Journal of Posthumanism
2024
Volume: 4, No: 3, pp. 758–769
ISSN: 2634-3576 (Print) | ISSN 2634-3584 (Online)
posthumanism.co.uk

DOI: https://doi.org/10.63332/joph.v4i3.3085

Quality Assurance Strategies in Medical Diagnostic Laboratories

Sami Maqbul Althobaiti[1], Fawaz Awadh Alammari[2], Abdulaziz Ali Ahmed Alghamdi[3], Mohammed Thakir Salem Alghamdi[4], Yasir Mohammed Ahmed Alkhammash[5], Abdulaziz Mohammed Hamdan Alghamdi[6]

Abstract

Medical diagnostic laboratories are foundational to modern healthcare, providing objective data that informs an estimated 70% of clinical decisions. The accuracy, reliability, and timeliness of laboratory results are therefore paramount to effective patient care and safety. However, the diagnostic process is vulnerable to error, with studies indicating that most individuals will experience a diagnostic error in their lifetime, contributing to significant patient harm, including tens of thousands of preventable deaths annually. To mitigate these risks, laboratories must implement a comprehensive Quality Management System (QMS). This paper provides a detailed analysis of the core strategies that constitute a robust QMS. It examines the foundational role of statistical quality control, including Internal Quality Control (IQC) for monitoring daily analytical precision and External Quality Assessment (EQA) for verifying inter-laboratory accuracy. The paper details the requirements of ISO 15189, the international standard for medical laboratory competence, emphasizing its holistic, process-oriented framework and its evolution toward proactive, patient-centered risk management. Furthermore, it explores strategies addressing human factors, such as structured staff training and competency assessment, and process control, including the development of Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs) and rigorous equipment maintenance. Finally, it discusses performance monitoring through quality indicators and audits. The central finding is that these strategies are interdependent and must be integrated into a cohesive system that extends across the entire total testing process. A commitment to this holistic approach is the fundamental mechanism by which laboratories can ensure diagnostic integrity, enhance patient safety, and fulfill their critical role in the healthcare ecosystem.

Keywords: *Quality Assurance, Medical Laboratory, Diagnostic Error, ISO 15189, Quality Control, Patient Safety, Proficiency Testing.*

Introduction

Medical diagnostic laboratories serve as the bedrock of modern medicine, providing the objective data essential for evidence-based clinical practice (1). These facilities are integral to nearly every aspect of patient care, from disease prevention and diagnosis to therapy monitoring and public health surveillance (2). An estimated 70-75% of all medical decisions—including those related to diagnosis, treatment, hospitalization, and medication—are influenced by laboratory test results (3). With billions of tests performed annually in the United States alone, the scope and impact of laboratory medicine are immense, making it an indispensable partner in delivering safe and effective patient-centered care (4).

[1] Ministry of health- Taif Health Cluster -Saudi Arabia, (Corresponding Author)
[2] Ministry of health- Taif Health Cluster -Saudi Arabia.
[3] Ministry of health- Taif Health Cluster -Saudi Arabia
[4] Ministry of health- Taif Health Cluster -Saudi Arabia
[5] Ministry of health- Taif Health Cluster -Saudi Arabia
[6] Ministry of health- Taif Health Cluster -Saudi Arabia

Despite this critical role, the diagnostic process is inherently susceptible to error, posing a significant threat to patient safety. The National Academy of Medicine has concluded that most people will experience at least one diagnostic error in their lifetime (5). Research corroborates this, with studies suggesting that diagnoses are incorrect 10-15% of the time, and autopsy reviews consistently identifying major diagnostic discrepancies in 10-20% of cases, even in the age of advanced imaging (6). Recent data paints a stark picture of the consequences: an estimated 795,000 Americans suffer permanent disability or death each year from misdiagnosis, and between 40,000 and 80,000 deaths annually are attributed to preventable diagnostic errors (7). In the hospital setting, diagnostic errors account for 17% of preventable adverse events (8). A 2024 study of seriously ill hospitalized adults found that nearly one-quarter experienced a diagnostic error, with 75% of these errors resulting in patient harm (9).

