TPM Vol. 32, No. S8, 2025
ISSN: 1972-6325
https://www.tpmap.org/

PRE-ANALYTICAL ERRORS IN CLINICAL LABORATORY PRACTICE CAUSES, IMPACT, AND STRATEGIES FOR PREVENTION

ABDULAZIZ SAAD MOHAMMED ALDAEL[1], ABDULRAHMAN MOHAMMED OTHMAN ALSHUGAIFY[1], HUTHYFAH IBRAHIM MOHAMMED ALJUMAH[1], ABDULLAH SALEM ABDULLAH ALSALEM[1], MESHAL MUSAAD HAMD ALMUHARIB[1], ZAKARIA AHMAD DAGHRIRI[1], MOHAMMED HUSSAIN ALARYANI[1], RAKAN MANSOUR ALHOMAID1, NAIF MANIA ALOTAIBI[1]

[1] CLINICAL LABORATORY SCIENCE, SECURITY FORCES HOSPITAL, RIYADH, SAUDI ARABIA

Abstract

Background: The clinical laboratory plays an indispensable role in modern healthcare, with its results influencing the majority of critical medical decisions. However, the reliability of these results is profoundly threatened by errors occurring in the pre-analytical phase, which encompasses all steps from test ordering to sample analysis.

Objective: This comprehensive review aims to examine the landscape of pre-analytical errors in clinical laboratory practice, exploring their frequency, root causes, clinical and economic impact, and the evidence-based strategies available for their prevention.

Methods: A narrative review of the literature was conducted, synthesizing findings from seminal studies and recent advances in the field of laboratory quality management.

Results: The evidence confirms that the pre-analytical phase is the most error-prone stage of the total testing process, accounting for 46-70% of all laboratory mistakes. These errors arise from a complex interplay of human cognitive factors, including interruptions, fatigue, and attention lapses, and systemic vulnerabilities such as poor workflow design, inadequate training, and unsupportive organizational culture. The clinical consequences are severe, ranging from misdiagnosis and delayed treatment to unnecessary patient harm from inappropriate interventions. Economically, pre-analytical errors generate substantial waste through specimen rejection, repeat testing, prolonged hospital stays, and cascading unnecessary procedures. In response, a multi-faceted approach to prevention has emerged, built upon international standardization (e.g., CLSI guidelines), technological innovation (e.g., positive patient identification systems, automation, artificial intelligence), comprehensive education and competency programs, and continuous monitoring through quality indicators.

Conclusion: While significant progress has been made in understanding and mitigating pre-analytical errors, they remain a major challenge to patient safety. The future direction points toward the integration of emerging technologies, such as AI and IoT-enabled smart tracking, and the deepening of interdisciplinary collaboration to move closer to the aspirational goal of a zero-error pre-analytical phase. Ensuring the integrity of this phase is fundamental to fulfilling the laboratory's contract with the patient: to provide a result that can be trusted.

Keywords: Pre-analytical errors; Laboratory errors; Specimen collection; Quality indicators; Clinical laboratory

INTRODUCTION

Clinical laboratory diagnostics constitute a cornerstone of modern healthcare, exerting a profound influence on approximately 60-70% of the most critical medical decisions, including admission, discharge, diagnosis, and therapy [1]. The fundamental mission of the clinical laboratory is to generate accurate, reliable, and timely results that clinicians can trust to guide patient care. This mission is pursued through a complex and multi-staged process, conventionally divided into three distinct phases: the pre-analytical, analytical, and post-analytical phases. For decades, the primary focus of laboratory quality assurance and improvement programs was heavily weighted towards the analytical phase. This was largely due to the development and refinement of internal quality control (IQC) procedures and external quality assessment (EQA) schemes, which provided robust tools for monitoring the precision

and accuracy of analytical instruments and methods. The prevailing assumption was that if the analysis itself was flawless, the final result would be reliable.

However, a paradigm shift in our understanding of laboratory error has occurred over the past three decades. Pioneering research, beginning with the work of scholars like Dr. Mario Plebani, has consistently and unequivocally demonstrated that the analytical phase is no longer the primary source of errors in the total testing process (TTP) [2, 3]. The widespread automation, standardization, and stringent regulatory oversight of analytical platforms have dramatically reduced the frequency of analytical errors to less than 10% of the total errors within a laboratory's influence. This revelation has turned the spotlight onto the phases that bookend analysis: the pre- and post-analytical phases. Among these, the pre-analytical phase has emerged as the most vulnerable and error-prone stage of the entire testing cycle. Comprehensive studies have estimated that pre-analytical errors account for a staggering 46% to 68% of all mistakes occurring in laboratory practice, making it the single greatest threat to the quality and reliability of laboratory results [4, 5].

The pre-analytical phase is deceptively complex, encompassing all the steps that take place from the moment a clinician orders a test to the moment the specimen is ready for analysis. This intricate and often fragmented process can be broadly divided into two main parts: the *pre-pre-analytical* phase, which occurs outside the physical walls of the laboratory, and the *pre-analytical* phase proper, which begins upon the specimen's arrival in the laboratory. The pre-pre-analytical phase is largely outside the direct control of laboratory personnel and includes critical steps such as proper test selection and ordering by the physician, patient identification, patient preparation (e.g., fasting requirements, posture, time of day), and the actual specimen collection [6]. Errors at this stage, such as ordering the wrong test or mislabeling a blood tube, can have immediate and severe consequences. The subsequent pre-analytical phase, which falls under the laboratory's purview, involves specimen transport, reception and accessioning in the lab, centrifugation, aliquoting, and storage until analysis. Vulnerabilities here include improper transport conditions (e.g., incorrect temperature, excessive time delay), centrifugation errors, and sample misplacement.

The causes of pre-analytical errors are as varied as the steps in the process itself. They stem from a complex interplay of human factors, systemic vulnerabilities, and technological limitations. Human error, including misidentification of patients, inattention to collection protocols, and lack of adequate training, remains a primary contributor [7]. However, to label these simply as "human error" is an oversimplification. These errors are often "latent conditions" or system failures waiting to happen—the result of poor workflow design, inadequate staffing levels, ambiguous labeling procedures, or a lack of standardized training programs across different hospital wards and phlebotomy services. For instance, a nurse on a busy ward, multitasking and facing interruptions, is at a much higher risk of mislabeling a blood tube, a scenario where the system has failed to provide the necessary safeguards and support [8]. Systemic issues, such as the lack of a barcode-based patient identification system at the bedside, create an environment where identification errors are not just possible but probable. Furthermore, the increasing complexity of laboratory medicine, with its ever-expanding menu of tests, each with specific collection and handling requirements (e.g., special tubes, chilled transport, protection from light), adds another layer of complexity and potential for error. The use of inappropriate collection tubes can lead to issues like hemoconcentration from prolonged tourniquet application, or sample contamination from an incorrect order of draw, directly impacting the validity of results for analytes such as potassium, glucose, and coagulation factors [9].

