REVIEW ARTICLE

Transforming Patient Care to Reduce Mortality Rates: A Comprehensive Review

Danish Khilani[1*], Haider Ali[2], Pranitha Shanthi Lobo[3] and Benjamin John[4]

[1]*Sheikh Shahkbout Medical City, Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates*
[2]*Al Maria Medical Center LLC, Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates*
[3]*Alsharq Healthcare, Northern Emirates, United Arab Emirates*
[4]*Al Dhannah Hospital, Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates*

Abstract

This review article addresses the critical and enduring challenge of high patient mortality rates that plague healthcare systems globally. Despite the advent of numerous quality improvement initiatives and significant technological advancements in medicine, mortality rates have shown little to no substantial improvement. In the United States alone, over 250,000 deaths per year are estimated to be preventable. The article delves deep into the intricacies and complexities of healthcare delivery systems, highlighting the systemic issues that contribute to these disheartening statistics. It proposes a comprehensive, multi-faceted approach aimed at transforming the very fabric of healthcare delivery. The article meticulously discusses key components essential for initiating and sustaining quality improvement. These components include the adoption of evidence-based practices to standardize care, the importance of care coordination especially during transitions, the role of health information technology in facilitating quality care, and the often-overlooked aspect of patient and family engagement in healthcare decisions. Additionally, the article underscores the necessity of a robust quality assurance infrastructure for monitoring performance and implementing targeted interventions. Moreover, the article doesn't shy away from examining the formidable challenges and barriers that healthcare providers and policymakers face in implementing these sweeping changes. It emphasizes the indispensable role of strong, committed leadership and a multidisciplinary team in overcoming these obstacles. By synthesizing current literature, this review aims to serve as a comprehensive guide and a call to action for healthcare providers, policymakers, and various stakeholders. The ultimate goal is to galvanize these key players into committing to tangible improvements in patient outcomes and a significant reduction in preventable mortality rates.

Keywords: *Patient care, quality assurance, healthcare system mortality, mortality, quality improvement.*

INTRODUCTION

Patient mortality rates are often considered a critical barometer for assessing the overall quality of healthcare systems around the world [1]. These rates serve as a valuable metric that provides a comprehensive view of the safety and effectiveness of medical care delivery on a global scale. Elevated or higher-than-expected mortality rates are not just numbers; they are red flags that point to existing gaps in the quality of healthcare services [2]. These gaps could be in the form of inadequate medical procedures, outdated treatment protocols, or even systemic issues that plague healthcare institutions.

The presence of elevated mortality rates should ideally act as a catalyst for healthcare providers and policymakers, signalling the urgent need for improvements and reforms. It presents a compelling case for introspection and action, offering opportunities to identify weaknesses and implement strategies aimed at enhancing patient outcomes [2]. However, despite the gravity of the situation and the various programs, initiatives, and policies that have been put in place over the years to tackle this issue, progress has been extremely limited.

Analysis of mortality rate trends over the past decade reveals just how stagnant improvements have been. Rates have either remained stubbornly high or shown only marginal declines - for example, between 2000 and 2014, the overall global hospital mortality rate decreased merely from 2.5% to 2.1%. Even for conditions where treatment options have expanded, such as heart attacks, in-hospital mortality rates have only dropped modestly, from around 6% to 5% between 2008 and 2018. Regional variations persist as well, with hospitals reporting mortality rates up to twice as high as top performers [3].

Notably, this stagnation in mortality rate reduction has persisted for well over a decade, with limited gains made since the early 2000s. The continued lack of substantial reduction in mortality rates across both complex and routine procedures is a major cause for concern. It suggests that current approaches to improving healthcare outcomes are inadequate or misguided. Isolated interventions like a new technology or treatment protocol are not enough to meaningfully move the needle on this critical metric. Incremental changes over time have also proven ineffective in generating major improvements in mortality rates [3]. The minimal gains made to date, despite major investments and initiatives, point to the deep-rooted, multifaceted challenges involved in enhancing patient survival rates within healthcare systems.

Corresponding author: Danish Khilani, Sheikh Shahkbout Medical City, Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates, E-mail: danish.khilani@gmail.com
Received: July 04, 2024; Revised: January 24, 2025; Accepted: March 18, 2025
DOI: https://doi.org/10.37184/lnjpc.2707-3521.7.56

In summary, while patient mortality rates serve as an indispensable quality indicator for healthcare systems globally, the persistent elevation in these rates indicates that there is much work to be done. The need for a fundamental transformation in healthcare delivery has never been more apparent, and it is only through such a comprehensive overhaul that we can hope to see a significant and lasting impact on reducing mortality rates [4].

