Perioperative structure and process quality and safety indicators: a systematic review

Chazapis, M.; Gilhooly, D.; Smith, A.F.; Myles, P.S.; Haller, Guy Serge Antoine; Grocott, M.P.W.; Moonesinghe, S.R.

How to cite

CHAZAPIS, M. et al. Perioperative structure and process quality and safety indicators: a systematic review. In: British journal of anaesthesia, 2018, vol. 120, n° 1, p. 51–66. doi: 10.1016/j.bja.2017.10.001

This publication URL: https://archive-ouverte.unige.ch/unige:158490

Publication DOI: 10.1016/j.bja.2017.10.001

BJA

British Journal of Anaesthesia, 120(1): 51–66 (2018)

doi: 10.1016/j.bja.2017.10.001
Advance Access Publication Date: 24 November 2017
Review Article

Perioperative structure and process quality and safety indicators: a systematic review

M. Chazapis[1,2,3,4,*], D. Gilhooly[1,2,3,4], A.F. Smith[9], P.S. Myles[5,6], G. Haller[7], M.P.W. Grocott[8] and S.R. Moonesinghe[1,2,3,4]

[1]Institute of Epidemiology and Applied Health Research, UK, [2]UCLH Surgical Outcomes Research Centre, Department of Applied Health Research, UK, [3]Department of Anaesthesia and Perioperative Medicine, University College Hospital, London, UK, [4]National Institute for Academic Anaesthesia's Health Services Research Centre, Royal College of Anaesthetists, London, UK, [5]Department of Anaesthesia and Perioperative Medicine, Alfred Hospital and Monash University, Melbourne, Australia, [6]Health Services Management and Research Unit, Department of Epidemiology and Preventive Medicine, Monash University, The Alfred Centre, Melbourne, Australia, [7]Division of Anaesthesia, Department of Anaesthesiology, Pharmacology and Intensive Care, Geneva University Hospitals, Geneva, Switzerland, [8]Critical Care Research Group, Southampton NIHR Biomedical Research Centre, University Hospital Southampton NHS Foundation Trust/University of Southampton, Southampton, UK and [9]Department of Anaesthesia, Royal Lancaster Infirmary, Lancaster, UK

*Corresponding author.
E-mail: m.chazapis@gmail.com.

Editorial about this article by L.A. Fleischer, BJA 2018:120:2-4, doi: 10.1016/j.bja.2017.11.018.

Abstract

Background: Clinical indicators assess healthcare structures, processes, and outcomes. While used widely, the exact number and level of scientific evidence of these indicators remains unclear. The aim of this study was to evaluate the number, type, and evidence base of clinical process and structure indicators currently available for quality and safety measurement in perioperative care.

Methods: We performed a systematic review searching Medline, Embase, Cumulative Index to Nursing and Allied Health Literature (CINAHL), Cochrane, Google Scholar, and System for Information in Grey Literature in Europe databases for English language human studies in adults (age >18) published in the past 10 years (January 2005–January 2016). We also included professional and governmental body publications and guidelines describing the development, validation, and use of structure and process indicators in perioperative care.

Results: We identified 43 860 journal articles and 43 relevant indicator program publications. From these, we identified a total of 1282 clinical indicators, split into structure (36%, *n*=463) and process indicators (64%, *n*=819). The dimensions of quality most frequently addressed were effectiveness (38%, *n*=475) and patient safety (29%, *n*=363). The majority of indicators (53%, *n*=675) did not have a level of evidence ascribed in their literature. Patient-centred metrics accounted for the fewest published clinical indicators.

Editorial decision: October 7, 2017; **Accepted:** October 2, 2017

Conclusions: Despite widespread use, the majority of clinical indicators are not based on a strong level of scientific evidence. There may be scope in setting standards for the development and validation process of clinical indicators. Most indicators focus on the effectiveness, safety, and efficiency of care.
PROSPERO database: CRD4201501277.

