How Emergency Medicine Can Be Improved Through Measurement And Change

Hamoud Nawaf Alharbi, Sultan Abdullah Muqbil Alanazi , Yousef Awad R Alshammari, Madhi Fraih Abdulaziz Alshammari, Sami Abdulmohsen Abdulkarim Alanazi, Wafi Sulaiman S Alshammari, Mamdouh Ateeq Abdulaziz Alshammari, Saleh Soud Almulq, Raed Farhan Eid Alshammari, Abdullah Hamad Fahad Alwakid, Mohammed Hamad Fahad Alwakid , Abdullah Batel Alshammari , Saleh Turki Hamad Alothman

Abstract:

This research examines how to assess quality in emergency medicine, emphasizing the importance of relevant metrics and acknowledging the unique challenges of emergency departments. It explores effective strategies to change physician behavior for quality improvement, but recognizes the obstacles like lack of resources and competing priorities. The paper also highlights the need to consider vulnerable populations and offers insights for emergency medicine professionals to improve the care they provide.

Keywords: physician behavior, emergency medicine, continuous quality improvement.

Introduction:

Methods quantifying these metrics are investigated, along with their precision in evaluating quality and accounting for variations in patient demographics and environments. Effective methods for modifying the behavior of physicians are described, along with obstacles to change. There are instances of effective quality improvement initiatives provided. The way in which to attend to the emergency care requirements of vulnerable groups, including women, people of color, the elderly, and those without health insurance, is also examined. Key words: vulnerable populations; emergency medicine; quality improvement. 2002; 9:1091–1107 in Academic Emergency Medical Imaging.

Assessing the caliber of emergency medicine Why This Time? Physicians have measured medical quality systematically since the end of the 19th century, when Ernest Codman and Harvey Cushing started compiling surgical statistics to compare which of them produced better results.1 Since then, however, despite the persuasive arguments of a few forward-thinking doctors, practicing physicians have not prioritized quality measurement and improvement. Consequently, outside commercial and regulatory entities emerged as the primary forces behind medical quality assessment.8–10 This development picked up speed in the period of contractual healthcare, which was brought about by federal health maintenance organization (HMO) legislation.

The Institute of Medicine's (IOM) description of this new culture aptly captures its unwavering commitment to change, which is where it diverges most from conventional health care organizations.

Crossing the Quality Chasm report, which calls on Congress (recommendation to authorize and appropriate funds for" the health system to pursue six improvement goals: safety, effectiveness, patient-centeredness, timeliness, efficiency, and equitable care. ....tracking and monitoring procedures for use in assessing the health system's advancement in the achievement of the aforementioned goals. 15 In companies that have embraced this new approach, measurement and improvement are inextricably intertwined. Measurement is necessary for both quality and output improvement, and measurement exists only to facilitate improvement. There is no longer any room for the status quo.

Which Quality Indicators and Measures Are Relevant for Emergency Medicine Use?

Define and select quality metrics. The consumer lies at the heart of most approaches to defining and measuring quality. In the medical field, "the care health professionals would want to receive if they got sick" is widely accepted as the best criterion for evaluating a product or service's quality.17 Data elements that describe a medical care component that is significant to one or more customers can be included in health care quality measures. Patients, family members, admitting and consulting physicians, hospital management, payers, and purchasers are among the clients of an emergency department (ED). While

some of these consumers' requirements and priorities coincide, others don't. For instance, while payers place less emphasis on it, patients, family members, and hospital administration are quite concerned about cutting down on wait times and visitation duration.

While patients are less directly impacted, payers and purchasers place a high value on the appropriate use of expensive pharmaceuticals and diagnostic procedures. Ultimately, when patients receive precise medical care based on the greatest available published evidence, everyone wins. The framework for evaluating the quality of care is broken down by Donabedian into three categories: structure, process, and outcome. Structure refers to the conditions that exist before a patient enters the emergency department. This covers the department's physical design, people, equipment, laboratory, protocols, clinical guidelines, and procedures. It also comprises the department's organizational structure and the methodology for ensuring that the quality of care is being provided. The Joint Commission on Accreditation of Health-care Organizations and other regulatory agencies usually concentrate on structural difficulties. While facility, equipment, and procedure structural issues may be pertinent to quality improvement projects, most quality improvement programs do not have structural difficulties as their primary focus. This is because emergency department management frequently places a great deal of emphasis on these issues. Process measures are actions taken while the patient is at the emergency department. These policies are easily obtainable, realistic, and flexible. As a result, attempts to improve quality frequently center on them. As a result, they are the main target of initiatives for quality improvement. What happens after the patient leaves the emergency department is known as an outcome measure. Usually, this covers quality of life, morbidity, and death.