The repercussions of laboratory-specific errors are severe and multifaceted. They can lead to misdiagnosis, delayed or incorrect treatment, unnecessary invasive procedures, increased healthcare costs, and profound emotional distress for patients and their families. In the most tragic cases, these errors result in permanent disability or wrongful death. Beyond the direct harm to patients, such failures erode the trust of clinicians and the public, damaging the laboratory's reputation and credibility (10).

To understand and mitigate these risks, it is essential to view laboratory testing not as a single event but as a complex sequence of activities known as the Total Testing Process (TTP). The TTP is often conceptualized as a "brain-to-brain loop," beginning with the clinician's test order and ending with the action taken based on the reported result (11). This process is traditionally divided into three phases: pre-analytical, analytical, and post-analytical. While decades of technological advancement and automation have dramatically improved the reliability of the analytical phase, a significant body of evidence now shows that the vast majority of laboratory errors occur outside of this core testing phase (12). This phenomenon can be understood as a displacement of error; as intense focus and automation have "squeezed" errors out of the analytical core, they have "bulged" at the system's interfaces—the pre-analytical phase (e.g., test ordering, sample collection) and the post-analytical phase (e.g., result interpretation, communication). This shift underscores that the greatest vulnerabilities and, therefore, the most significant opportunities for improvement, lie at the boundaries where the laboratory interacts with the broader healthcare system. Table (1) provides an overview of the distribution and nature of errors across the TTP, illustrating why a comprehensive approach to quality is essential.

Phase	*Estimated Frequency of Errors*	*Common Error Examples*	*Primary Cause Category*
Pre-analytical	46%–77.1%	Improper patient identification; mislabeled/unlabeled specimen; wrong tube/container; incorrect phlebotomy technique; clotted/hemolyzed sample; improper storage or transport	Human and Organizational Factors
Analytical	7%–13.5%	Instrument malfunction or calibration error; incorrect reagent use; non-adherence to Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs); analytical interference (e.g., from monoclonal proteins)	Technical and Human Factors
Post-analytical	8%–47%	Data transcription/entry error; incorrect calculation; result misinterpretation by clinician; failure to report or act on critical results in a timely manner	Human and Organizational Factors

Table 1. Distribution and Nature of Errors Across the Total Testing Process

To combat these multifaceted risks, laboratories must implement a robust Quality Management System (QMS). A QMS is defined as a set of "coordinated activities to direct and control an organization with regard to quality". It provides a systematic and comprehensive framework for ensuring the accuracy, reliability, and timeliness of all laboratory services, forming the foundation for all quality assurance strategies aimed at protecting patient safety and enhancing clinical care.

Core Strategies for Ensuring Diagnostic Integrity and Patient Safety

A comprehensive QMS is composed of multiple interdependent strategies, each designed to control specific sources of error across the TTP. These strategies are not standalone solutions but are interconnected components that work together to create a resilient, high-quality laboratory service. Table 2 provides a high-level overview of these core strategies, their primary functions, and their direct contributions to patient safety.

Strategy	*Primary Function*	*Key Tools/Standards*	*Contribution to Patient Safety*
Internal Quality Control (IQC)	Monitors day-to-day analytical precision and detects immediate errors.	Control materials, Levey-Jennings charts, Westgard rules	Prevents release of erroneous results caused by instrument drift or reagent failure.
External Quality Assessment (EQA)	Verifies long-term accuracy and competence against peer laboratories.	Proficiency Testing (PT) samples from an external provider	Identifies systemic bias and ensures results are comparable across different