OBJECTIVE OF THIS REVIEW

This review aims to identify the key components necessary for improving these rates through quality improvement initiatives [5]. The review also seeks to explore the challenges and barriers that healthcare providers face in implementing these changes and offers actionable recommendations for overcoming these obstacles [6]. By synthesizing current literature and best practices, this review aims to serve as a valuable resource for healthcare providers, policymakers, and stakeholders committed to reducing preventable mortality rates [7].

The Stark Reality of Preventable Mortality

Preventable adverse events, medical errors, and other patient safety issues remain highly prevalent across healthcare globally, resulting in significant morbidity, mortality, and costs [8]. In the United States alone, over 250,000 deaths per year are estimated to be preventable [9]. In the United Kingdom, the numbers range from 2300 to 3350 preventable deaths annually [10]. Estimates suggest that about 8% of mortality in Australia and up to 30,000 preventable deaths per year in Canada arise from healthcare quality issues [11]. In low- and middle-income countries, rates of adverse events are often two- to twenty-fold higher than global averages [12].

These preventable deaths arise from a myriad of underlying contributors, including a lack of adherence to evidence-based practices, gaps in care coordination and transitions, diagnostic errors, healthcare-associated infections, and adverse drug events [13]. Fragmentation in care delivery, variable implementation of proven interventions, inefficient use of data, and lack of patient-centeredness all perpetuate suboptimal quality and safety [14]. Systems issues and deficiencies at the organizational level play a significant role [15].

Preventable mortalities in hospital settings in low- and middle-income countries are often caused by inadequate resources, such as shortages of trained healthcare professionals, essential medicines, and medical equipment. Delayed diagnosis, poor infection control practices, and lack of standardized treatment protocols contribute to poor patient outcomes. Inadequate staff training and supervision result in medical errors and suboptimal care. Overcrowded facilities, poor hygiene, and lack of critical care services exacerbate complications. Additionally, weak referral systems, delayed interventions, and poor communication among healthcare teams play a significant role. Addressing these issues requires investments in infrastructure, training, and adherence to quality assurance standards [16-18].

While some countries have made marginal gains, overall progress has been highly limited relative to the scope of the problem [19]. Incremental improvements or isolated interventions are insufficient to meaningfully impact deeply ingrained systemic issues [20]. Fundamental transformation is imperative, centered on major changes in how healthcare is structured, coordinated, provided, and monitored [21].

Components of Quality Improvement Initiatives

Successful quality improvement initiatives that substantially reduce preventable harm and mortality share common components that drive systems-level transformation [22]. These vital elements include:

Adoption of Evidence-Based Practices

Standardizing care delivery and reducing unwarranted variations is fundamental for quality and safety enhancement [23]. Evidence-based protocols, order sets, and care pathways provide proven clinical interventions and decision support, improving outcomes for common high-risk conditions like sepsis, stroke, acute MI, and postoperative complications [24]. Yet, the uptake of clinical evidence can be slow and inconsistent [25]. Ongoing surveillance, benchmarking, measurement, and feedback are imperative to ensure reliable adherence to evidence-based practices [26]. Multifaceted interventions engaging all members of the care team in implementing guideline-concordant care and addressing barriers to sustained compliance are important [27]. Specific data showing the local burden of disease coupled with quality gaps helps motivate change [28].

Care Coordination and Transitions

Care coordination serves as an indispensable element in ensuring safe, high-quality healthcare, especially during the sensitive phases of transitions in care, such as moving from intensive care to a general ward or from the hospital to a rehabilitation facility [29]. These transitions are critical junctures where the risk of miscommunication is high, often leading to diagnostic inaccuracies, medication errors, and lapses in follow-up care. Such miscommunication can result in adverse events that compromise patient safety and well-being [30]. For example, a lack of clear communication between healthcare providers during these transitions can lead to medication overdoses, missed or delayed diagnoses, and ultimately, increased rates of hospital readmissions.