The majority of quality indicators are care-be- the root of practical problems.

Factors Influencing Selection of Process Measures for Quality Patient Care:

The appropriate process measures to measure the quality of patient care depend on a number of factors18,19. First and foremost, the degree of evidence supporting a process-to-outcome relationship is crucial. The more proof there is that a

process exists and influences an outcome, such as randomized clinical trials, case-controlled cohorts, or expert consensus panels, the more certain it is that the process will lead to the desired improvement in outcome. Examples for patients with acute myocardial infarction (MI) include the following: using beta blockers upon arrival reduces mortality by 4–10% at six weeks; using aspirin upon arrival reduces mortality by 23% at 35 days; using acute reperfusion reduces mortality by 18% at 35 days; and using angiotensin-converting enzyme (ACE) inhibitors reduces mortality by 7% at 30 days.

The American College of Emergency Physicians and other professional organizations classify the strength of evidence into three classes based on the level of evidence in the medical literature. Class I, which denotes a high level of evidence, includes observational research, such as prospective cohort studies, randomized clinical trials, and aggregate studies, such as meta-analyses of big database outcome trials or randomized clinical trials. It also includes interventional studies. Class II refers to an intermediate level of evidence and includes aggregate research, such as additional meta-analyses, and observational studies, such as retrospective cohort studies, case-control studies, and observational registries. Descriptive research, such as cross-sectional studies, observational reports, case series, and case reports, and consensual studies, such as published panel consensus by recognized expert groups, include Class III, which denotes lower strength of evidence.

A classification of the level of recommendation is created based on the strength of the evidence. A recommendation classified as Level A indicates broad acceptance and a high level of clinical confidence (strong evidence from Class I research or overwhelming evidence from Class II studies). A Level B recommendation is one that is widely accepted and indicates a moderate level of clinical confidence (strong consensus from Class III research or Class II studies with strong evidence). A recommendation with a Level C indicates that some people accept it, indicating a limited level of clinical certainty (class III studies or preliminary, inconclusive, or conflicting evidence). The second consideration in choosing process-of-care measures is the capacity to extract data in a valid and trustworthy way without placing an excessive burden on the healthcare provider. As electronic records become more commonplace, this component should become less significant

in the future. Whether there is room for improvement is the third consideration. Attempts to further enhance compliance with the quality measure may not yield significant results if the process measures are followed to a high degree, such as 95%. The opposition to change is another aspect. When there are many barriers to change, a process measure will be less effective than one where the resistance is lower. The measure's broad applicability to a sizable patient population or subpopulation is the last consideration.

Measuring Quality in the ED – Aligning Patient Care, Efficiency, and Comprehensiveness

Another tactic is to focus on areas of care where The interests of multiple clients coincide. For instance, the value of the care received is high and benefits all customer groups when patients with community-acquired pneumonia are promptly triaged and evaluated, accurately risk-stratified using an evidence-based approach, recommended for inpatient or outpatient treatment based on risk, and given timely, effective empiric antibiotic therapy. Valid quality indicators for this frequent type of visit include waiting room and physician evaluation times, following protocols or hospitalization pathways, selecting and timing the first antibiotic treatment, and outcomes such as hospital length of stay, morbidity and mortality, and severity-adjusted total episode costs.

striking a balance while measuring quality. A significant obstacle departments must overcome when selecting quality metrics is making sure the many facets of the treatment they provide are adequately "covered." Identifying multiple "dimensions" of quality and selecting projects that address each one is one method for creating a balanced portfolio of metrics and initiatives. Three primary elements of quality are identified by researchers at one institution: clinical quality, service quality, and cost efficiency. Table 3 lists projects in each category along with how they relate to the six improvement goals of the IOM.