Keywords: healthcare; perioperative period; quality indicators; review; systematic

Editor's key points

- This systematic review investigates and summarizes process and structure clinical indicators currently available for quality and safety measurement in perioperative care.
- Despite widespread use, the majority of indicators are not supported by a high grade of scientific evidence.
- Most indicators focus on the effectiveness, safety, and efficiency of care, with patient-centred metrics found less frequently in the literature.

Clinical indicators assess healthcare structures, processes, and outcomes, and can provide a quantitative basis for quality improvement.[4] Variation in practices, outcomes, and costs of care is substantial.[1,2] Variability in postoperative outcomes may not be attributable to patient risk factors alone; some variation will be due to differing processes and structures of care within medical centres and some variation will simply be random or unattributable.[5]

Indicators are typically classified into specific areas of care using the conceptual model of quality assessment developed by Donabedian.[6] Here, patients and antecedent conditions enter an organization's structure (how care is organized) to undergo processes of care (what is done), leading to healthcare outcomes (the achieved results). Process indicators examine all the steps and activities taken in implementing a treatment or care episode. Structure indicators assess the settings in which healthcare occurs. These include physical resources (such as facilities and equipment), human resources (such as number, qualifications, and availability of personnel), and the administrative structure.

A previous systematic review[7] of the literature until 2005 described 108 anaesthetic quality and safety indicators. With many new initiatives and further developments since the study was published, we hypothesized that it was likely that new quality indicators will have been developed. With substantial parallel work in the outcomes domain[8,9] already underway, we decided to limit our investigation to structure and process indicators.

The aim of this systematic review was to investigate the process and structure clinical indicators currently available for quality and safety measurement in perioperative care, and their level of scientific evidence.

Methods

Definitions for the purposes of this review

Quality of care

The Institute of Medicine (IOM) defines healthcare quality as 'the degree to which health services for individuals and populations increase the likelihood of desired health outcomes and are consistent with current professional knowledge'.[10] It further subdivides healthcare quality into the six dimensions of: effectiveness, safety, patient-centredness, timeliness, efficiency, and equity.[10]

Clinical indicators

An indicator is a measurable aspect of care for which there is evidence that it represents quality.[11]

Level of evidence

The levels of evidence for papers were ranked using the Oxford Centre for Evidence-based Medicine scale.[12]

Search strategy and selection criteria

This systematic review was registered with the International prospective register of systematic reviews (PROSPERO) database (CRD42015017277). Methods and reporting conform to the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses, BMC and Cochrane guidelines,[13–15] and the BJA guidelines.

We searched Ovid Medline, Ovid Embase, and the Cochrane Database of Abstracts of Reviews of Effects (DARE) library for all articles relating to the development and use of structure and process clinical indicators in general perioperative care. We additionally searched grey literature databases: Google Scholar,[16] and the System for Information in Grey Literature in Europe. We also included professional, governmental, and quality standard initiative publications and guidelines (Table 1). We limited the search to English language human studies in adults (age >18), published in the past 10 years (1 January, 2005–1 January, 2016). The detailed search strategy is presented in Appendix 1.

Data extraction

We screened titles and abstracts for relevance. We included national audit projects, clinical practice guidelines, literature reviews, surveys, service evaluations, and validation studies. Conference abstracts and letters were excluded. Indicators had to be generalizable to all surgical specialities, but their use may have been described for a specific surgical population. We excluded indicators relating only to intensive care, paediatrics, neurosurgery, cardiothoracics, and obstetrics. We searched the citations and the references (snow-balling) of the shortlisted publications for relevant literature. The final shortlisted publications are presented in Table 1.