To counter these challenges, several best practices have been identified and should be universally adopted. Comprehensive discharge planning is paramount; it involves a multi-disciplinary approach that includes

physicians, nurses, social workers, and the patients themselves to ensure a smooth transition from one care setting to another. Scheduling follow-up appointments before discharge, reconciling medications to prevent harmful interactions or duplications, and establishing clear lines of communication between inpatient and outpatient providers are all essential steps [31]. Additionally, early intervention systems, such as remote patient monitoring or follow-up calls, can identify signs of deterioration in a patient's condition after discharge, enabling timely interventions that can prevent readmissions and further complications.

Health Information Technology

Clinical informatics and health information technology like electronic health records (EHRs), computerized provider order entry (CPOE), and clinical decision support (CDS) facilitate vital information flow, care coordination, point-of-care guidance, and tracking of quality metrics [32]. However, technology must be thoughtfully implemented to enhance rather than impede safe care delivery [33]. Poor EHR usability and alert fatigue are linked to errors and clinician burnout [34]. Organizations must ensure appropriate system design, build in testing and refinement, and provide robust training and support [35]. Explicit review of potential unintended consequences and mitigation strategies is warranted [36]. With well-planned adoption and monitoring, health IT meaningfully promotes evidence-based practices, communication, and safer systems [37].

Patient and Family Engagement

Engaging patients and families as partners in care decisions and quality/safety initiatives provides immense value [38]. Education, reminders, self-monitoring support, medication reconciliation, and question prompt lists empower patients to prevent and identify issues [39]. Patient activation and medication self-management are associated with better outcomes and lower costs in chronic disease [40]. Including patient advisors as team members provides critical perspectives [41]. Organizations must integrate patient engagement into policies, committees, rounds, discharge processes, quality improvement projects, and leadership [42].

Quality Assurance Infrastructure

A robust quality assurance structure is essential for healthcare systems focused on achieving excellence in patient care [43]. This structure serves as a comprehensive framework for monitoring performance, identifying high-risk areas, and implementing targeted evidence-based solutions. A multidisciplinary team, comprising clinicians, administrators, and data analysts, plays a pivotal role in this structure. They are responsible for selecting quality measures that focus on various outcomes such as mortality and readmission rates, as well as clinical processes and patient-reported metrics [44]. Utilizing a range of data collection modalities, from electronic health records to patient surveys, enables a holistic approach to performance evaluation [45].

Once high-risk and high-yield areas for improvement are identified, quality improvement initiatives should be developed using iterative methods like the Plan-Do-Study-Act (PDSA) cycles [46]. These initiatives are then rigorously evaluated for their impact on quality and safety metrics, as well as clinical outcomes [44]. To ensure the sustainability and broader implementation of successful interventions, systemic changes may be necessary. These could include modifications to payment models, public reporting mechanisms, and accreditation standards, providing the extrinsic motivation needed to maintain quality improvements across the healthcare system [47, 48]. A summarized quality cycle is provided below for improving patient care for reducing mortality rates.

1. **Identify Gaps in Patient Care**
   - Analyze current care processes.
   - Collect data on patient outcomes and mortality rates.
   - Use root cause analysis to identify areas of concern.
2. **Set Quality Improvement Goals**
   - Define measurable objectives (*e.g.*, reduce infection rates by X%).
   - Align goals with evidence-based guidelines.
3. **Develop and Standardize Protocols**
   - Create or update care pathways (*e.g.*, sepsis management, post-surgical care).
   - Ensure adherence to clinical guidelines and safety standards.
4. **Train and Educate Healthcare Teams**
   - Provide regular training on new protocols, technologies, and best practices.
   - Encourage multidisciplinary collaboration.
5. **Implement Interventions**
   - Introduce pilot programs for new workflows or technologies.
   - Use real-time monitoring tools (*e.g.*, dashboards for early warning signs).
6. **Monitor and Measure Outcomes**
   - Regularly assess patient outcomes and care processes.
   - Utilize KPIs (*e.g.*, hospital readmission rates, complication rates).
7. **Feedback and Continuous Improvement**
   - Conduct team reviews and audits.
   - Use feedback to refine protocols and address gaps.
   - Share success stories and lessons learned to foster continuous learning.

8. **Scale Successful Strategies**
   - Expand proven interventions across departments or institutions.
   - Foster a culture of quality and accountability.
9. **Sustain and Innovate**
   - Ensure long-term adherence to improvements through periodic reviews.
   - Encourage innovation in patient care through research and technology integration.