A second strategy for attaining sufficient compliance with quality metrics involves creating a model of the "ideal" ED visit for a certain complaint, and then selecting metrics that sample multiple aspects or dimensions of the treatment. For instance, an emergency department may choose to assess and enhance the standard of treatment for patients who report headaches. In a perfect visit, the patient would be swiftly triaged and

visited by a physician; tests, such as lumbar punctures and brain imaging, would only be carried out if necessary in accordance with an evidence-based recommendation; pain would be promptly eased with a minimal incidence of side effects; and a survey with sufficient validity and reliability would gauge how satisfied patients were with their visit overall. The triage and evaluation times from an electronic log, the imaging and CSF fluid studies from the radiology and laboratory systems, the imaging and lumbar puncture indications from the medical record, the pain management and adverse effects from the nursing notes, and the satisfaction from a patient survey can all be extracted from a retrospective study of headache visits.

How Can the Behavior of Emergency Medical Professionals Be Modified?

Although doctors learn clinical skills in medical school and residency, medical knowledge is always expanding, and doctors must adapt to conduct "best practice." Various tactics are employed to alter doctors' behavior, with varying degrees of success. Physician behavior can only be successfully changed if the continuous quality improvement paradigm is understood and applied correctly. It also depends on the effort being well organized in terms of participants, assets, and expert knowledge base.

The practice of consistently raising the standard of patient care is known as continuous quality improvement.44 It starts with determining the goal and selecting metrics to determine if the goal is met. A process like FOCUS, which identifies a process to improve, organizes a group to understand its details, clarifies information about it, understands the sources of process variation, and chooses improvements for it, defines the group working on the project. As "tests of change," quality improvement cycles (PDSA—Plan, Do, Study, and Act) are carried out. During the plan phase, a "high-leverage change" that is thought to have a good possibility of succeeding in getting the quality improvement is chosen. The reforms must be put into practice next. Examining the modifications is the third stage. The gathered samples are analyzed to ascertain whether the

The intended outcome of the adjustment was enhanced quality. In the event that the change was successful, the fourth

step involves acting on the results to consolidate the improvement or, in the event that the change was unsuccessful, planning a new "test of change" cycle to trial a new "high-leverage change."

In any project aimed at improving quality, selecting participants is crucial. A facilitator who is familiar with the PDSA cycles and measure selection procedure is required.

One of the most important components of the quality improvement project is selecting which modifications to test in PDSA cycles. This can be ascertained by "brainstorming" with the initiative's participants, but the decision is more likely to succeed if it is made with the expertise of clinical knowledge or organizational transformation. The literature44 and the consultants and doctors involved in planning, measuring, management, data analysis, and other ways of improvement demonstrate the expertise in organizational transformation. An endeavor aimed at reducing x-ray result delays would be an example of utilizing organizational transformation knowledge.

Improve work flow (redesign system) is one of the change concepts that is selected after a list of other ideas is reviewed (improve work flow, remove waste, optimize inventory, modify the work environment, manage time, manage variation, design the system to avoid mistakes, focus on the product). After reviewing examples of this selected concept (system redesign), such as using multiple processes, minimizing handoffs, synchronizing, using pull systems, moving steps closer together, using automation, considering people to be in the same system, using multiple processing units, giving specialists more time, and converting internal to external steps, one is selected, for example, to perform tasks in parallel. The idea is then translated into a specific, tangible change. For example, instead of waiting until later in the patient's ED stay, as is customary, for the x-ray to be ordered after the patient has been evaluated by the doctor, the triage nurse orders the x-ray concurrently with performing the initial nursing assessment (tasks in parallel).

The medical literature and the doctors who are knowledgeable and skilled in the field of study both demonstrate the clinical expertise. An endeavor aimed at improving the standard of treatment for patients with pneumonia is an example of utilizing clinical expertise. The

American College of Emergency Physicians, the American Thoracic Society, the Infectious Diseases Society of America, and other specialty societies have published practice guidelines that contribute to the wealth of knowledge found in the medical literature regarding the optimal

What Is the Obstacle to Improving Quality?