The full text of all shortlisted articles was reviewed and the data extracted using a data extraction form (Appendix 2). The indicators were tabulated and classified into structure or process indicators. We added the timing of use of the perioperative indicator defined as: preoperative (from the decision to operate to entry into the theatre suite), intraoperative (from entry into the theatre suite to leaving the recovery area),

Table 1 List of publications included within this review, grouped by type of publication. Also included is the developer country, and the number and type of clinical indicators; structure (S) *vs* process (P) obtained from each publication. A, audit; ACHS, Australian Council on Healthcare Standards; ACI, Agency for Clinical Innovation; AHRQ, Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality; AQA, Ambulatory Care Quality Alliance; AQI, Anaesthesia Quality Institute; ASA, American Society of Anesthesiologists; CS, case study; CPG, clinical practice guideline; CMS, Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services; EC, expert consensus; GIRFT, Getting it Right First Time; HQIP, Healthcare Quality Improvement Partnership; ISD, Information Services Division; NAOGC, National Oesophago-Gastric Cancer Audit; NCEPOD, National Confidential Enquiry into Patient Outcome and Death; NELA, National Emergency Laparotomy Audit; NICE, National Institute for Health and Care Excellence; NQF, National Quality Forum; PQRS, Physician Quality Reporting System; R, review article; RCoA, Royal College of Anaesthetists; RCoS, Royal College of Surgeons; SCIP, Surgical Care Improvement Project; SE, service evaluation; SLR, systematic literature review; VS, validation study

Type of article	Year	Article author	Developer country	Number of measures
A	2015	HQIP Audits: Adult Cardiac Surgery (ACS). Bowel Cancer Audit (RCoS). NELA (RCoA). National Joint Registry (NJR). National Vascular Registry. NAOGC. Prostate Cancer Audit. National Hip Fracture Audit[44–51]	UK	P: 80, S: 61
CPG	2009	AQA[52]	USA	P: 7
CPG	2009	NICE[53]	UK	S: 2
CPG	2009	Vimlati *et al.*[54]	Europe, Hungary	P: 9, S: 13
CPG	2010	ACI[55]	Australia	P: 12
CPG	2010	ASA[56]	USA	P: 4, S: 4
CPG	2010	ASA[57]	USA	P: 1
CPG	2010	CMS SCIP[58]	USA	P: 9
CPG	2010	NICE[59]	UK	P: 7
CPG	2011	AHRQ[60]	USA	S: 1
CPG	2011	RCoS[61]	UK	P: 39, S: 53
CPG	2012	NICE[62]	UK	P: 4, S: 1
CPG	2012	NQF[63]	USA	P: 8
CPG	2012	Wickham *et al.*[64]	Australia	P: 4
CPG	2013	ACHS[65]	Australia	P: 18
CPG	2013	ASA[66]	USA	P: 3
CPG	2013	Lassen *et al.*[67]	Europe, Norway	P: 19, S: 1
CPG	2013	NICE[68]	UK	P: 4
CPG	2014	ASA[69]	USA	P: 2, S: 2
CPG	2014	AQI[70]	USA	P: 3, S: 1
CPG	2014	AQI[71]	USA	P: 6
CPG	2014	SCIP[72]	USA	P: 9
CPG	2015	AQI[73]	USA	P: 22
CPG	2015	AQI[74]	USA	P: 11
CPG	2015	AQI[75]	USA	P: 8
CPG	2015	ISD Scotland[76]	UK	P: 1
CPG	2015	ISD Scotland[77]	UK	P: 1
CPG	2015	Merchant *et al.*[78]	Canada	P: 3, S: 13
CPG	2015	NICE[79]	UK	S: 1
CPG	2015	PQRS[80]	USA	P: 22
CPG	2015	RCoA[81]	UK	P: 24, S: 124
CS	2013	Gort *et al.*[82]	Europe, The Netherlands	S: 10
CS	2015	NCEPOD[83]	UK	S: 1
EC	2006	McGory *et al.*[84]	USA	P: 24, S: 2
EC	2007	Meredith and Katz[85]	USA	S: 1
EC	2009	McGory *et al.*[86]	USA	P: 25
EC	2009	Weiser *et al.*[87]	USA	S: 4
EC	2011	Goossens-Laan *et al.*[88]	Europe, The Netherlands	P: 4, S: 2
EC	2013	Kalish *et al.*[89]	USA	P: 4, S: 1
LR	2007	McGory[90]	USA	P: 5
LR	2007	Arora *et al.*[91]	USA	P: 14
LR	2010	Passman[92]	USA	P: 2
LR	2012	Wang *et al.*[93]	UK	P: 3, S: 4
LR	2015	Hyder *et al.*[22]	USA	P: 2
R	2005	Dimick *et al.*[94]	USA	S: 1
R	2006	Bratzler and Hunt[95]	USA	P: 7
R	2008	Fry[96]	USA	P: 8
R	2009	Dixon *et al.*[97]	Canada	P: 1
R	2010	Courrech Staal *et al.*[98]	Europe, The Netherlands	P: 3, S: 4
R	2010	del Turco MR *et al.*[99]	Europe	P: 2
R	2012	Nygren *et al.*[100]	Europe, Sweden	P: 18, S: 1
R	2013	Collins *et al.*[101]	USA	P: 9
R	2013	Mohammed and Fisher[102]	USA	P: 3, S: 3