			healthcare settings.
Accreditation & Certification	Establishes a system-wide framework for quality and competence.	ISO 15189:2022 standard, CLIA regulations	Creates a failure-resistant system focused on proactive risk mitigation across the entire TTP.
Staff Training & Competency	Ensures personnel perform tasks correctly, safely, and consistently.	Training checklists, competency assessments, continuing education	Reduces human error by verifying and maintaining staff proficiency in all procedures.
SOPs & Documentation	Guarantees procedural uniformity and provides a blueprint for all operations.	Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs), document control systems	Ensures that every task is performed consistently and correctly, regardless of the operator.
Equipment Management	Ensures all instruments and devices function reliably and accurately.	Calibration records, preventive maintenance logs, CLSI guidelines	Guarantees the reliability and precision of the analytical tools used to generate patient results.
Quality Indicators & Audits	Monitors system performance and drives continuous improvement.	Quality Indicators (QIs), audit checklists, corrective action plans	Identifies weaknesses in the QMS and ensures that corrective actions are effective.

Table 2. Overview of Key Quality Assurance Strategies and Their Contributions

Statistical Quality Control: The Foundation of Analytical Reliability

Statistical quality control comprises the methods used to ensure that analytical instruments and assays perform within established specifications, providing the fundamental assurance that test results are analytically sound.

Internal Quality Control (IQC): Monitoring Daily Precision and Accuracy

Internal Quality Control (IQC) is the routine analysis of stable control materials with known analyte concentrations alongside patient specimens (13). This process serves as the laboratory's first and most immediate line of defense against analytical error, designed to detect deficiencies in the testing process before patient results are reported. IQC is performed at specified intervals, such as at the beginning of each shift, after instrument service or calibration, and whenever a new lot of reagents is introduced. The results are typically plotted on Levey-Jennings charts, which provide a simple visual method for detecting random error (imprecision) and systematic error (shifts or trends in performance). To provide an objective basis for decision-making, statistical rules, most notably the multi-rule system developed by Westgard, are applied to the IQC data. These rules help determine if an analytical run is "in control" and patient results can be released, or if it is "out of control," necessitating rejection of the run and investigation into the cause of the error. A well-designed IQC strategy, tailored to the specific performance characteristics of each assay, is crucial for optimizing error detection while minimizing the rate of false rejections. The failure to implement basic IQC practices is directly linked to inaccurate test results, thereby compromising the 70% of medical decisions that rely on this data (14).

External Quality Assessment (EQA) and Proficiency Testing (PT)

While IQC monitors internal consistency, External Quality Assessment (EQA) provides an external and objective evaluation of a laboratory's performance. The most common form of EQA is Proficiency Testing (PT), a process in which an independent organization distributes unknown (blind) samples to a group of participating laboratories. Each laboratory analyzes the samples and reports its results back to the provider, who then compares the laboratory's performance against a peer group or a reference method target value. This process is a critical regulatory requirement; under the Clinical Laboratory Improvement Amendments (CLIA), participation in a CMS-approved PT program is mandatory for U.S. laboratories performing moderate- and high-complexity testing, and it is a key requirement for international accreditation standards like ISO 15189 (15).

EQA is invaluable for identifying systemic inaccuracies or biases that may not be apparent through IQC alone. It allows laboratories to benchmark their performance, evaluate the long-term reliability of their methods and equipment, and pinpoint areas where additional staff training may be needed. Studies have consistently shown that systematic participation in EQA schemes leads to improved laboratory performance over time (16). For instance, a 2024 study in Ethiopia found that addressing the root causes of PT failures—such as reagent unavailability or a lack of corrective action procedures—was essential for reducing high error rates and improving overall quality (17).

However, the dual role of PT as both an educational tool and a high-stakes regulatory requirement creates a potential conflict. The pressure to pass for accreditation can incentivize laboratories to give PT samples "special treatment," such as having them analyzed by the most experienced staff, a practice that undermines the goal of assessing routine performance. The true value of EQA is realized only when it is embedded within a non-punitive culture of continuous improvement (18). In such an environment, an "unacceptable" PT result is not viewed as a failure to be concealed but as a valuable data point that triggers a thorough root cause analysis. This transforms EQA from a periodic compliance check into a powerful catalyst for systemic quality improvement, compelling laboratories to address the foundational weaknesses that cause errors.