The conversation above makes it very evident that one of the biggest obstacles to success in the quality improvement process is a lack of knowledge and experience with all facets of it. A poor selection of participants, a failure to include people with the necessary clinical experience, and a clumsy decision about trial modifications can all spell disaster for the quality improvement project.

Numerous more variables have been found to be essential for effective initiatives aimed at improving quality46 (Table 6). Six general characteristics have been identified as identifying health care organizations that have had success with quality improvement initiatives.46 One of these characteristics is goals. The information must be properly focused, describe itself with specificity, and present a challenge to its reach. The organization's goals must be widely shared and agreed upon, or there cannot be a shared set of goals. The administrative support component is the second one. The administrations of the hospital and ED must embrace the idea that quality improvement is crucial and demonstrate their support for it by providing the initiative with the necessary financial and human resources. Clinical support is the third component. A significant degree of participation and presence in the doctors' effort is required. Lead by example and provide support for the adjustments. Nursing personnel must be present in order to take part in and implement many of the intended improvements. Ancillary staff in the ED frequently participates in this as well. The actual quality improvement project comes in fourth. Changes that have a very low chance of success include a single formal educational conference. On the other hand, changes that have a high chance of success include physician reminders, academic detailing of the physicians, and involvement in the initiative of opinion leaders. The quality improvement initiative's implementation strategy is crucial. The leadership of the initiatives must concentrate on PDSA cycles and efforts to imitate excellent practices. There is less possibility of success if the initiative's leadership is fixated on

identifying flaws and placing blame for subpar performance. Utilizing data comes in fifth. The doctors must accept the data as an accurate indicator of their performance and have access to it for review. Data ought to be used to evaluate operations and determine whether the project is effective in improving performance. For the doctors to determine what goals are reachable and what actions are fair, they need benchmark data. Contextual factors are the final component. Physicians in larger institutions or inside health systems typically have access to more benchmark data, but doctors at smaller hospitals find it easier to communicate. Hospital employees in fiercely competitive markets are more motivated to carry out quality improvement projects. Employees at hospitals experiencing organizational instability (financial challenges, administrative changes) find it more difficult to concentrate on quality improvement projects.

Two of these elements are particularly significant in Emergency medicine:

contextual considerations and administrative support. Emergency rooms, or EDs, have historically been viewed as the "ER," with minimal assistance from the company. Although in exceptional cases the ED has been designated as the institution's top priority, receiving all necessary resources,36 the ED's typical priority inside the institution is number 11 on a list of 10. Thus, the significance of contextual elements for emergency medicine quality. A great deal of overcrowding and deadlock in American EDs is caused by uncontrollable sociopolitical circumstances. The challenge faced by many emergency departments is recruiting and hiring enough nursing staff to meet the needs of their patients. Due to a "poor" payer mix of Medicaid-eligible patients or patients without insurance, many EDs struggle to make ends meet (in many states, the payer's reimbursement only covers a fraction of the expenditures). These EDs are legally and ethically obligated (EMTALA) to offer people who visit them excellent care; nevertheless, they are unable to construct the necessary infrastructure, purchase the necessary tools and supplies, or employ the personnel without funding.

Conclusion

By implementing a data-driven approach to quality measurement and leveraging effective change management strategies, emergency medicine can achieve significant

improvements in patient care. This cyclical process of measurement, evaluation, and adaptation ensures continuous improvement while addressing the unique challenges faced by emergency departments, such as overcrowding and limited resources. Furthermore, focusing on vulnerable populations and incorporating their specific needs into quality improvement initiatives will ensure equitable care for all. Through this commitment to ongoing quality improvement, emergency medicine can provide the best possible care for patients during their time of greatest need.