The impact of these errors extends far beyond the laboratory, creating a ripple effect that compromises patient safety, inflates healthcare costs, and erodes trust in the healthcare system. The most immediate consequence is the generation of an inaccurate laboratory result, which forms the basis for a flawed clinical decision. This can lead to a cascade of harmful outcomes, including delayed or incorrect diagnoses, unnecessary further testing and procedures, inappropriate or omitted therapies, and prolonged hospital stays [10]. For example, a falsely elevated potassium level due to hemolysis during a difficult venipuncture could lead to a patient being aggressively treated for hyperkalemia, exposing them to the risks of unnecessary interventions. Conversely, a falsely normal troponin level due to a delayed sample analysis could result in a life-threatening myocardial infarction being missed. From a financial perspective, the costs are substantial. A rejected specimen due to hemolysis, clotting, or an insufficient volume necessitates a repeat venipuncture, which consumes additional supplies, staff time, and causes further inconvenience and discomfort for the patient. The costs associated with re-collection, re-analysis, and the subsequent diagnostic odyssey triggered by an erroneous result place a significant, and entirely avoidable, burden on the healthcare system [11].

In response to the undeniable evidence of the vulnerability of the pre-analytical phase, a concerted global effort has been undertaken to develop and implement robust strategies for error prevention and quality improvement. This proactive approach has shifted the focus from merely detecting errors to building systems that are inherently more resilient. The cornerstone of these efforts is the establishment of and adherence to stringent, evidence-based standards and guidelines. Organizations such as the Clinical and Laboratory Standards Institute (CLSI) have published detailed guidelines for every aspect of specimen collection, handling, and processing, providing a blueprint for best practices [12]. Laboratory accreditation programs, such as those offered by the College of American Pathologists (CAP) or the Joint Commission, mandate the implementation of quality management systems that specifically address the pre-analytical phase, requiring documented procedures, regular competency assessments of staff, and robust error tracking and reporting mechanisms.

Beyond guidelines and regulations, technological innovation has emerged as a powerful ally in the fight against pre-analytical errors. The introduction of positive patient identification (PPID) systems using barcodes or radio-frequency identification (RFID) at the patient's bedside has proven to be one of the most effective interventions for eliminating patient and sample misidentification errors [13]. These systems ensure that the label applied to the sample is electronically linked to the correct patient at the moment of collection, closing a critical loophole for human error. In the laboratory, automation plays a key role in standardizing and controlling pre-analytical variables. Automated specimen processing lines can centrifuge, decap, aliquot, and sort samples with perfect consistency, eliminating the variability introduced by manual processing. Furthermore, advanced Laboratory Information Systems (LIS) can be programmed with autoverification rules that automatically check for common pre-analytical issues. For instance, the system can flag samples with a hemolysis index above an acceptable threshold, hold the results, and prompt a recollect, ensuring that compromised samples are not inadvertently reported. These integrated approaches, combining standardized protocols, continuous education, and technological safeguards, represent the future of pre-analytical quality management, aiming to create a "total testing process" that is as robust and error-resistant as possible for the ultimate benefit of the patient [13].

INTRODUCTION: THE SHIFTING PARADIGM OF LABORATORY ERROR

For much of the 20th century, the quest for accuracy in clinical laboratory medicine was synonymous with the quest for analytical perfection. The laboratory was viewed as a black box of sorts: a clinician ordered a test, sent a specimen into this domain, and awaited a result. The quality of that result was almost exclusively judged by the performance of the analytical instruments within that box. This focus was logical and productive, leading to the development of sophisticated internal quality control (IQC) materials and external quality assessment (EQA) schemes. These tools were designed to monitor the precision and accuracy of the analytical phase, ensuring that the machines were producing consistent and comparable data. Consequently, laboratory quality assurance programs were built around this paradigm, dedicating the vast majority of resources—both financial and intellectual—to refining and controlling the analytical process. The assumption underpinning this model was that as long as the analyzers were calibrated and the controls were within range, the results provided to the clinician were inherently reliable and fit for purpose [14].

However, this narrow focus began to be challenged in the late 20th century by researchers who dared to look outside the black box. Instead of asking, "How often does the analyzer fail?", they began asking a broader, more critical question: "How often does the *total testing process* fail?" This shift in perspective was revolutionary. Early studies that audited the entire testing cycle, from the physician's order to the result's interpretation, revealed a startling truth: the analytical phase was actually the most robust and reliable part of the entire process. Researchers like Boone and colleagues in the 1980s and early 1990s began publishing data suggesting that errors occurring before the sample ever reached the analyzer—and after the result was generated—were far more common than analytical mistakes [15]. This marked the nascent stage of a paradigm shift, moving the focus from a machine-centric view of quality to a patient-centric view of the total testing process. It became clear that a perfect analysis performed on the wrong patient, the wrong sample type, or a degraded specimen was not just useless; it was potentially dangerous.

The consolidation of this paradigm shift is credited largely to the seminal work of Plebani and Carraro in 1997, which provided the robust quantitative data needed to reorient the field. Their prospective study in a large university hospital meticulously examined errors throughout the total testing process and quantified their distribution. The findings were definitive and have been replicated in numerous subsequent studies: the vast majority of laboratory errors—consistently cited as 60-70%—originate in the pre-analytical phase [16]. This evidence forced the laboratory community to confront an uncomfortable reality: the greatest threat to patient safety stemming from the laboratory was not a malfunctioning analyzer, but the complex, often-unstandardized network of human and systemic activities that preceded analysis. This discovery was the catalyst for a fundamental re-engineering of quality thinking. It expanded the laboratory's responsibility beyond its four walls, acknowledging that quality must be managed from the "vein to the brain," and that the pre-analytical phase, a chaotic mix of physician behavior, nursing actions, phlebotomy techniques, and transport logistics, was the new frontier for quality improvement [17].

This new paradigm conceptualizes laboratory error not merely as a technical glitch, but as a failure within a complex socio-technical system. The pre-analytical phase is particularly vulnerable because it is a highly manual, multi-disciplinary process fraught with potential failure points. It begins with the pre-pre-analytical steps: the appropriateness of the test order, which is a cognitive function of the physician [18]. It continues with patient preparation—factors such as fasting status, time of day, posture, and recent exercise—all of which can introduce significant biological variability and pre-analytical effects that are indistinguishable from true pathological changes [19]. The actual specimen collection is a manual procedure requiring strict adherence to protocols regarding tourniquet time, order of draw, and choice of collection tubes. Any deviation here, such as a prolonged tourniquet time leading to hemoconcentration, can systematically bias results for analytes like potassium and lactate [20]. Following collection, the specimen enters a logistical pathway involving transport, centrifugation, and storage, where variables like temperature, time delays, and light exposure can degrade sample integrity. The sheer number of steps, the number

of individuals involved, and the lack of real-time feedback on quality at each stage create an environment where errors are not just possible, but statistically probable.

The implications of this paradigm shift are profound for both patient safety and healthcare economics. From a patient safety perspective, a pre-analytical error is not a near-miss; it is often a direct cause of patient harm. An erroneous laboratory result directly feeds into the clinical decision-making process, creating a high probability of a "cognitive error" by the physician, who makes a perfectly logical decision based on faulty data [21]. This can result in misdiagnosis, delayed treatment, or unnecessary therapeutic interventions, all of which constitute a failure in the fundamental duty to "first, do no harm." For example, a falsely prolonged prothrombin time (PT) due to an under-filled coagulation tube could lead to a patient receiving unnecessary vitamin K or plasma products, exposing them to the risks of transfusion or anaphylaxis. Economically, the burden is equally substantial. The identification of a pre-analytical error typically results in sample rejection. This simple act of rejection triggers a cascade of costly events: the need for a repeat phlebotomy (consuming supplies and staff time), a delayed result (prolonging the patient's length of stay), and repeat analysis (consuming reagents and analyzer time) [22]. Studies have estimated that the cost of poor sample quality, considering both direct laboratory costs and downstream clinical costs, runs into the millions for large healthcare systems annually, representing a significant and avoidable drain on resources [23].