Continued

Table 1 Continued

Type of article	Year	Article author	Developer country	Number of measures
S	2005	Broder *et al.*[103]	USA	S: 1
S	2007	Main *et al.*[104]	USA	P: 5, S: 7
S	2007	Schifftner *et al.*[5]	USA	P: 3, S: 16
S	2008	Wick *et al.*[105]	USA	P: 5
S	2013	Tillman *et al.*[106]	USA	P: 5
S	2014	Yoo S *et al.*[107]	Asia, South Korea	P: 2
S	2015	Emond *et al.*[108]	Europe, The Netherlands	P: 4, S: 7
S	2015	Gockel *et al.*[109]	Europe	S: 3
SE	2005	Currie and Hutchison[110]	UK	P: 6, S: 1
SE	2010	NCEPOD[111]	UK	P: 2, S: 1
SE	2010	Watkins *et al.*[112]	USA	P: 11
SE	2011	Gray *et al.*[113]	USA	S: 1
SE	2011	NCEPOD[114]	UK	P: 12, S: 13
SE	2011	Rosenberger *et al.*[115]	USA	P: 7
SE	2011	RCoS[116]	UK	P: 5
SE	2012	Andersson *et al.*[117]	Europe, Sweden	P: 2
SE	2012	Kwon *et al.*[118]	USA	P: 5
SE	2012	Urman *et al.*[119]	USA	P: 4
SE	2014	RCoA (NELA organizational audit)[37]	UK	P: 4, S: 43
SE	2014	Sutherland *et al.*[120]	USA	P: 3
SE	2015	GIRFT[121]	UK	P: 2, S: 6
SE	2015	Pronovost *et al.*[122]	USA	P: 2
SE	2015	RCoA[123]	UK	P: 11
SE	2015	Liang *et al.*[124]	USA	P: 3
SE	2015	Gwatirisa[125]	USA	P: 2
SE	2015	Costa Ada S Jr *et al.*[126]	Brazil	S: 2
SE	2015	Steelman *et al.*[127]	USA	P: 1
SE	2015	Marshall *et al.*[128]	Canada	P: 2
SLR	2005	Fearon *et al.*[129]	Europe	P: 9
SLR	2006	Wind *et al.*[130]	Europe, Denmark	P: 11, S: 2
SLR	2008	Lemmens *et al.*[131]	Europe, The Netherlands	P: 5
SLR	2009	Haller *et al.*[7]	Europe, Switzerland	P: 29, S: 1
SLR	2011	ASA[132]	USA	P: 5
SLR	2011	De Hert S *et al.*[133]	Europe, Belgium	P: 15
SLR	2012	ASA[134]	USA	P: 2, S: 4
SLR	2013	Cerantola *et al.*[135]	Europe	P: 14
SLR	2013	Dikken *et al.*[136]	Europe, The Netherlands	P: 5, S: 2
SLR	2013	Gustafsson *et al.*[137]	Europe, Sweden	P: 21
SLR	2014	Halverson *et al.*[138]	USA	P: 9
VS	2005	Gagliardi *et al.*[139]	Canada	P: 2, S: 2
VS	2006	Birkmeyer *et al.*[140]	USA	S: 1
VS	2006	Hollenbeck *et al.*[141]	USA	P: 2, S: 1
VS	2007	Hedrick *et al.*[142]	USA	P: 5
VS	2007	Hollenbeck *et al.*[143]	USA	P: 4, S: 1
VS	2007	Holt *et al.*[144]	UK	S: 1
VS	2007	Makary *et al.*[145]	USA	P: 1
VS	2008	Kaplan *et al.*[146]	USA	S: 1
VS	2009	Bhattacharyya *et al.*[147]	USA	P: 3, S: 1
VS	2009	Bilimoria *et al.*[148]	USA	P: 3, S: 7
VS	2009	Kreckler *et al.*[149]	UK	P: 4
VS	2009	Kuwabara *et al.*[150]	Japan	P: 1, S: 1
VS	2010	Ball *et al.*[151]	USA	P: 2
VS	2010	Bozic *et al.*[152]	USA	P: 4, S: 2
VS	2010	Brokelmann and Backer[153]	Europe, Germany	P: 4, S: 1
VS	2010	Brooke *et al.*[154]	USA	P: 1
VS	2010	Chen *et al.*[155]	USA	P: 1
VS	2010	Sedlack[156]	UK	P: 1
VS	2011	Gastmeier *et al.*[157]	Europe, Germany	P: 1
VS	2011	Mu *et al.*[158]	USA	S: 1
VS	2011	SooHoo *et al.*[159]	USA	P: 16, S: 2
VS	2012	Comber *et al.*[160]	Europe, Ireland	S: 2
VS	2012	Mathoulin-Pelissier *et al.*[161]	Europe, France	S: 1
VS	2012	Kondo *et al.*[162]	Japan, USA	P: 10
VS	2012	Renzi *et al.*[163]	Europe, Italy	P: 1
VS	2012	Vrijens *et al.*[164]	Europe, Belgium	P: 1, S: 1
VS	2013	Bergman *et al.*[165]	Canada	P: 14
VS	2013	Bilimoria *et al.*[166]	USA	P: 1, S: 8
VS	2013	Dimick *et al.*[180]	USA	S: 2