References

1. Millenson ML. Demanding Medical Excellence. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1997, p 142.
2. Donabedian A. Evaluating the quality of medical care. Milbank Q. 1966; 44(3, suppl):166–206.
3. Brook RH. Quality—can we measure it? N Engl J Med. 1977; 296:170–2.
4. James BC. Improving quality can reduce costs. Qual As- sur Rev. 1989; 1(1):4.
5. Berwick DM. Continuous improvement as an ideal in health care. N Engl J Med. 1989; 320:53–6.
6. Eddy DM. Clinical decision making: from theory to prac- tice. Guidelines for policy statements: the explicit ap- proach. JAMA. 1990; 263:2239–40, 2243.
7. Chassin MR, Galvin RW. The urgent need to improve health care quality. Institute of Medicine National Roundtable on Health Care Quality. JAMA. 1998; 280: 1000–5.
8. Schneider EC, Riehl V, Courte-Wienecke S, Eddy DM, Sennett C. Enhancing performance measurement: NCQA's road map for a health information framework. National Committee for Quality Assurance. JAMA. 1999; 282:1184–90.
9. ORYX requirements simplified. Jt Comm Perspect. 1999; 19(3):4.
10. Milstein A, Galvin RS, Delbanco SF, Salber P, Buck CR Jr. Improving the safety of health care: the Leapfrog Initia- tive. Eff Clin Pract. 2000; 3(6):313–6.
11. Casalino LP. The unintended consequences of measuring quality on the quality of medical care. N Engl J Med. 1999; 341:1147–50.
12. Herlinger R. Market Driven Health Care. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley, 1997.
13. Millenson ML. Demanding Medical Excellence. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1997, p 12.
14. Institute of Medicine. To Err Is Human: Building a Safer Health System. Washington, DC: National Academy Press, 1999.

15. Institute of Medicine. Crossing the Quality Chasm: A New Health System for the 21st Century. Washington, DC: National Academy Press, 2001.
16. Lewin JC. Building a proactive culture through creative leadership. In: Lowery JE (ed). CultureShift: A Leader's Guide to Managing Change in Health Care. Chicago: American Hospital Association, 1997.
17. Godfrey AB. A short history of managing for quality in health care. In: Caldwell C (ed). The Handbook for Man- aging Change in Health Care. Milwaukee, WI: American Society for Quality, 1997.
18. Jencks SF, Cuerdon T, Burwen DR, et al. Quality of medi- cal care delivered to Medicare beneficiaries: profile at state and national level. JAMA. 2000; 284:1670–6.
19. Krumholz H, Baker DW, Ashton CM, et al. Evaluating quality of care for patients with heart failure. Circulation. 2000; 101:e101–e140.
20. Yusuf S, Peto R, Lewis J, Collin R, Sleight P. Beta block- ade during and after myocardial infarction: an overview of the randomized trials. Prog Cardiovasc Dis. 1985; 27: 335–71.
21. Freemantle N, Cleland J, Young P, Mason J, Harrison J. Beta-blockade after myocardial infarction: systematic re- view and meta regression analysis. BMJ. 1999; 318:1730– 7.
22. ISIS-2 (Second International Study of Infarct Survival) Collaborative Group. Randomised trial of intravenous streptokinase, oral aspirin, both, or neither among 17,187 cases of suspected acute myocardial infarction: ISIS-2. Lancet. 1988; 2:349–60.
23. Fibrinolytic Therapy Trialists' (FTT) Collaborative Group. Indications for fibrinolytic therapy in suspected acute myocardial infarction: collaborative overview of early mortality and major morbidity results from all random- ised trials of more than 1000 patients. Lancet. 1994; 343: 311–22.
24. ACE Inhibitor Myocardial Infarction Collaborative Group. Indications for ACE inhibitors in the early treat- ment of acute myocardial infarction: systematic overview of individual data from 100,000 patients in randomised trials. Circulation. 1998; 97:2202–12.
25. Niederman MS, Bass JB, Campbell GD, et al. Guidelines for the initial management of adults with community ac- quired pneumonia: diagnosis, assessment of severity, and initial therapy. American Thoracic Society. Am Rev Res- pir Dis. 1993; 148:1418–26.
26. Bernstein JM. Treatment of community-acquired pneu- monia—IDSA guidelines. Infectious Diseases Society of America. Chest. 1999; 115:9S–13S.
27. Karas S, Lukens T, Cantrill SV, et al. American College of Emergency Physicians. Clinical policy for management and

risk stratification of community acquired pneumonia in adults in the emergency department. Ann Emerg Med. 2001; 38:107–13.