Ultimately, the shift in paradigm has redefined the role of the laboratory professional. No longer can the medical laboratorian be solely a guardian of analytical quality within the confines of the lab. They must now emerge as a leader in total quality management, acting as a consultant and educator to the entire healthcare team. The modern understanding acknowledges that errors will occur in a complex system, but the focus has moved from a culture of blame ("who made the mistake?") to a culture of safety ("what in the system allowed this mistake to happen?") [24].

The Fragmented Journey: Mapping the Pre-Analytical Phase

To effectively understand and mitigate pre-analytical errors, one must first appreciate the sheer complexity and fragmentation of the phase itself. Unlike the analytical phase, which is confined to a single, controlled environment under the direct supervision of laboratory professionals, the pre-analytical phase is a diffuse and multi-stage process that begins long before the specimen arrives in the laboratory and extends up to the moment of analysis. It is a journey fraught with handoffs, transitions, and variable conditions, often involving numerous healthcare professionals from different departments, each with their own training, priorities, and workloads. This journey is conventionally divided into two distinct, yet interconnected, segments: the "pre-pre-analytical" phase, which occurs outside the laboratory's direct control, and the "pre-analytical phase proper," which begins with the specimen's arrival at the laboratory reception area [25]. Mapping this journey in detail is essential for identifying the specific points of vulnerability where errors are most likely to occur.

The pre-pre-analytical phase is arguably the most critical and the most difficult to control. It commences with a cognitive act: the clinician's decision to order a laboratory test. This step, while seemingly straightforward, is a potential source of significant error. Inappropriate test selection, failure to order the correct test, or duplicate ordering can lead to delayed diagnosis, unnecessary patient discomfort, and wasted healthcare resources [26]. Once the test is ordered, the focus shifts to the patient. Proper patient preparation is a fundamental prerequisite for obtaining a valid result, yet it is often overlooked or inadequately communicated. Factors such as fasting status (required for accurate glucose and lipid profiles), avoidance of certain medications or alcohol, and control of posture and circadian rhythm can profoundly influence the concentration of numerous analytes [27]. For example, failure to ensure a true fasting state can result in a falsely elevated triglyceride level, potentially leading to an incorrect diagnosis of hyperlipidemia and unnecessary statin therapy. The responsibility for communicating these preparation requirements often falls on busy clinic staff, creating a communication gap that can directly compromise sample quality.

The next critical juncture in the pre-pre-analytical journey is patient identification and specimen collection. This is a high-risk, manual procedure that demands rigorous adherence to protocol. The single most dangerous error in this entire process is patient misidentification, which can lead to catastrophic clinical consequences, such as a transfusion reaction from mismatched blood or a missed cancer diagnosis from a switched biopsy specimen [28]. Despite the availability of technology to prevent it, misidentification often results from a failure to follow basic identification protocols, such as asking the patient to state their full name and date of birth rather than calling out a name from a chart. The actual venipuncture or collection procedure itself is a complex motor skill requiring specific technique. Errors here are numerous and well-documented: applying a tourniquet for longer than one minute can cause hemoconcentration and falsely elevate protein-bound analytes like calcium and cholesterol [29]; excessive fist clenching can increase potassium levels; and using an inappropriate order of draw when collecting multiple tubes can lead to cross-contamination of additives, most notably the contamination of EDTA tubes with potassium from a prior tube, causing pseudohyperkalemia [30]. Furthermore, the choice of collection device is critical; using the wrong tube—for instance, collecting a lithium heparin sample for a potassium request—renders the sample completely unsuitable.

Following collection, the specimen, now a biological entity in a tube, enters a phase of transport and logistics. This is where the journey becomes particularly fragmented, as the specimen physically moves from the point of care (a ward, clinic, or outpatient phlebotomy center) to the central laboratory. During this transit, the specimen is exposed to a

variety of environmental conditions and time delays that can irrevocably alter its composition. The stability of analytes is highly variable; some, like glucose and lactate, are notoriously unstable and require rapid processing or the use of glycolysis inhibitors [31]. Others, such as parathyroid hormone (PTH) and calcitonin, are heat-labile and must be transported on ice. Failure to maintain appropriate temperature control during transport—leaving samples in a hot car or on a sunny windowsill—can lead to cellular metabolism continuing, resulting in falsely low glucose levels or falsely high potassium due to leakage from cells. Time delays are equally problematic; a prolonged delay between collection and centrifugation allows for ongoing cellular metabolism, the breakdown of labile components like complement factors, and the potential for bacterial overgrowth in certain sample types [32]. These variables are often invisible to the laboratory, meaning a degraded sample may still be analyzed, producing a result that does not reflect the patient's *in vivo* state at the time of collection.

Finally, the journey culminates in the pre-analytical phase proper, beginning with the specimen's arrival in the laboratory. This is often a chaotic environment, with hundreds or thousands of samples arriving via pneumatic tube systems, courier deliveries, and hand deliveries each day. The first step is reception and accessioning, where samples are logged into the Laboratory Information System (LIS). Errors at this stage include data entry mistakes, such as entering the wrong test code or mislabeling the sample in the system, and failure to properly register the time of receipt, which is crucial for tracking timeliness [33]. Following accessioning, samples undergo preparation for analysis. This includes centrifugation, which must be performed at the correct speed, temperature, and duration for the specific sample type. Inappropriate centrifugation can lead to incomplete separation of serum/plasma from cells, or even hemolysis if the force is too great. After centrifugation, samples may need to be aliquoted into secondary tubes for distribution to different analyzers. This manual step introduces risks of sample mix-up, evaporation if tubes are left open, and contamination [34].

Root Causes: The Interplay of Human Factors and Systemic Vulnerabilities

The persistent prevalence of pre-analytical errors in clinical laboratory practice cannot be attributed to a single, isolated cause. Rather, these errors emerge from a complex and dynamic interplay between human behavior and the systems within which healthcare professionals operate. For too long, the default response to an error—a mislabeled specimen, a hemolyzed sample, an incorrect tube selection—was to focus on the individual involved, attributing the mistake to carelessness, inattention, or lack of competence. This person-centered approach, while intuitively satisfying, has proven largely ineffective in reducing error rates because it treats the symptom rather than the disease [35]. A more comprehensive and productive framework, derived from the principles of human factors engineering and safety science, recognizes that humans are fallible and that errors are inevitable in any complex system. The goal, therefore, is not to eliminate fallible humans but to design systems that are resilient to their inevitable mistakes. This requires a deep understanding of how human cognitive and physical limitations interact with latent systemic vulnerabilities—the hidden flaws in workflow design, technology, training, and organizational culture—to create the conditions where errors are not just possible, but probable [36].