Continued

Table 1 Continued

Type of article	Year	Article author	Developer country	Number of measures
VS	2013	Nojiri *et al.*[167]	Japan	P: 1, S: 2
VS	2013	Kwon *et al.*[168]	USA	P: 1
VS	2014	Bergman *et al.*[169]	Canada	P: 10
VS	2014	Cataife *et al.*[170]	USA	P: 2
VS	2014	Keenan *et al.*[171]	USA	P: 5
VS	2014	Kitazawa *et al.*[172]	Japan	S: 1
VS	2014	Leonard *et al.*[173]	Europe, Belgium	S: 1
VS	2014	Richman *et al.*[174]	USA	P: 2
VS	2014	Singh *et al.*[175]	USA	S: 2
VS	2015	Stordeur *et al.*[176]	Europe, Belgium	S: 1
VS	2015	Scott *et al.*[177]	USA	P: 1
VS	2015	Gourin *et al.*[178]	USA	S: 1
VS	2015	Scally *et al.*[179]	USA	P: 5

postoperative (following transfer from the recovery area), or all (spanning the whole perioperative journey).

We also included the indicator's name, country of origin, developer's definition, the type of article the indicator is identified from, the surgical subspecialty the indicator is based on, the level of evidence for its validity, and the quality domain measured. We reported ranges rather than individual scores of evidence in order to account for the heterogeneity of the literature on which indicators are based. The search and data extraction were performed by two authors (M.C. and D.G.). Differences in extracted data were discussed and consensus reached with a third author (S.R.M.).