28. Chen J, Radford M, Wang Y, Marciniak T, Krumholtz H. Do 'America's best hospitals' perform better for acute MI? N Engl J Med. 1999; 340:286–92.
29. Graff L, Palmer AC, LaMonica P, Wolf S. Triage of pa- tients for a rapid (5-minute) electrocardiogram: a rule based on presenting chief complaints. Ann Emerg Med. 2000; 36:554–60.
30. Meehan TP, Weingarten SR, Holmbe ES, et al. A state- wide initiative to improve the care of hospitalized pneu- monia patients: the Connecticut Pathway Project. Am J Med. 2001; 111:203–10.
31. Benenson R, Magalski A, Cavanaugh S, Williams E. Ef- fects of a pneumonia clinical pathway on time to antibi- otic treatment, length of stay, and mortality. Acad Emerg Med. 1999; 6:1243–8.
32. Graff L, Prete M, Werdmann M, et al. Improved out- comes with implementation of emergency department observation units within a multihospital network. J Qual Improve. 2000; 26:421–7.
33. Graff LG, Dallara J, Ross MA, et al. Impact on the care of the emergency department chest pain patient from the Chest Pain Evaluation Registry (CHEPER) study. Am J Cardiol. 1997; 80:563–8.
34. Graff L, Russell J, Seashore J, et al. False-negative and false-positive errors in abdominal pain evaluatoin: failure to diagnose acute appendicitis and unnecessary surgery. Acad Emerg Med. 2000; 7:1244–55.
35. Fernandes CMB, Price A, Christenson JM. Does reduced length of stay decrease the number of emergency depart- ment patients who leave without seeing a physician? J Emerg Med. 1997; 15:397–9.
36. Spaite D, Bartholomeaux F, Guisto J, et al. Rapid process redesign in a university-based emergency department: decreased waiting time intervals and improving patient satistaction. Ann Emerg Med. 2002; 39:168–77.
37. Docimo AB, Pronovost PJ, Davis RO, et al. Using the on- line and offline change model to improve efficiency for fast track patients in an emergency department. J Qual Improve. 2000; 26:503–14.
38. Katz S, Falk J. Misplaced endotracheal tubes by para- medics in an urban emergency medical services system. Ann Emerg Med. 2001; 37:32–7.
39. Dronen SC, Merigian KS, Hedges JR, Hoekstra JW, Bor- ron SW. A comparison of blind nasotracheal and succi- nylcholine assisted intubation in the poisoned patient. Ann Emerg Med. 1987; 16:650–2.

40. Rose WD, Anderson LD, Edmond SA. Analysis of intubations: before and after establishment of a rapid se- quence intubation protocol for air medical use. Air Med J. 1994; 13:475–8.
41. Carey RG, Lloyd RC. Measuring Quality Improvement in Health Care: A Guide to Statistical Process Control Applications. New York: Quality Resources, 1995.
42. Hart MK, Hart RF. Statistical Process Control for Health Care. Pacific Grove, CA: Duxbury, 2002.
43. Langley GJ, Nolan KM, Nolan TW, Provost LP. The Improvement Guide: A Practical Approach to Enhancing Organizational Performance. San Francisco, CA: Jossey- Bass Publishers, 1996.
44. Davis DA, Thomson MA, Oxman AD, Haynes RB. Changing physician performance: a systematic review of the effect of continuing medical education strategies. JAMA. 1995; 274:700–5.
45. Bradley EH, Holmboe ES, Mattera JA, Roumanis SA, Radford MJ, Krumholz AM. A qualitative study of in- creasing beta blocker use after myocardial infarction: why do some hospitals succeed? JAMA. 2001; 285:2604– 11.
46. Cleary PD, Edgman-Levitan S, Roberts M, et al. Patients evaluate their hospital care: a national survey. Health Aff. 1991; 10:254–67.
47. Raskin IE, Maklan CW. Medical treatment effectiveness research: a view from inside the Agency for Health Care Policy and Research. Eval Health Prof. 1991; 14:161–86.
48. Relman AS. Assessment and accountability: the third revolution in medical care. N Engl J Med. 1988; 319:1220–2.
49. Roper WL, Winkenwerder W, Hackbarth GM, et al. Effectiveness in health care: an initiative to evaluate and improve medical practice. N Engl J Med. 1988; 319:1197–202.
50. Kane RL. Approaching the outcomes question. In: Kane RL (ed). Understanding Health Care Outcomes Research. Gaithersburg, MD: Aspen Publishers, 1997, pp 1–17, 127–89.
51. Nitz NM. Comorbidity. In: Kane RL (ed). Understanding Health Care Outcomes Research. Gaithersburg, MD: As- pen Publishers, 1997, pp 153–74.
52. Iezzoni LI. Risk and outcomes. In: Iezzoni L (ed). Risk Adjustment for Measuring Healthcare Outcomes, 2nd Edition. Chicago: Health Administration Press, 1997, pp 1–41.
53. Maio RF, Garrison HG, Spaite DW, et al. Emergency Medical Services Outcomes Project I (EMSOP I): Prioritiz- ing conditions for outcomes research. Ann Emerg Med. 1999; 33:423–32.