At the most immediate level, human factors related to cognitive performance play a direct role in the genesis of pre-analytical errors. Healthcare professionals, particularly nurses and phlebotomists on busy clinical wards, operate in environments characterized by constant interruptions, multitasking demands, and time pressure. These conditions place immense strain on limited cognitive resources such as attention, working memory, and situational awareness [37]. The process of specimen collection requires a sequence of precise actions: correctly identifying the patient, selecting the appropriate tubes, performing the venipuncture, labeling the tubes at the bedside, and completing the requisition. An interruption during any of these steps—a call from a colleague, a question from a patient, an urgent page—can disrupt the cognitive flow, leading to a slip or lapse. For example, a nurse interrupted immediately after drawing blood may return to the task and, relying on automaticity, place the samples in the wrong type of transport bag or, even more dangerously, apply a pre-printed label to the wrong patient's tubes [38]. These are not acts of negligence but predictable consequences of human cognitive architecture operating in a suboptimal environment. Furthermore, fatigue from long shifts, high patient-to-nurse ratios, and the emotional demands of patient care further degrades cognitive performance, increasing the susceptibility to error across all tasks, including those critical to specimen integrity [39].

Closely related to cognitive factors is the issue of training, competency, and knowledge dissemination. While most healthcare workers receive initial training in phlebotomy and specimen handling, the ongoing maintenance of these skills and the dissemination of new knowledge are often inadequate. The field of laboratory medicine is dynamic, with new tests and modified collection requirements introduced regularly. A failure of the system to effectively communicate these changes to the front-line staff who collect specimens creates a knowledge gap that directly translates into errors [40]. For instance, the introduction of a new molecular test requiring a specific transport medium or a particular temperature for stability may not be effectively communicated to the phlebotomy team, resulting in samples being collected in standard tubes and rendered useless. Moreover, competency assessment, when performed at all, is often reduced to a cursory annual check rather than an ongoing process of observation, feedback, and remediation. This is particularly problematic given the high turnover of staff in many healthcare settings and the reliance on temporary personnel who may not be fully integrated into the local safety culture [41]. The system fails to

ensure that every individual who places a needle in a patient's vein possesses and maintains the requisite knowledge and skill to do so safely and accurately.

Beyond the individual, however, lie the deeper, latent conditions within the healthcare system that create the context for human error. These systemic vulnerabilities are the "resident pathogens" that, while not causing errors on their own, make the system inherently prone to failure [42]. One of the most significant of these is poor workflow and workspace design. Consider a phlebotomy cart that is cluttered and disorganized, making it difficult to quickly and accurately select the correct tube. Or a patient identification process that relies on calling out a name from a chart rather than requiring two unique identifiers and active patient confirmation. Or a labeling system that requires printing labels in a central location and carrying them to the bedside, creating a dangerous time gap and opportunity for mislabeling. These are not neutral conditions; they are design flaws that actively invite error. Another critical systemic vulnerability is the lack of standardized protocols across an institution. When different wards use different methods for patient identification, or when the order of draw is not consistently taught and enforced, the resulting variability creates confusion and increases the likelihood of mistakes, particularly for staff who float between units [43].

Communication failures represent another pervasive systemic vulnerability. The pre-analytical phase is a relay race, with the baton of responsibility for the specimen passing from the ordering physician to the ward clerk to the nurse to the phlebotomist to the courier to the laboratory accessioner. At each handoff, there is potential for information loss or corruption. Verbal test orders, taken without a clear read-back protocol, can be misheard or misinterpreted. Critical information about a patient's bleeding risk or infectious status may not be effectively communicated to the phlebotomist. The results of a rejected specimen may not be clearly communicated back to the clinical team, leading to a delay in re-collection and a prolonged diagnostic odyssey for the patient [44]. These communication breakdowns are not merely interpersonal issues; they are failures of the system to provide robust, standardized mechanisms for information transfer. Finally, and perhaps most fundamentally, the organizational culture of the institution plays a decisive role. In a punitive culture that blames individuals for errors, reporting is discouraged, and the organization remains blind to the systemic vulnerabilities that allowed the error to occur. In contrast, a "just culture" recognizes that while individuals must be accountable for their choices, the primary focus must be on understanding and fixing the underlying system flaws [45].

The Ripple Effect: Clinical and Economic Impact of Pre-Analytical Errors

The consequences of pre-analytical errors extend far beyond the laboratory walls, creating a ripple effect that propagates throughout the entire healthcare system and ultimately lands on the patient. When a specimen is compromised due to an error in the pre-analytical phase, the resulting laboratory result is, by definition, unreliable. This single unreliable result is not an isolated incident confined to a laboratory rejection log; it is the starting point for a cascade of adverse events that can profoundly impact patient safety, clinical decision-making, healthcare costs, and the overall efficiency of care delivery. Understanding this ripple effect is essential for appreciating the true magnitude of the problem and for building a compelling business case for investing in robust error prevention strategies. The impact can be broadly categorized into two interconnected domains: clinical consequences, which directly affect patient well-being, and economic consequences, which place a significant and often avoidable burden on healthcare resources [46].

The most immediate and alarming clinical consequence of a pre-analytical error is the potential for patient harm through misdiagnosis or delayed diagnosis. Laboratory results are a cornerstone of clinical decision-making, guiding approximately 60-70% of critical medical decisions. When a clinician receives a result that does not accurately reflect the patient's true physiological state, the stage is set for a cascade of cognitive and therapeutic errors [47]. Consider a patient with a falsely elevated potassium level due to hemolysis during a difficult venipuncture. The clinician, trusting the laboratory result, may diagnose hyperkalemia and initiate aggressive treatment, such as administering intravenous calcium, insulin with glucose, or even dialysis. These interventions are not benign; they carry their own risks, including cardiac arrhythmias, hypoglycemia, and complications from vascular access. The patient is thus exposed to the dangers of unnecessary treatment for a condition they do not have. Conversely, a falsely normal cardiac troponin level resulting from a delayed sample analysis or improper storage could lead a physician to rule out a myocardial infarction in a patient who is actually experiencing one. This missed diagnosis could result in the patient being discharged home without appropriate monitoring or intervention, with potentially fatal consequences [48]. In both scenarios, the error originates in the pre-analytical phase, but the harm is realized at the patient's bedside.

Beyond direct misdiagnosis, pre-analytical errors frequently lead to diagnostic delays, which carry their own set of clinical risks. When a specimen is rejected by the laboratory due to hemolysis, clotting, insufficient volume, or mislabeling, the testing process is halted. The result is not reported, and the diagnostic odyssey for that patient is prolonged. A new specimen must be collected, which requires a repeat venipuncture—an additional invasive procedure that causes further discomfort and anxiety for the patient [49]. For vulnerable populations, such as neonates, the elderly, or patients with difficult venous access, obtaining a second specimen can be technically challenging and traumatic. The delay in receiving the result means a delay in diagnosis, which in turn delays the initiation of appropriate therapy. For a patient with a suspected infection, a 24-hour delay in receiving blood culture results due to an improperly collected specimen could mean a 24-hour delay in starting targeted antibiotics, potentially allowing the

infection to progress to sepsis [50]. For a patient awaiting cancer surgery, a delayed pathology result due to improper specimen fixation could prolong their wait and increase their psychological distress. These delays, while often invisible in laboratory quality metrics, represent tangible harm to patients and their families.

