

Title

Overcoming incomplete laboratory request forms: Is an updatable online database of clinician contact details the answer?

Authors and affiliations

DJ van der Westhuizen, J Cole, R Dalmacio, E Gantana, JA Rusch, HW Vreede

Background

As a result of omission of contact details on laboratory request forms, laboratory personnel frequently spend excessive time attempting to reach responsible clinicians regarding patient results. Poor completion of request forms was previously established in our laboratory as well as at the nearby Tygerberg Hospital NHLS. An online web form was created in our laboratory that allows clinicians to update the contact details linked to their professional registration number.

Objective

This audit is intended as a proof of concept that the proportion of clinicians that are readily contactable would significantly increase should a system that links professional registration numbers with valid contact details be implemented.

Method

All request forms for the Core Laboratory of Groote Schuur Hospital (encompassing chemistry, haematology, immunology and virology) over a two-day period were scrutinised to determine the proportion of clinicians that provided their contact details and HPCSA registration numbers. The completeness of other clinically and analytically relevant fields was also recorded. Request forms received from all hospitals and clinics in our catchment zone were included.

Results

A total of 2301 forms were analysed. Personal contact-and pager numbers were absent on 81.6% of forms and the ward or clinic contact number was absent on 64.3% of forms. Of the 34.4% of forms which exhibited an HPCSA registration number, 41.1% lacked a personal contact number ~~or~~ and pager number. Of all forms from local clinics, 46% provided no contact number. Specimen collection time was absent in 21.4%, collection date in 2.6% and clinical details in 34.5% of forms.

Conclusions

The vast majority of clinicians do not provide personal contact details for the communication of critical laboratory results. This audit illustrates that a significant improvement may be made were clinicians able to maintain their contact details on an online form that links these details with their professional registration number. Such a form has been created and awaits approval by the NHLS executive. Should it be approved, it will be made available to clinicians in the Western Cape who are served by the NHLS. After sufficient time has elapsed, an audit will be undertaken to monitor the effect of this intervention.

Commented [LU1]: The convention is that the presenting author be listed first, and the primary investigator/consultant should be last. The others go in order of the level of their contribution or alphabetical order if their contributions are equal.

Commented [HV2]: Include initial of second name to be consistent

Commented [DJ3]: Shouldn't it still be "and", because in 41.1% of forms there were no cell or pager number. If it was "or" the stat% would be much higher. My English stands to be corrected however.