54. Spaite DW, Maio RF, Garrison HG, et al. Emergency Medical Services Outcomes Project (EMSOP) II: Develop- ing the foundation and conceptual models for prehospi- tal outcomes research. Ann Emerg Med. 2001; 37:657–63.
55. Berwick DM. Eleven working aims for clinical leadership of health system reform. JAMA. 1994; 272:797–802.
56. Berwick DM. Harvesting knowledge from improvement. JAMA. 1996; 275:877–8.
57. Ishikawa K. What Is Total Quality Control? Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1985, pp 46–9.
58. Marder RJ. Relationship of clinical indicators and prac- tice guidelines. Qual Rev Bull. 1990; 16(2):16–60.
59. Overton DT, Delene LM. The cost of quality in health care. Emerg Med Clin North Am. 1992; 10:549–56.
60. Bopp KD. How patients evaluate the quality of ambula- tory medical encounters: a marketing perspective. J Health Care Market. 1990; 10:6–15.
61. Hayes GE. Measuring Customer Satisfaction: Develop- ment and Use of Questionnaires. Milwaukee, WI: ASQC Press, 1992.
62. Rhee KJ, Allen RA, Bird J. Telephone vs. mail response to an emergency department patient satisfaction survey. Acad Emerg Med. 1998; 5:1121–3.
63. Goss MEW, Reed II, Reader GG. Time spent by patients in the emergency room: survey at the New York Hospi- tal. N Y State Med. 1971; 71:1243–6.
64. Fineberg DA, Steward MM. Analysis of patient flow in the emergency room. Mt Sinai J Med. 1977; 44:551–9.
65. Heckerling PS. Time study of an emergency room: identi- fication of sources of patient delay. Ill Med J. 1984; 166: 437–40.
66. Saunders CE. Time study of patient movement through the emergency department: sources of delay in relation to patient acuity. Ann Emerg Med. 1987; 16:1244–8.
67. Hall MF, Press I. Keys to patient satisfaction in the emer- gency department: results of a multiple facility study. Hosp Health Serv Admin. 1996; 41:515–32.
68. Bursch B, Beezy J, Shaw R. Emergency department satis- faction: what matters most? Ann Emerg Med. 1993; 22: 586–91.
69. Berwick DM, Espinosa J, Kosnik L. Reducing waits and delays and improving patient satisfaction in the emer- gency department. Boston, MA: Institute for Healthcare Improvement, 1999.
70. Mayer TA, Cates RJ, Mastorovich MJ, et al. Emergency department patient satisfaction: customer service training improves patient satisfaction and ratings of physician and nurse skill. J Healthcare Manage. 1998; 43:427–40.

71. Rhee KJ, Bird J. Perceptions and satisfaction with emergency department care. J Emerg Med. 1996; 14:679–83.
72. Thompson DA, Yarnold PR, Williams DR, et al. Effects of actual waiting time, perceived waiting time, information delivery, and expressive quality on patient satisfaction in the emergency department. Ann Emerg Med. 1996; 28: 657–65.
73. Baker WD, Stevens CD, Brook RH. Patients who leave a public hospital emergency department without being seen by a physician. JAMA. 1991; 266:1085–90.
74. Bindman AB, Grumach K, Keane D, et al. Consequences of queuing for care at a public hospital emergency department. JAMA. 1991; 266:1091–5.