.*, vol. 4, no. 3, pp. 592–595, 2001.

P. Bonini, M. Plebani, F. Ceriotti, and F. Rubboli, "Errors in laboratory medicine," *Clin. Chem.*, vol. 48, pp. 691–698, 2002.

P.B. Southard, S. Kumar, and C.A. Southard, "A modified Delphi methodology to conduct a failure modes effects analysis: a patient-centric effort in a clinical medical laboratories," *Qual. Manag. Health Care*, vol. 20, no. 2, pp. 131–151, 2011.

D. W. Bates et al., "The impact of computerized physician order entry on medication error prevention," *J. Am. Med. Inform. Assoc.*, vol. 6, no. 4, pp. 313–321, 1999.

D. L. Wagar, A. S. Tamashiro, and M. R. Yasin, "Effectiveness of training interventions in improving laboratory quality," *Arch. Pathol. Lab. Med.*, vol. 132, no. 3, pp. 511–516, 2008.

G. Lippi, M. Plebani, "Laboratory applications of failure mode and effect analysis: a valuable tool for quality improvement," *Clin. Chim. Acta*, vol. 404, no. 1, pp. 1–2, 2009.

A. M. Valenstein, "Laboratory errors and patient safety: a 5-year Q-Probes study of general chemistry tests," *Arch. Pathol. Lab. Med.*, vol. 130, no. 2, pp. 166–175, 2006.

L. Njoroge, M. Rao, and B. Lwembe, "Reducing errors through continuous laboratory staff training in developing countries," *Afr. J. Lab. Med.*, vol. 6, no. 1, pp. 1–6, 2017.

M. Sciacovelli et al., "The role of external quality assessment schemes in detecting pre-analytical errors," *Clin. Chim. Acta*, vol. 404, no. 1, pp. 125–131, 2009.

J. P. Nolan and C. L. Temple, "Systematic training and its impact on laboratory safety," *J. Clin. Lab. Anal.*, vol. 32, no. 5, pp. e22380, 2018.

World Health Organization, *Laboratory Quality Management System: Handbook*, Geneva: WHO Press, 2011.