Results

We identified 43 860 journal articles of which 98 articles met all the inclusion criteria. Fig. 1 provides a description of the selection process for the journal articles. The most common



Fig 1. Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) flow diagram. CINAHL: The Cumulative Index to Nursing and Allied Health Literature.

reason for excluding articles after full text review was the absence of a clinical indicator. The grey literature search further identified 43 relevant indicator programme publications, resulting in a total of 131 publications included in this review.

The included publications are presented in Table 1. From these we identified a total of 1282 indicators. The majority of these indicators came from clinical practice guidelines (36%, *n*=456), followed by service evaluations (13%, *n*=166), validation studies (12%, *n*=153), audits (11%, *n*=142), systematic literature reviews (10%, *n*=124), expert consensus (7%, *n*=88), narrative reviews (7%, *n*=86), surveys, (3%, *n*=57), and case studies (1%, *n*=10).

Most of the indicators were developed for general surgery (83%, *n*=1064), followed by orthopaedic (6%, *n*=82), upper gastrointestinal (6%, *n*=73), urology (3%, *n*=39), vascular (1%, *n*=10), gynaecological (1%, *n*=9), and breast surgery (*n*=5).

The indicators were split into structure (36%, *n*=463) and process measures (64%, *n*=819). These were further subdivided into preoperative (27%, *n*=342), intraoperative (29%, *n*=373), postoperative (18%, *n*=227), and all (26%, *n*=339). The majority of indicators (53%, *n*=675) did not have a level of evidence described in the shortlisted publication. These indicators were split into structure (48%, *n*=325) and process indicators (52%, *n*=350). The remaining 47% of indicators (*n*=598) had a published evidence base, ranging from 1a (randomized controlled trials) to 5 (expert opinion based).

As some indicators were mentioned in several different publications, duplicated indicators were aggregated, resulting in a total of 261 indicators. The aggregated structure indicators (*n*=112) are presented in Supplementary Table 1 and the aggregated process indicators (*n*=149) are presented in Supplementary Table 2.

The dimensions of quality measured by the aggregated indicators were: effectiveness (38%, *n*=136) [split into structure (S) 21%, *n*=35, process (P) 79%, *n*=145], safety (29%, *n*=104) (S 68%, n=71, P 32%, *n*=33), efficiency (26%, *n*=64) (S 57%, *n*=36, P 44%, *n*=28), timeliness (14%, *n*=30) (S 28%, *n*=8, P 72%, *n*=28), patient-centredness (4%, *n*=13) (S 31%, *n*=4, P 69%, *n*=9), and equity (2%, *n*=7) (S 100%, *n*=7). Note that some indicators measured multiple quality domains.

Discussion

We have identified 261 clinical indicators relevant to structure and process measurement of perioperative care. The majority were process indicators (58%). About half of the structure indicators (51%) were relevant to the whole perioperative pathway. The process indicators were approximately evenly split between preoperative (32%), perioperative (28%), and postoperative (27%) care. The dimensions of quality most frequently addressed were effectiveness (38%) and patient safety (29%). Our most notable finding was that the majority of indicators (53%) did not have a level of evidence ascribed in their literature.

This is the first systematic review of perioperative process and structure indicators that has been performed, allowing no direct comparison with previous work. A systematic review clarifying the number of indicators available solely for anaesthesia care was published in 2009.[7] This identified 108 anaesthetic clinical indicators, split between process (42%), outcome (57%), and structure (1%) indicators. Our review focusing on the whole perioperative pathway identified a higher proportion of structure indicators. The previous systematic review of anaesthesia-related indicators also identified that the majority (62%) of their prescriptive indicators had a low level (4–5) of evidence associated with their descriptions.