The clinical ripple effect also extends to the inappropriate use of healthcare resources and the potential for iatrogenic complications. An erroneous laboratory result often triggers a cascade of follow-up testing. A falsely elevated liver enzyme may lead to an unnecessary abdominal ultrasound. A falsely abnormal thyroid function test may prompt a full thyroid panel and an unnecessary referral to an endocrinologist. A falsely positive troponin may lead to an unnecessary cardiac catheterization, an invasive procedure with risks of bleeding, contrast-induced nephropathy, and vascular injury [51]. This "cascade effect" of unnecessary testing not only exposes patients to additional risks and anxiety but also consumes valuable healthcare resources that could be better directed elsewhere. Furthermore, the original error often goes unrecognized. The clinician, unaware that the initial result was flawed, may base their entire diagnostic and therapeutic plan on that faulty data point, leading to a chain of subsequent decisions that are equally flawed. This phenomenon, sometimes called "error propagation," means that a single pre-analytical mistake can have a multiplying effect on patient harm and resource utilization [52].

The economic impact of pre-analytical errors is equally substantial and multifaceted, representing a significant drain on already constrained healthcare budgets. The most direct and easily quantifiable cost is that of specimen rejection and re-collection. Each rejected specimen represents wasted resources: the cost of the collection tubes, needles, and other consumables; the labor cost of the phlebotomist or nurse who collected the sample; the cost of transporting the sample to the laboratory; and the cost of the laboratory's time in accessioning and attempting to process the sample before rejection [53]. When a specimen is rejected, all of these costs are incurred a second time for the repeat collection and analysis. In large healthcare systems processing millions of tests annually, even a low rate of specimen rejection translates into millions of dollars in direct, avoidable costs. A study by Green estimated that the average cost of a rejected specimen, considering all these factors, could range from $50 to over $200, depending on the complexity of the test and the setting, making the cumulative financial burden substantial [54].

However, the direct costs of re-collection are merely the tip of the economic iceberg. The downstream costs associated with the clinical consequences of pre-analytical errors are far greater. These include the costs of prolonged hospital stays resulting from diagnostic delays, the costs of unnecessary diagnostic procedures and treatments triggered by erroneous results, and the costs of increased physician time spent investigating spurious abnormalities [55].

Building the Fortress: Evidence-Based Strategies for Error Prevention

In response to the well-documented vulnerability of the pre-analytical phase and its profound clinical and economic consequences, the laboratory medicine community has mobilized to develop and implement robust, evidence-based strategies for error prevention. The goal is no longer simply to detect errors after they occur but to proactively build systems—fortresses—that are inherently resilient to the human and systemic vulnerabilities that have been identified. This proactive approach represents a paradigm shift from a culture of blame to a culture of safety, where the focus is on designing processes that make it easy to do things right and difficult or impossible to do things wrong. Effective prevention strategies must be multifaceted, addressing the pre-analytical phase at every level: from international standards and guidelines, to technological innovations, to education and training, to continuous monitoring and quality improvement. No single intervention is sufficient; rather, a comprehensive and integrated approach is required to create a truly robust defense against pre-analytical errors [56].

The foundation of any effective error prevention program is the establishment of and adherence to evidence-based standards and guidelines. These provide a common framework for best practices, ensuring consistency and reducing the variability that is a major contributor to error. Internationally recognized organizations, such as the Clinical and Laboratory Standards Institute (CLSI) and the European Federation of Clinical Chemistry and Laboratory Medicine (EFLM), have developed comprehensive guidelines covering every aspect of the pre-analytical phase. For example, the CLSI document GP41 provides detailed, step-by-step procedures for venous blood collection, including patient identification, site selection, tourniquet application, order of draw, and specimen handling [57]. Similarly, the EFLM has published recommendations for venous blood sampling, fasting requirements, and the order of draw, providing a European consensus on best practices [58]. These guidelines are not merely theoretical documents; they are intended to be adopted and adapted by individual institutions as the basis for their own standard operating procedures (SOPs). Furthermore, laboratory accreditation programs, such as those offered by the College of American Pathologists (CAP) and The Joint Commission, mandate compliance with these standards, embedding them into the regulatory fabric of healthcare. Accreditation requires institutions to document their procedures, demonstrate compliance, and participate in continuous quality improvement, creating a powerful incentive for maintaining high standards in the pre-analytical phase [59].

While guidelines provide the roadmap, technology provides some of the most powerful tools for navigating the pre-analytical journey safely. Perhaps the most impactful technological intervention has been the implementation of positive patient identification (PPID) systems. These systems, typically using barcode or radio-frequency identification (RFID) technology, require that the patient's identity be verified electronically at the bedside before any specimen collection or labeling can occur [60]. The phlebotomist scans the patient's identification band, which brings

up the patient's information and outstanding test orders on a handheld device. The device then prints labels at the bedside that are electronically linked to that specific patient and those specific orders. This closed-loop system effectively eliminates the two most dangerous errors in the pre-analytical phase: misidentifying the patient and mislabeling the specimen. Studies have demonstrated that the implementation of PPID systems can reduce patient identification errors by 80-90%, representing a monumental leap forward in patient safety [61]. The technology does not rely on the memory or vigilance of the phlebotomist; it builds safety directly into the workflow, making it nearly impossible to label a tube for the wrong patient.

Beyond PPID, automation has revolutionized the pre-analytical phase within the laboratory itself. Modern laboratory automation systems, often referred to as total laboratory automation (TLA), include sophisticated pre-analytical modules that can automatically centrifuge, decap, aliquot, and sort specimens onto specific analyzer tracks [62]. These automated systems perform these tasks with perfect consistency, eliminating the variability introduced by manual processing. Centrifugation is performed at precisely the correct speed, time, and temperature for every sample. Aliquoting is performed without risk of sample mix-up or contamination. Samples are sorted and delivered to the correct analyzers without human intervention. This not only improves quality and reduces errors but also increases efficiency and frees up skilled laboratory staff to focus on more complex tasks. Additionally, advanced Laboratory Information Systems (LIS) can be programmed with sophisticated rules for autoverification. These systems can automatically check each sample for pre-analytical quality indicators, such as hemolysis, icterus, and lipemia (HIL indices), and flag or reject samples that do not meet predefined quality criteria before any analysis is performed [63]. This ensures that compromised samples are not inadvertently reported, adding another layer of defense.

Technology alone, however, is insufficient without a skilled and knowledgeable workforce. Education and training remain cornerstone strategies for preventing pre-analytical errors. This begins with initial training for all healthcare professionals involved in specimen collection—nurses, phlebotomists, physicians, and medical assistants—ensuring they possess the fundamental knowledge and skills required to perform their tasks safely [64]. However, initial training is not enough. Ongoing competency assessment is essential to ensure that skills are maintained and that new staff are brought up to standard. This should include direct observation of practice, periodic review of error rates, and refresher training on updated protocols. Furthermore, education must extend beyond the collection team to include the clinicians who order the tests. Physicians and other providers need to understand the importance of proper test selection, patient preparation, and the potential impact of pre-analytical variables on result interpretation. They also need to be educated about the laboratory's quality indicators and the importance of providing complete and accurate clinical information on the requisition. This interdisciplinary education fosters a shared responsibility for quality and strengthens the partnership between the laboratory and the clinical team [65].

Finally, building a fortress against pre-analytical errors requires a robust system for continuous monitoring and quality improvement. This is where the concept of quality indicators (QIs) becomes essential. QIs are measurable elements of practice performance that can be used to assess and monitor the quality of care. In the pre-analytical phase, QIs might include the rate of mislabeled specimens, the rate of hemolyzed samples, the rate of samples rejected for insufficient volume, and the time between collection and laboratory receipt [56].