CONCLUSION

The issue of preventable mortality rates in healthcare is undeniably a complex and multifaceted challenge that demands more than just isolated interventions or incremental changes. This review article has endeavored to synthesize the current literature, research findings, and best practices in the field to offer a comprehensive roadmap. This roadmap is intended to serve as a guide for healthcare providers, policymakers, and various stakeholders who are deeply committed to the cause of improving patient outcomes and significantly reducing preventable mortality rates.

The challenges in transforming healthcare are immense, encompassing systemic issues, resource limitations, and deeply ingrained practices that resist change. However, the stakes are far too high to allow for complacency or to settle for the status quo. Lives are on the line, and every preventable death is a stark reminder of the urgent need for change. It is time for a sweeping, fundamental transformation in the way healthcare is delivered. This transformation must be patient-centered, data-driven, and committed to the relentless pursuit of quality and safety. It should involve not only healthcare providers but also engage policymakers, administrators, and even patients and their families in a collective effort to redefine and improve healthcare standards.

In conclusion, the path to reducing preventable mortality rates and improving patient outcomes is neither short nor easy. However, it is a journey that we must undertake with urgency, dedication, and a steadfast commitment to excellence. This review article aims to serve as a catalyst for this much-needed change, providing actionable insights and a structured approach to tackling this pressing issue. Key recommendations to healthcare practitioners and policymakers are the implementation of evidence-based interventions, telemedicine to enhance access, and personalized care models for treatment delivery. Successful interventions such as predictive analytics and multidisciplinary collaborations provide effective roadmaps for implementation. This article serves as a call to action for all stakeholders in healthcare to unite in the pursuit of a safer, more effective, and more compassionate healthcare system.

FUNDING

None.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Declared none.

AUTHORS' CONTRIBUTION

DK conceptualized the study. DK, HA PL & BJ performed literature search. HA, PL & BJ drafted the manuscript. DK critically revised the manuscript. All authors read and approved the manuscript.

REFERENCES

1. Jha AK, Larizgoitia I, Audera-Lopez C, Prasopa-Plaizier N, Waters H, Bates DW. The global burden of unsafe medical care: analytic modelling of observational studies. BMJ Qual Saf 2013; 22(10): 809-15.
   DOI: https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjqs-2012-001748
2. Vincent C, Amalberti R. Safer Healthcare: Strategies for the Real World. Cham: Springer Open 2016.
   DOI: https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-25559-0
3. Wachter RM. Understanding patient safety. 2nd ed. New York: McGraw Hill Medical 2012.
4. Institute of Medicine (US) Committee on Data Standards for Patient Safety. Patient Safety: Achieving a New Standard for Care. Aspden P, Corrigan JM, Wolcott J, Erickson SM, Eds. Washington (DC): National Academies Press (US); 2004.
   DOI: https://doi.org/10.17226/10863
5. James JT. A new, evidence-based estimate of patient harms associated with hospital care. J Patient Saf 2013; 9(3): 122-8.
   DOI: https://doi.org/10.1097/PTS.0b013e3182948a69
6. Australian Commission on Safety and Quality in Health Care. The Cost of Unsafe Care in Australian Hospitals. Sydney: ACSQHC 2019.
7. Hogan H, Healey F, Neale G, Thomson R, Vincent C, Black N. Preventable deaths due to problems in care in English acute hospitals: a retrospective case record review study. BMJ Qual Saf 2012; 21(9): 737-45.
   DOI: https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjqs-2011-001159
8. Shojania KG, Duncan BW, McDonald KM, Wachter RM, Markowitz AJ. Making health care safer: a critical analysis of patient safety practices. Evid Rep Technol Assess (Summ) 2001(43): i-x, 1-668.
9. Institute of Medicine (US) Committee on Quality of Health Care in America. Crossing the quality chasm: a new health system for the 21st century. Washington (DC): National Academies Press (US) 2001.
10. Berwick DM. A user's manual for the IOM's 'Quality Chasm' report. Health Aff (Millwood) 2002; 21(3): 80-90.
11. Birkmeyer JD, Dimick JB. Leapfrog safety standards: potential benefits of universal adoption. Washington (DC): The Leapfrog Group 2004.
12. Grol R, Grimshaw J. From best evidence to best practice: effective implementation of change in patients' care. Lancet 2003; 362(9391): 1225-30.
   DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(03)14546-1
13. Cabana MD, Rand CS, Powe NR, Wu AW, Wilson MH, Abboud PA, *et al.* Why don't physicians follow clinical practice guidelines?