Accreditation and Standardization: The ISO 15189 Framework

Accreditation to a globally recognized standard provides the most comprehensive framework for a laboratory QMS. ISO 15189, "Medical laboratories — Requirements for quality and competence," is the international gold standard, specifically designed to address the unique demands of the medical laboratory environment (19).

Management and Technical Requirements for System-Wide Competence

Unlike more generic quality standards such as ISO 9001, ISO 15189 is tailored to the entire TTP in a clinical context, with a strong and explicit focus on patient care and safety (20). The standard is divided into two main sections of requirements:

- **Management Requirements:** These clauses establish the structure and oversight of the QMS. They mandate that the laboratory's leadership implement and maintain policies for critical functions such as document control, service agreements with users, management of nonconformities, corrective and preventive actions, continual improvement, internal audits, and regular, formal management reviews. This ensures that quality is not just an operational task but a strategic priority driven by top-level management (21).

- **Technical Requirements:** These clauses focus on the resources, procedures, and conditions necessary to produce technically valid results. They cover all aspects of laboratory operations, including personnel qualifications and competence, accommodation and environmental conditions, the selection and management of equipment and reagents, and detailed processes for the pre-examination, examination, and post-examination phases of testing (21).

A Process-Oriented Approach to Risk Management and Patient Safety

The philosophy of ISO 15189 represents a significant evolution in quality assurance. While traditional QC methods are primarily detective—identifying errors after they have occurred—ISO 15189 champions a proactive, preventative approach centered on risk management. This is the most profound change in the 2022 revision of the standard, which places patient-centered risk management at the heart of the QMS (22). The standard requires laboratories to systematically identify potential failures in all of their processes, evaluate the potential impact of these failures on patient safety, and implement controls to reduce or eliminate the identified risks (23).

This represents a paradigm shift. Instead of waiting for an IQC failure to signal a problem, the laboratory is compelled to ask, "Where could we fail, how would it harm a patient, and what can we do to prevent it?" This proactive mindset forces the laboratory to look beyond the analytical phase and address the vulnerabilities in test ordering, sample collection, and result communication where most errors occur. This transforms quality assurance from a set of technical tasks into a strategic clinical governance function. By creating failure-resistant systems and fostering a culture of continual improvement, ISO 15189 accreditation directly enhances patient safety, improves operational efficiency, and builds confidence among clinicians and patients (20).

Human Factors: The Critical Role of Personnel Competence

Even the most sophisticated systems and automated instruments are operated by people. Therefore, ensuring the competence of laboratory personnel is a non-negotiable component of any effective QMS.

Structured Training Programs for Procedural Adherence and Error Reduction

All laboratory personnel must receive thorough training before they are permitted to perform patient testing. Effective training programs are comprehensive, covering not only the technical aspects of test performance but also foundational knowledge of the laboratory's QMS, safety protocols (e.g., OSHA, HIPAA), quality control procedures, and equipment maintenance (24). A structured approach typically involves having the trainee read all relevant SOPs, observe experienced personnel performing the tasks, and then perform the procedures under direct supervision until proficiency is achieved (25). Ongoing training is also critical, required whenever new technologies or procedures are introduced, or when performance issues are identified.

Evidence overwhelmingly supports the impact of training on reducing errors. Well-designed programs enhance technical skills, reinforce quality practices, and improve familiarity with protocols, leading to fewer incidents of sample mislabeling, contamination, and result misinterpretation. A 2022 study focusing on coagulation testing demonstrated that targeted training workshops led to a 105% increase in staff knowledge regarding specimen acceptance criteria. This resulted in a statistically significant increase in the correct rejection of poor-quality specimens, directly preventing the release of potentially erroneous results and improving the overall quality of patient care (26). Other studies have linked training to a 20% improvement in accuracy and a 15% reduction in test turnaround times.