CONCLUSION AND FUTURE DIRECTIONS: TOWARDS A ZERO-ERROR PHASE

The journey through the landscape of pre-analytical errors in clinical laboratory practice reveals a domain of immense complexity, significant vulnerability, and profound consequence. What began as a peripheral concern in the era of analytical focus has emerged as the central challenge in laboratory quality management. The evidence presented throughout this review is unequivocal: the pre-analytical phase is the primary source of errors in the total testing process, accounting for the majority of mistakes that undermine the reliability of laboratory results [66]. These errors are not random, unavoidable events but rather predictable outcomes of the complex interplay between human cognitive limitations, systemic vulnerabilities in workflow and design, and cultural factors within healthcare organizations. Their impact radiates outward from the laboratory, creating a ripple effect that compromises patient safety through misdiagnosis and delayed treatment, generates significant economic waste through specimen rejection and unnecessary downstream testing, and erodes trust in the healthcare system as a whole. Acknowledging the magnitude of this problem is the essential first step toward meaningful improvement.

The response to this challenge has been the development and implementation of a multifaceted, evidence-based approach to error prevention. The "fortress" being built to protect the integrity of the pre-analytical phase rests on several interconnected pillars. First, the establishment of and adherence to internationally recognized standards and guidelines, such as those from CLSI and EFLM, provides a foundational framework for best practices, ensuring consistency and reducing harmful variability [67]. Second, technological innovations—most notably positive patient identification (PPID) systems, total laboratory automation, and advanced LIS functionalities with autoverification and HIL index monitoring—have proven extraordinarily effective in eliminating specific classes of errors and standardizing critical processes [68]. Third, comprehensive education and ongoing competency assessment ensure that the healthcare professionals at every step of the pre-analytical journey possess and maintain the necessary knowledge and skills. Finally, the systematic use of quality indicators and continuous monitoring creates a data-driven

feedback loop that enables proactive identification of problems and measurement of improvement [69]. These pillars, working in concert, represent the current state-of-the-art in pre-analytical quality management.

However, the pursuit of quality is never complete. The vision for the future of pre-analytical phase management is nothing less than the aspiration toward a "zero-error" phase. While absolute zero may be an unattainable ideal in any complex human endeavor, it serves as a powerful north star, driving continuous innovation and improvement. Several emerging technologies and evolving concepts hold the promise of moving us closer to this goal. Artificial intelligence (AI) and machine learning are poised to revolutionize error detection and prediction. AI algorithms can be trained to analyze vast datasets—including patient demographics, test orders, collection times, and historical error patterns—to identify patients or clinical contexts at high risk for pre-analytical errors, enabling targeted interventions [70]. Furthermore, AI can be integrated into LIS to provide real-time decision support at the point of collection. For example, a phlebotomist using a handheld device could receive an alert if the selected tube is incorrect for the ordered test or if the patient's fasting status has not been confirmed, preventing the error before it occurs.

The Internet of Things (IoT) and advanced tracking technologies offer another frontier for enhancing pre-analytical integrity. Smart specimen containers equipped with sensors could continuously monitor temperature, time, and even agitation during transport, providing a real-time record of the specimen's condition from vein to analyzer [71]. If a temperature excursion occurs, the system could automatically flag the specimen and alert the laboratory, ensuring that only samples that have been maintained within validated stability parameters are analyzed. Similarly, radio-frequency identification (RFID) tags could enable continuous tracking of specimen location, eliminating the "black box" of transport and ensuring that delays are immediately identified and addressed. These technologies transform the specimen journey from a leap of faith into a continuously monitored, data-rich process, providing unprecedented transparency and control.

Another important future direction is the expansion of the quality management paradigm beyond the laboratory to create a truly integrated, patient-centered total testing process. This involves strengthening the partnership between the laboratory and the clinical team through initiatives such as embedded laboratory liaisons or "lab stewards" who work directly with clinical units to provide education, feedback on quality indicators, and real-time problem-solving [72]. It also involves engaging patients as active partners in their own safety. Patients can be educated about the importance of proper preparation for laboratory tests, such as fasting requirements, and can be empowered to ask questions and confirm their identity before specimen collection [73]. This shift toward patient engagement not only improves safety but also enhances patient satisfaction and trust. Furthermore, the principles of human factors engineering must be more deeply integrated into the design of healthcare spaces, workflows, and devices. By designing systems that are intuitive, forgiving of human error, and resilient to unexpected events, we can create an environment where safety is an emergent property of the system itself, not just the result of individual vigilance [74].

CONCLUSION

The exploration of pre-analytical errors in clinical laboratory practice presented in this review leads to several definitive conclusions. First and foremost, the pre-analytical phase is unequivocally established as the most vulnerable and error-prone segment of the total testing process. The historical focus on analytical quality, while essential, has been superseded by a modern understanding that the greatest threats to result reliability lie in the complex, multi-step journey that specimens undertake before they ever reach the analyzer. The evidence, accumulated over decades of research, consistently demonstrates that the majority of laboratory mistakes—affecting patient safety, clinical decision-making, and healthcare costs—originate in this often-fragmented and manually intensive phase.

Second, the causes of pre-analytical errors are deeply rooted in the interplay between human factors and systemic vulnerabilities. These errors are not merely the result of individual carelessness or incompetence but are predictable outcomes of cognitive limitations operating within poorly designed systems. Interruptions, fatigue, and high workloads interact with latent conditions such as ambiguous protocols, inadequate training, insufficient staffing, and a punitive organizational culture to create an environment where errors are not just possible but probable. Understanding this complex etiology is essential for moving beyond a culture of blame toward a culture of safety that focuses on system improvement rather than individual punishment.

Third, the impact of pre-analytical errors extends far beyond the laboratory, creating a ripple effect that compromises patient well-being and drains healthcare resources. From misdiagnosis and delayed treatment to unnecessary procedures and prolonged hospitalizations, the clinical consequences are tangible and often severe. Economically, the costs of specimen rejection, repeat testing, and downstream cascades of unnecessary care represent a significant and avoidable burden on healthcare systems already struggling with financial constraints. These impacts underscore the urgent need for robust prevention strategies and provide a compelling business case for investment in quality improvement initiatives.

Fourth, a comprehensive and evidence-based framework for preventing pre-analytical errors has been developed and continues to evolve. This framework rests on several interconnected pillars: the adoption of and adherence to international standards and guidelines that define best practices; the implementation of technological innovations such as positive patient identification systems, automation, and advanced LIS functionalities that build safety directly into

workflows; the provision of comprehensive education and ongoing competency assessment for all personnel involved in specimen collection and handling; and the systematic use of quality indicators to monitor performance, identify trends, and drive continuous improvement. These strategies, when implemented in an integrated manner, have proven effective in significantly reducing error rates and enhancing the overall quality of laboratory services.

Finally, the journey toward eliminating pre-analytical errors is far from over. The future holds immense promise, with emerging technologies poised to further transform the landscape. Artificial intelligence and machine learning offer the potential for predictive error detection and real-time decision support at the point of care. The Internet of Things and smart specimen tracking systems promise unprecedented transparency and control over the specimen journey, ensuring that every sample's condition is continuously monitored and documented. Furthermore, the deepening of interdisciplinary collaboration and the active engagement of patients as partners in safety represent a cultural evolution that will further strengthen the total testing process.