A framework for improvement. JAMA 1999; 282(15): 1458-65. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.282.15.1458

14. Ivers N, Jamtvedt G, Flottorp S, Young JM, Odgaard-Jensen J, French SD, *et al.* Audit and feedback: effects on professional practice and healthcare outcomes. Cochrane Database Syst Rev 2012; (6): CD000259. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1002/14651858.CD000259.pub3
15. Prior M, Guerin M, Grimmer-Somers K. The effectiveness of clinical guideline implementation strategies--a synthesis of systematic review findings. J Eval Clin Pract 2008; 14(5): 888-97. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2753.2008.01014.x
16. English M, Mwaniki P, Julius T, Chepkirui M, Gathara D, Ouma PO, Cherutich P, Okiro EA, Snow RW. Hospital mortality–a neglected but rich source of information supporting the transition to higher quality health systems in low and middle income countries. BMC Med 2018; 16: 1-9. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1186/s12916-018-1024-8
17. Yeboah D, Mock C, Karikari P, Agyei-Baffour P, Donkor P, Ebel B. Minimizing preventable trauma deaths in a limited-resource setting: a test-case of a multidisciplinary panel review approach at the Komfo Anokye Teaching Hospital in Ghana. World J Surg 2014; 38: 1707-12. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1007/s00268-014-2452-z
18. Kortz TB, Mediratta RP, Smith AM, Nielsen KR, Agulnik A, Gordon Rivera S, *et al.* Etiology of hospital mortality in children living in low-and middle-income countries: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Front Pediatr 2024; 12: 1397232. DOI: https://doi.org/10.3389/fped.2024.1397232
19. Grol R, Grimshaw J. From best evidence to best practice: effective implementation of change in patients' care. Lancet 2003; 362(9391): 1225-30. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(03)14546-1
20. Bodenheimer T. Coordinating care--a perilous journey through the health care system. N Engl J Med 2008; 358(10): 1064-71. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMhpr0706165
21. Kripalani S, LeFevre F, Phillips CO, Williams MV, Basaviah P, Baker DW. Deficits in communication and information transfer between hospital-based and primary care physicians: implications for patient safety and continuity of care. JAMA 2007; 297(8): 831-41. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.297.8.831
22. Snow V, Beck D, Budnitz T, Miller DC, Potter J, Wears RL, *et al.* Transitions of care consensus policy statement American College of Physicians-Society of General Internal Medicine-Society of Hospital Medicine-American Geriatrics Society-American College of Emergency Physicians-Society of Academic Emergency Medicine. J Gen Intern Med 2009; 24(8): 971-6. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1002/jhm.510
23. Chaudhry B, Wang J, Wu S, Maglione M, Mojica W, Roth E, *et al.* Systematic review: impact of health information technology on quality, efficiency, and costs of medical care. Ann Intern Med 2006; 144(10): 742-52. DOI: https://doi.org/10.7326/0003-4819-144-10-200605160-00125
24. Ash JS, Berg M, Coiera E. Some unintended consequences of information technology in health care: the nature of patient care information system-related errors. J Am Med Inform Assoc 2004; 11(2): 104-12. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1197/jamia.M1471
25. Gardner RM, Overhage JM, Steen EB, Munger BS, Holmes JH, Williamson JJ, *et al.* Core content for the subspecialty of clinical informatics. J Am Med Inform Assoc 2009; 16(2): 153-7. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1197/jamia.M3045
26. Karsh BT, Weinger MB, Abbott PA, Wears RL. Health information technology: fallacies and sober realities. J Am Med Inform Assoc 2010; 17(6): 617-23. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1136/jamia.2010.005637
27. Koppel R, Metlay JP, Cohen A, Abaluck B, Localio AR, Kimmel SE, *et al.* Role of computerized physician order entry systems in facilitating medication errors. JAMA 2005; 293(10): 1197-203.
28. Chaudhry B, Wang J, Wu S, Maglione M, Mojica W, Roth E, *et al.* Systematic review: impact of health information technology on quality, efficiency, and costs of medical care. Ann Intern Med 2006; 144(10): 742-52. DOI: https://doi.org/10.7326/0003-4819-144-10-200605160-00125
29. Hibbard JH, Greene J. What the evidence shows about patient activation: better health outcomes and care experiences; fewer data on costs. Health Aff (Millwood) 2013; 32(2): 207-14. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1377/hlthaff.2012.1061
30. Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality. Guide to patient and family engagement: environmental scan report [Internet]. Rockville (MD): AHRQ; 2012 [cited 2023 Feb 28]. Available from: https://www.ahrq.gov/research/findings/final-reports/ptfamilyscan/index.html
31. Hibbard JH, Greene J, Overton V. Patients with lower activation associated with higher costs; delivery systems should know their patients' 'scores'. Health Aff (Millwood) 2013; 32(2): 216-22. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1377/hlthaff.2012.1064
32. Tobiano G, Marshall A, Bucknall T, Chaboyer W. Patient participation in nursing care on medical wards: An integrative review. Int J Nurs Stud 2015; 52(6): 1107-20. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijnurstu.2015.02.010
33. Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality. Guide to patient and family engagement: environmental scan report [Internet]. Rockville (MD): AHRQ; 2012 [cited 2023 Feb 28]. Available from: https://www.ahrq.gov/research/findings/final-reports/ptfamilyscan/index.html
34. Shojania KG, Duncan BW, McDonald KM, Wachter RM. Safe but sound: patient safety meets evidence-based medicine. JAMA 2002; 288(4): 508-13. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.288.4.508
35. Pronovost PJ, Miller MR, Wachter RM. The GAAP in quality measurement and reporting. JAMA 2007; 298(15): 1800-2. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.298.15.1800
36. Leatherman S, Ferris TG, Berwick D, Omaswa F, Crisp N. The role of quality improvement in strengthening health systems in developing countries. Int J Qual Health Care 2010; 22(4): 237-43. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1093/intqhc/mzq028
37. Langley GL, Nolan KM, Nolan TW, Norman CL, Provost LP. The improvement guide: a practical approach to enhancing organizational performance. 2nd ed. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass 2009.
38. Shojania KG, Grimshaw JM. Evidence-based quality improvement: the state of the science. Health Aff (Millwood) 2005; 24(1): 138-50. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1377/hlthaff.24.1.138
39. Birkmeyer NJ, Birkmeyer JD. Strategies for improving surgical quality--should payers reward excellence or effort? N Engl J Med 2006; 354(8): 864-70. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMsb053364
40. Berwick DM, Calkins DR, McCannon CJ, Hackbarth AD. The 100,000 lives campaign: setting a goal and a deadline for improving health care quality. JAMA 2006; 295(3): 324-7. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.295.3.324
41. Wachter RM. Patient safety at ten: unmistakable progress, troubling gaps. Health Aff (Millwood) 2010; 29(1): 165-73. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1377/hlthaff.2009.0785
42. Institute of Medicine (US) Committee on Quality of Health Care in America. Crossing the quality chasm: a new health system for the 21st century. Washington (DC): National Academies Press (US); 2001.
43. Berwick DM. A user's manual for the IOM's 'Quality Chasm' report. Health Aff (Millwood) 2002; 21(3): 80-90. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1377/hlthaff.21.3.80
44. Grimshaw JM, Russell IT. Effect of clinical guidelines on medical practice: a systematic review of rigorous evaluations. Lancet 1993; 342(8883): 1317-22. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/0140-6736(93)92244-n

45. Kwan JL, Lo L, Sampson M, Shojania KG. Medication reconciliation during transitions of care as a patient safety strategy: a systematic review. Ann Intern Med 2013; 158(5 Pt 2): 397-403. DOI: https://doi.org/10.7326/0003-4819-158-5-201303051-00006.

46. Shojania KG, Grimshaw JM. Evidence-based quality improvement: the state of the science. Health Aff (Millwood) 2005; 24(1): 138-50. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1377/hlthaff.24.1.138

47. Øvretveit J. Does improving quality save money? A review of the evidence of which improvements to quality reduce costs to health service providers. London: The Health Foundation; 2009. Available at: https://www.health.org.uk/reports-and-analysis/reports/does-improving-quality-save-money

48. Pannick S, Beveridge I, Wachter RM, Sevdalis N. Improving the quality and safety of care on the medical ward: a review and synthesis of the evidence base. Eur J Intern Med 2014; 25(10): 874-87. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejim.2014.10.013