Competency Assessment: Verifying and Documenting Ongoing Proficiency

Training alone is insufficient; its effectiveness must be verified through ongoing competency assessment. This is a formal process of evaluating and documenting that an individual maintains the necessary skills and knowledge to perform their assigned duties accurately and reliably (25). Under CLIA regulations, competency assessment is a mandatory quality measure. It must be performed at least semi-annually during an employee's first year of patient testing and annually thereafter (27). The assessment must encompass six specific methods:

- Direct observation of routine patient test performance.
- Monitoring the recording and reporting of test results.
- Review of intermediate test results, QC records, PT results, and preventive maintenance records.
- Direct observation of instrument maintenance and function checks.
- Assessment of test performance using previously analyzed specimens or PT samples.
- Assessment of problem-solving skills.

This rigorous process ensures that staff skills do not degrade over time and provides a formal mechanism for identifying knowledge gaps that require retraining before they can lead to patient-harming errors (24).

The relationship between staff competency and system design is symbiotic. An SOP is not merely a procedural document; it is a primary training tool (28). The most effective training teaches staff to follow a well-designed, clearly written, standardized procedure. Conversely, even a highly competent employee will struggle with a poorly designed process or an ambiguous SOP, leading to inconsistencies. Therefore, a failed competency assessment should trigger a review not only of the individual's performance but also of the system itself. This creates a powerful feedback loop for continuous improvement: improving the system (e.g., rewriting an SOP) provides a better foundation for the next cycle of training and assessment, ensuring that both people and processes are optimized for quality.

Process Control and Documentation: The Blueprint for Consistency

To achieve reliable and reproducible results, every critical process in the laboratory must be standardized and controlled. This is accomplished through comprehensive documentation and diligent management of the physical assets used in testing.

Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs) and Documentation Control

Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs) are detailed, written instructions that provide a definitive guide for performing a specific task. They are the cornerstone of the QMS, serving as the official blueprint for all laboratory operations and ensuring that processes are performed with uniformity and consistency, regardless of the operator. By standardizing every step—from sample collection and processing to equipment operation and data entry—SOPs minimize the process variability that is a primary source of error. An effective SOP is lab-specific and contains clear sections for its purpose, scope, procedural steps, safety precautions, and quality control requirements. To be effective, SOPs must be supported by a strict document control system. This system ensures that only the most current, approved version of any procedure is in use, that documents are readily accessible to staff at the point of use, and that obsolete versions are formally archived and removed from circulation (29).

Equipment Calibration, Verification, and Preventive Maintenance

The reliability of test results is directly dependent on the reliability of the instruments that generate them. A comprehensive equipment management program is therefore essential. This program includes:

- **Calibration:** The process of configuring an instrument to ensure its measurements are accurate against a known standard. Over time, instruments can "drift" from their calibrated state, leading to increasingly inaccurate results. Regular calibration is essential to correct this drift and maintain analytical accuracy (30).

- **Preventive Maintenance (PM):** This involves a schedule of proactive care, including routine cleaning, inspection, and replacement of worn parts, designed to identify and correct potential issues before they lead to catastrophic equipment failure. PM schedules often include daily, weekly, and monthly tasks performed by laboratory staff, as well as more intensive semi-annual or annual service performed by qualified service engineers (30).

Authoritative bodies like the Clinical and Laboratory Standards Institute (CLSI) provide detailed guidelines (e.g., QMS23) for equipment performance qualification, use, and maintenance. Adherence to these guidelines and manufacturers' recommendations ensures that equipment operates consistently and reliably, which directly translates to higher test precision, reduced instrument downtime, and an extended operational lifespan for these critical assets (31).

Performance Monitoring: Tools for Continuous Improvement

A QMS is not a static system; it must be continuously monitored and improved. Quality indicators and audits are the primary tools used to evaluate the effectiveness of the QMS and drive the cycle of improvement.