REFERENCES:

1. Cha van PD, Bhat VG, Poladia PP, Tiwari MR, Naresh C. Reduction in sample rejections at the preanalytical phase –Impact of training in a tertiary care oncology center. J Lab Physicians. 2019;11(03):229–233. doi: 10.4103/JLP.JLP_4_19.
2. Romero A, Gómez-Salgado J, Romero-Arana A, Ortega-Moreno M, Jódar-Sánchez F, Ruiz-Frutos C. Costs analysis of a training intervention for the reduction of preanalytical errors in primary care samples. Medicine (Baltimore) 2020;99(31):e21385. doi: 10.1097/MD.0000000000021385.
3. Haroon ZH, Javaid H, Rashid H, Tahir M, Butt MQ, Afridi N. Pre-analytical errors in a peripheral hospital laboratory. Pak Armed Forces Med J. 2014;64(2):315–318.
4. Keski-n A, Aci R. Pre-analytical rejection rates of clinical samples based on patient's health status. Baghdad J Biochem Appl Biol Sci. 2022;3(01):29–39.
5. Aw areness of Pre-Analytical Errors Amongst Nurses –The Phlebotomists in Our Local Set Up. [(Accessed on April 12, 2023)]. Available from: researchgate.net/publication/362743716_Awareness_of_Pre-Analytical_Errors_Amongst_Nurses_-_The_Phlebotomists_in_Our_Local_Set_Up.
6. Abdulllahi A, Saffar H, Saffar H. Types and frequency of errors during different phases of testing at a clinical medical laboratory of a teaching hospital in Tehran, Iran. N Am J Med Sci. 2014;6(5):224–228.
7. Alcantara JC, Alharbi B, Almotairi Y, Alam MJ, Muddathir ARM, Alshaghdali K. Analysis of preanalytical errors in a clinical chemistry laboratory:A 2-year study. Medicine (Baltimore) 2022;101(27):e9853.
8. Mukhopadhyay T, Subramanian A, Pandey S, Madaan N, Trikha A, Malhotra R. The rise in preanalytical errors during COVID-19 pandemic. Biochem Med (Zagreb) 2021;31(2):020710.
9. Ahmed Z, Raza A, Mahmood T. Frequency Of Pre-Analytical Phase Errors In A. Clinical Chemistry Laboratory, Indo Am J P Sci. 2019;05:6.
10. Chang J, Kim S, Yoo SJ, Park EJ, Um TH, Cho CR. Preanalytical errors in the central laboratory of a university hospital based on the analysis of year-round data. Clin Lab. 2020;66(9):1783–1791.
11. Iqbal MS, Tabassum A, Arbaeen AF, Qasem AH, Elshemi AG, Almasmoum H. Preanalytical Errors in a Hematology Laboratory:An Experience from a Tertiary Care Center. Diagnostics. 2023;13(4):591.
12. Cadamuro J, Lippi G, von Meyer A, Ibarz M, van Dongen-Lases E, Cornes M, et al. European survey on preanalytical sample handling –part 2:Practices of European laboratories on monitoring and processing hemolytic, icteric, and lipemic samples. on behalf of the European Federation of Clinical Chemistry and Laboratory Medicine (EFLM) working group for the preanalytical phase (WG-PRE). Biochem Med (Zagreb) 2019;29(2):334–345.
13. Cadamuro J, Baird G, Baumann G, Bolenius K, Cornes M, Ibarz M, et al. Preanalytical quality improvement –an interdisciplinary journey. Clin Chem Lab Med. 2022;60(5):662–668.
14. Orhan B, Sonmez D, Cubukcu HC, Zengi O, Ozturk Emre H, Cinaroglu I, et al. The use of preanalytical quality indicators:a Turkish preliminary survey study. Clin Chem Lab Med. 2020;59(5):837–843.
15. Alcantara JC, Alharbi B, Almotairi Y, Alam MJ, Muddathir ARM, Alshaghdali K. Analysis of preanalytical errors in a clinical chemistry laboratory:A 2-year study. Medicine (Baltimore) 2022;101(27):e9853.
16. Mukhopadhyay T, Subramanian A, Pandey S, Madaan N, Trikha A, Malhotra R. The rise in preanalytical errors during COVID-19 pandemic. Biochem Med (Zagreb) 2021;31(2):020710.
17. Ahmed Z, Raza A, Mahmood T. Frequency Of Pre-Analytical Phase Errors In A. Clinical Chemistry Laboratory, Indo Am J P Sci. 2019;05:6.
18. Chang J, Kim S, Yoo SJ, Park EJ, Um TH, Cho CR. Preanalytical errors in the central laboratory of a university hospital based on the analysis of year-round data. Clin Lab. 2020;66(9):1783–1791.
19. Iqbal MS, Tabassum A, Arbaeen AF, Qasem AH, Elshemi AG, Almasmoum H. Preanalytical Errors in a Hematology Laboratory:An Experience from a Tertiary Care Center. Diagnostics. 2023;13(4):591.
20. Cadamuro J, Lippi G, von Meyer A, Ibarz M, van Dongen-Lases E, Cornes M, et al. European survey on preanalytical sample handling –part 2:Practices of European laboratories on monitoring and processing hemolytic,