Quality Indicators (QIs): Tracking Key Processes and Benchmarking Performance

Quality Indicators (QIs) are defined, objective, and measurable metrics used to monitor the performance of critical activities across the TTP (32). Because it is not feasible to monitor every single step of every process, QIs are chosen to reflect the overall health of a key process area. For example, the "percentage of rejected samples" is a powerful QI for the entire pre-analytical process of sample collection, transport, and reception. The World Health Organization (WHO) recommends that laboratories identify a set of relevant QIs, monitor them on a regular basis (e.g., monthly), and formally investigate any significant negative trends as nonconformities (33). Given that the pre-analytical phase is the most error-prone, many QIs focus on this area, tracking rates of hemolyzed samples, clotted samples, mislabeled specimens, or samples of insufficient quantity (34).

After establishing a baseline performance, laboratories can engage in benchmarking by setting more stringent "limits of acceptability" for each QI and implementing targeted improvement projects to achieve these new goals. This process provides a quantitative and data-driven foundation for prioritizing improvement efforts and reducing laboratory errors (33).

Laboratory Audits: Systematic Evaluation for Compliance and Effectiveness

A laboratory audit is a systematic and documented evaluation of all laboratory operations to verify compliance with both internal QMS policies and external regulatory and accreditation standards (e.g., CLIA, ISO 15189). Audits can be internal, conducted by trained laboratory staff to perform a self-assessment of the QMS, or external, conducted by accreditation bodies (e.g., the College of American Pathologists) or regulatory agencies. A formal audit is a structured process that involves defining the purpose and scope, assembling a qualified audit team, developing checklists based on the relevant standards, reviewing documentation, directly observing processes, interviewing staff, and issuing a formal report detailing any findings or non-conformities. The audit is a critical tool for ensuring that the QMS is not only documented but is also functioning effectively in practice. By identifying procedural gaps and triggering Corrective and Preventive Actions (CAPA), audits close the loop on the quality cycle, fostering continuous improvement and ensuring the laboratory maintains a state of constant readiness for regulatory oversight (35).

Conclusion

The diverse strategies detailed in this paper—from statistical control of analytical processes to the comprehensive framework of ISO 15189—are not a menu of discrete options from which a laboratory can pick and choose. Rather, they are a set of interdependent and mutually reinforcing components of a single, cohesive Quality Management System. True quality assurance is achieved only when these gears mesh seamlessly. For example, an audit may uncover a non-conformity, which triggers a root cause analysis that points to a poorly written SOP. This leads to a revised SOP, which then becomes the foundation for new staff training, the effectiveness of which is verified through ongoing competency assessment and the long-term monitoring of relevant quality indicators. This entire cycle of improvement is governed by the risk-based, patient-focused principles of a standard like ISO 15189.

A central conclusion of this analysis is the marked evolution of quality assurance itself. The field has matured from a reactive, technically-focused discipline centered on detecting analytical errors to a proactive, systems-based approach focused on managing patient-centered risk across the entire Total Testing Process. This paradigm shift, formally championed by the latest ISO 15189 standard, represents the most effective path forward for addressing the majority of diagnostic errors, which continue to occur at the pre- and post-analytical interfaces of the laboratory.

In closing, a steadfast commitment to a comprehensive, integrated, and continually improving QMS is the fundamental professional and ethical obligation of every medical diagnostic laboratory. It is the primary mechanism through which laboratories can fulfill their essential mission: to provide accurate, reliable, and timely diagnostic information that empowers clinicians, protects patients, and improves clinical outcomes.

References

Value of clinical laboratory services in health care. American Society for Clinical Laboratory Science [Internet]. 2013 Jan 1;26(1):8–9. Available from: https://doi.org/10.29074/ascls.26.1.8

Webmaster A. Value of Medical Laboratory Science Personnel and Clinical Laboratory Services in Healthcare - ASCLS [Internet]. ASCLS. 2021. Available from: https://ascls.org/value-of-clinical-laboratory-services

Bayot ML, Lopes JE, Zubair M, et al. Clinical Laboratory. [Updated 2024 Jan 26]. In: StatPearls [Internet]. Treasure Island (FL): StatPearls Publishing; 2025 Jan-. Available from: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK535358/

Al-Worafi YM. Patient Care Related Issues in the Developing Countries: Laboratory Tests and its Interpretation. In: Springer eBooks [Internet]. 2023. p. 1–20. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-74786-2_241-1

Van Moll C, Egberts T, Wagner C, Zwaan L, Berg MT. The nature, causes, and clinical impact of errors in the clinical laboratory testing process leading to diagnostic error: a Voluntary Incident Report analysis. Journal of Patient Safety [Internet]. 2023 Sep 28;19(8):573–9. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1097/pts.0000000000001166

Graber ML. The incidence of diagnostic error in medicine. BMJ Quality & Safety 2013;22:ii21-ii27.

Davis C. Report highlights public health impact of serious harms from diagnostic error in U.S. Johns Hopkins Medicine [Internet]. 2023 Jul 17; Available from: https://www.hopkinsmedicine.org/news/newsroom/news-releases/2023/07/report-highlights-public-health-impact-of-serious-harms-from-diagnostic-error-in-us

DiPino S. Acute care [Internet]. ECRI and ISMP. 2024. Available from: https://home.ecri.org/blogs/ecri-news/data-analysis-reveals-common-errors-that-prevent-patients-from-getting-timely-accurate-diagnoses

Alharbi TAF, Rababa M, Alsuwayl H, Alsubail A, Alenizi WS. Diagnostic Challenges and Patient Safety: The Critical Role of Accuracy – A Systematic review. Journal of Multidisciplinary Healthcare [Internet]. 2025 May 1;Volume 18:3051–64. Available from: https://doi.org/10.2147/jmdh.s512254

Çubukçu HC, Cihan M, Alp HH, Bolat S, Zengi O, Uçar KT, et al. Measuring the impact: Severity of harm from laboratory errors in 195 tests. American Journal of Clinical Pathology [Internet]. 2024 Oct 22; Available from: https://doi.org/10.1093/ajcp/aqae144

Plebani M, Sciacovelli L, Aita A, Padoan A, Chiozza ML. Quality indicators to detect pre-analytical errors in laboratory testing. Clinica Chimica Acta [Internet]. 2013 Sep 4;432:44–8. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cca.2013.07.033

Plebani M. Diagnostic Errors and Laboratory Medicine - Causes and strategies. PubMed [Internet]. 2015 Jan 1;26(1):7–14. Available from: https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/27683477

Gruber L, Hausch A, Mueller T. Internal Quality controls in the medical laboratory: A narrative review of the basic principles of an appropriate quality control plan. Diagnostics [Internet]. 2024 Oct 5;14(19):2223. Available from: https://doi.org/10.3390/diagnostics14192223

Gras JM. Laboratory quality control and patient safety. Walter de Gruyter GmbH & Co KG; 2017.

De Albano FM, Caten CST. Proficiency tests for laboratories: a systematic review. Accreditation and Quality Assurance [Internet]. 2014 Jul 5;19(4):245–57. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1007/s00769-014-1061-8

De Lima Montalvão SA, Lowe A, Kitchen S. Advantages of external quality assessment-EQA programs. Haemophilia [Internet]. 2022 Apr 12;28(4):679–86. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1111/hae.14562

Cherie N, Teketelew BB, Tamir M, Angelo AA, Terekegne AM, Chane E, et al. Performances and determinants of proficiency testing in clinical laboratory services at comprehensive specialized hospitals, northwest Ethiopia. Scientific Reports [Internet]. 2024 Apr 2;14(1). Available from: https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-024-58525-6

Timothyradier. Proficiency testing: diagnosing threats to quality [Internet]. ASLM. 2024. Available from: https://aslm.org/proficiency-testing-diagnosing-threats-to-quality/