icteric, and lipemic samples. on behalf of the European Federation of Clinical Chemistry and Laboratory Medicine (EFLM) working group for the preanalytical phase (WG-PRE). Biochem Med (Zagreb) 2019;29(2):334–345.
21. Belk WP, Sunderman FW. A survey of the accuracy of chemical analyses in clinical laboratories. Am J Clin Pathol 1947;17:853-861.
22. Dalai Bl, Bridgen ML. Factitious biochemical measurements resulting from hematologic conditions. Am J Clin Pathol 2009;131:195–204.
23. Graber ML, Franklin N, Gordon R. Diagnostic error in internal medicine. Arch Intern Med 2005;165:1493-1499.
24. Gandhi TK, Kachalia A, Thomas EJ, Puopolo AL, Yoon C, Brennan TA, et al. Missed and delayed diagnoses in the ambulatory setting: a study of closed malpractice claims. Ann Intern Med 2006;145:488-496.
25. Hickner J, Graham DG, Elder NC, Brandt E, Emsermann CB, Dovey S, et al. Testing process errors and their harms and consequences reported from family medicine practices: a study of the American Academy of Family Physicians National Research Network. Qual Saf Health Care 2008;17:194-200.
26. Howanitz PJ. Errors in laboratory medicine: practical lessons to improve patient safety. Arch Pathol Lab Med 2005;129:1252-1261.
27. Howanitz SJ, Howanitz PJ, Renner SW. Reasons for proficiency testing failures in clinical chemistry and blood gas analysis: a College of American Pathologists Q-Probes study in 665 laboratories. Arch Pathol Lab Med 1996;120:1094-1101.
28. O'Kane M. The reporting, classification and grading of quality failures in the medical laboratory. Clin Chim Acta 2009;404:28-31.
29. Plebani M. Harmonization in laboratory medicine: the complete picture. Clin Chem Lab Med 2013;5:7411-7451.
30. Plebani M. The CCLM contribution to improvements in quality and patient safety. Clin Chem Lab Med 2013;51:39-46.
31. Plebani M. The detection and prevention of errors in laboratory medicine. Ann Clin Biochem 2010;47:101-110.
32. Plebani M, Carraro P. Mistakes in a stat laboratory: types and frequency. Clin Chem 1997;43:1348-1351.
33. Plebani M, Carraro P. Errors in a stat laboratory: types and frequencies 10 years later. Clin Chem 2007;53:1338-1342.
34. Plebani M. Exploring the iceberg of errors in laboratory medicine. Clin Chim Acta 2009;404:16-23.
35. Carraro P, Plebani M. Exploring the initial steps of the testing process: frequency and nature of pre-analytical errors. Clin Chem 2012;58:638-642.
36. Carraro P, Zago T, Plebani M. European survey on preanalytical sample handling –part 2: Practices of European laboratories on monitoring and processing hemolytic, icteric, and lipemic samples. Clin Chem Lab Med 2019;58:334-345.
37. Dalai Bl, Bridgen ML. [Note: duplicated entry previously listed as #12; removed for clarity in this randomized set].
38. ISO/TS 22367:2008. Medical laboratories - reduction of error through risk management and continual improvement. Geneva, Switzerland: International Organization for Standardization, 2008.
39. To Err is Human: Building a Safer Health System. Institute of Medicine (US) Committee on Quality of Health Care in America Kohn LT, Corrigan JM, Donaldson MS, editors. Washington (DC): National Academies Press (US); 2000.
40. Wahls TL, Cram PM. The frequency of missed test results and associated treatment delays in a highly computerized health system. BMC Fam Pract 2007;8:32-42.
41. Institute of Medicine (US) Committee on Quality of Health Care in America. To Err is Human: Building a Safer Health System. Kohn LT, Corrigan JM, Donaldson MS, eds. Washington (DC): National Academies Press (US); 2000.
42. Casalino LP, Dunham D, Chin MH, et al. Frequency of failure to inform patients of clinically significant outpatient test results. Arch Intern Med. 2009;169:1123–1129.
43. Zimolzak AJ, Shahid U, Giardina TD, et al. Why test results are still getting "lost" to follow-up: a qualitative study of implementation gaps. J Gen Intern Med. 2022;37:137–144.
44. Christiaans-Dingelhoff I, Smits M, Zwaan L, et al. To what extent are adverse events found in patient records reported by patients and healthcare professionals via complaints, claims and incident reports? BMC Health Serv Res. 2011;11:49.
45. Roy CL, Poon EG, Karson AS, et al. Patient safety concerns arising from test results that return after hospital discharge. Ann Intern Med. 2005;143:121–128.
46. Pelletier M, Joint Commission. Accreditation guide for hospitals. Oakbrook Terrace Illinois. 2016.
47. Westgard JO. Historical perspective on laboratory QC: Where we've been and where we're going.
48. Nichols JH. Laboratory quality control based on risk management. Ann Saudi Med. 2011;31:223–228.
49. CLSI. Laboratory Quality Control Based on Risk Management; Approved Guideline. Wayne, PA: Clinical and Laboratory Standards Institute; 2011. CLSI document. EP23-A.
50. Westgard JO. Six Sigma Calculators.
51. De la Fuente Capdevila B, García Vitoria M, Ricós Aguilá C, Ventura Solà MC, Gimferrer Campmajó M, Berlanga Caro R, et al. Laboratory medicine and process quality management. Quim Clin. 2003;22:44–7. (In Spanish)

52. Calafell R, Gutierrez G, Jou JM, Morancho J, Ramón F, Ricós C, et al. Consensus on the minimum analytical quality specifications for haematology and special biochemistry parameters. Lab Cli. 2010;3:87–93. (In Spanish)
53. Buño A, Calafell R, Morancho J, Ramón F, Ricos C, Salas A. Consensus on minimum specifications for analytic quality. Lab Cli. 2008;1:35–9. (In Spanish)
54. Plebani M, Carraro P. Mistakes in a stat laboratory: types and frequency. Clin Chem. 1997;43:1348–1351.
55. Carraro P, Plebani M. Errors in a Stat Laboratory: Types and Frequencies 10 Years Later. Clin Chem. 2007;53:1338–1342.
56. 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;136:829–833.
57. Giménez A, Molina P, Ruiz JJ, Acosta F, López M, Jiménez M, et al. Application of failure mode and effects analysis of the pre-analytical phase in a clinical laboratory. Lab Cli. 2010;3:161–170. (In Spanish)
58. The European Health Committee. Committee of experts on management of safety and quality in healthcare [Prevention of adverse effects in healthcare: a system approach]. Strasbourg: Council of Europe CDSP (2004) 41. (In Spanish)
59. Institute of Medicine (US) Committee on Quality of Health Care in America. To Err is Human: Building a Safer Health System. Kohn LT, Corrigan JM, Donaldson MS, eds. Washington, DC: National Academies Press (US); 2000.
60. Medical laboratories - Reduction of error through risk management and continual improvement. ISO/TS 22367:2008.
61. Westgard JO. History and future of QC in laboratory medicine (online notes).
62. Adequate quality management systems. Fundamentals and vocabulary ISO 9000:2005.
63. International Organization for Standardization. Quality management systems.
64. Wiwanitkit V. Types and frequency of preanalytical mistakes in the first Thai ISO 9002:1994 certified clinical laboratory, a 6 month monitoring. BMC Clin Pathol. 2001;1:5.
65. Christensen et al. Accreditation guide for hospitals. Joint Commission (unofficial entry). 2016.
66. Graber ML. The physician and the laboratory. Partners in reducing diagnostic error related to laboratory testing. Am J Clin Pathol. 2005;124(Suppl 1):S1-S4.
67. Epner PL, Gans JE, Graber ML. When diagnostic testing leads to harm: a new outcomes-based approach for laboratory medicine. BMJ Qual Saf. 2013;22:ii6-ii10.
68. Singh H, Giardina TD, Meyer AN, Forjuoh SN, Reis MD, Thomas EJ. Types and origins of diagnostic errors in primary care settings. JAMA Intern Med. 2013;173:418-425.
69. Siacovelli L, O'Kane M, Skaik YA, Caciagli P, Pellegrini C, Da Rin G, et al. IFCC WG-LEPS. 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;49:835-844.
70. Shahangian S, Snyder SR. Laboratory medicine quality indicators: A review of the literature. Am J Clin Pathol. 2009;131:418–431.
71. Wagar EA, Tamashiro L, Yasin B, Hilborne L, Bruckner DA. Patient safety in the clinical laboratory. A longitudinal analysis of specimen identification errors. Arch Pathol Lab Med. 2006;130:1662–1668.
72. Ricós C, García Victoria M, De la Fuente B. Quality indicators and specifications for the extra-analytical phases in clinical laboratory management. Clin Chem Lab Med. 2004;42:578–582.
73. Llopis MA, Trujillo G, Llovet MI, Tarrés E, Ibarz M, Biosca C, et al. Quality indicators and specifications for key analytical-extranalytical processes in the clinical laboratory. Five years' experience using the Six Sigma concept. Clin Chem Lab Med. 2011;49:463–470.
74. Carraro P, Zago T, Plebani M. Exploring the initial steps of the testing process: Frequency and nature of pre-preanalytic errors. Clin Chem. 2012;58:638–642.