Hafen U. ISO 15189 for medical laboratories [Internet]. Regulatory Knowledge for Medical Devices. 2025. Available from: https://blog.johner-institute.com/regulatory-affairs/iso-15189-medical-laboratories/

Plebani M, Sciacovelli L. ISO 15189 Accreditation: Navigation between quality management and patient safety. Journal of Medical Biochemistry [Internet]. 2017 Jul 15;36(3):225–30. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1515/jomb-2017-0038

Schneider F, Maurer C, Friedberg RC. International Organization for Standardization (ISO) 15189. Annals of Laboratory Medicine [Internet]. 2017 Jul 1;37(5):365–70. Available from: https://doi.org/10.3343/alm.2017.37.5.365

Giannoli JM, Vassault A, Carobene A, Liaudet AP, Blasutig IM, Dabla PK, et al. Ensuring internal quality control practices in medical Laboratories: IFCC recommendations for practical applications based on ISO 15189:2022. Clinica Chimica Acta [Internet]. 2025 Mar 1;120240. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cca.2025.120240

Oliver P, Fernandez-Calle P, Buno A. POCT Accreditation ISO 15189 and ISO 22870: Making the Point. EJIFCC. 2021;32(2):131-139. Published 2021 Jun 29.

COLA, Inc. Personnel training & competency assessment [Internet]. 2016. Available from: https://laboratoryconsultants.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/07/LabGuide-Personnel-Training-and-Competency-Assessment-COLA-2016.pdf

COLA. COLA PRIMER 16: Personnel training and competency assessment. 2025 p. 1–5.

Du Toit M, Chapanduka ZC, Zemlin AE. The impact of laboratory staff training workshops on coagulation specimen rejection rates. PLoS ONE [Internet]. 2022 Jun 3;17(6):e0268764. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0268764

Clinical Laboratory Improvement Amendments (CLIA). ASSESSING PERSONNEL COMPETENCY [Internet]. ASSESSING PERSONNEL COMPETENCY. Available from: https://www.cms.gov/regulations-and-guidance/legislation/clia/downloads/clia_compbrochure_508.pdf

Standard Operating Procedures for the Laboratory | Institutional Planning and Operations [Internet]. Available from: https://ipo.rutgers.edu/rehs/sop

Mathur A. Best Practices for writing Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs): A Comprehensive Guide. Independently Published; 2024.

Das BK, Kumar V. Laboratory Techniques for fish Disease diagnosis. 2025.

Kuehl D, Grindle K, Hart M, Callihan D, Donaldson K, Fisher MM, et al. General Laboratory Equipment Performance Qualification, use, and maintenance [Internet]. 2nd ed. CLSI guideline QMS23. Clinical and Laboratory Standards Institute; 2019. Available from: https://www.clsi.org

Laboratory Quality Stepwise Implementation tool [Internet]. Available from: https://extranet.who.int/lqsi/content/identify-and-start-monitoring-critical-parameters-quality-indicators

Plebani M, Sciacovelli L, Aita A, Chiozza ML. Harmonization of pre-analytical quality indicators. Biochemia Medica [Internet]. 2014 Jan 1;105–13. Available from: https://doi.org/10.11613/bm.2014.012

Kumar P. Utilizing Quality Indicators to Detect and Reduce Pre-Analytical Errors in Laboratory Testing. Int. J. Medi. Sci. Res. Practi. [Internet]. 2024 Sep. 30 [cited 2025 Jul. 22];11(3):8-12. Available from: https://ijmsrp.isroset.org/index.php/j/article/view/76

Ronny FMH, Sherpa T, Saquib FN, Ahmad S. Implementing laboratory internal audit to improve compliance and quality of care in the municipal public health system–based ambulatory care health clinics in New York city. Laboratory Medicine [Internet]. 2024 Nov 18; Available from: https://doi.org/10.1093/labmed/lmae088.