Our review also shows that most perioperative indicators have no or a very low associated level of evidence beyond face validity. For the indicators with a published evidence base, the level of evidence varied between level 1a (randomized clinical trials) to 5 (expert opinion). 'Expert opinion' was itself a broad category ranging from a singular expert viewpoint to a more rigorous international Delphi process.

Clinical indicators should be based on the best available and most robust scientific evidence.[17] The strength of the evidence for an indicator will determine its scientific soundness and the likelihood that improvements in the clinical indicator will produce consistent and meaningful improvements in quality of care.[4] Moreover, indicators only become convincing improvement tools if a causal link to important outcomes can be demonstrated. For example, if it is shown that a documented pre-anaesthetic consultation leads to a decrease in postoperative morbidity, only then can this indicator be considered a valid quality improvement target.[18] However, this approach illustrates why developing higher level evidence from randomized trials can be challenging for clinical indicators. It may be unethical to assign care considered by clinicians to be substandard. Other trial designs can offer sufficient evidence if sources of bias are identified and controlled for.[19] Both the Effective Healthcare Program of the U.S. Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality[20] and the Grading of Recommendations Assessment, Development and Evaluation Working Group[21] provide guidance for using non-randomized study designs in guideline development.

Pronovost and colleagues[3] state: 'Indicators are the lenses through which we quantitatively determine quality.' Our review demonstrates that the majority of perioperative indicators, both structural and process, measure the effectiveness, safety, and efficiency of care, with patient-centredness and equity less common. Healthcare professionals strive for efficiently delivered safe and effective patient care. However, this approach may not completely reflect the needs and wants of patients themselves. Given the opportunity, patients are unlikely to ask their perioperative teams about rates of goal directed haemodynamic optimization when they could ask about waiting times for surgery, presence of consultant led care etc.[22,23] Further research should aim at developing clinical indicators that are based on patient's perceptions and perspective over quality of perioperative care.[24] This approach is already being supported by work in the outcomes domain, such as the Core Outcome Measures for Perioperative and Anaesthetic Care (COMPAC) initiative,[8,9] which is part of the Core Outcome Measures for Effectiveness Trials campaign.[25] The aim of COMPAC is to develop a core outcome set for trials in perioperative medicine agreed by multiple stakeholders, including patients and carers.

Our review shows that an increasing number of perioperative clinical and safety indicators are published year on year. The majority of the indicators we identified came from clinical practice guidelines followed by service evaluations, perhaps reflecting an increasing provider drive for accountability, benchmarking, and quality improvement. As such, there is a powerful imperative to ensure the indicators chosen are valid and relevant.[26] Quality indicators should comply with high quality standards and should be constructed in a careful and transparent manner. They should be relevant (relevant to the dimensions of quality), valid (based on the best available evidence[17] and have a strong correlation with the current quality

of care and caregiver experience),[27] interpretable,[28] generalizable,[3] and feasible. It has previously been suggested that the clinical and academic communities produce a specific perioperative Quality Indicator Development Framework to funnel potential quality indicators from the latest research and quality improvement practices into a formal development or consensus programme.[29] This could then be followed by a rigorous evaluation of indicator implementation, to complete the loop back to the assessment of potential indicators.

As healthcare is continually changing, even established well-developed indicators should be re-evaluated on a regular basis, possibly by regular audit of their use or establishing and reassessing links to important patient outcomes. The decision can then be made to 'retain, revise, replace, or retire' them.[30–32]

Our review shows the majority of the indicators have been developed in the USA. Indeed, the adoption of 'practice parameters' (standards and guidelines) by anaesthetists in the USA in the 1980s helped increase the safety of anaesthesia. The first sets of structure indicator standards for basic monitoring were developed by the Harvard hospitals,[33] and similar ones were later adopted by the American Society of Anaesthesiologists.[34] In recent years, there has been an upsurgence of value-based healthcare and payment policies which may drive the development of new quality metrics. These include the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS) new Quality Payment Program and Merit-based Incentive Payment System.

Despite most indicators being developed in the USA, the UK has the most published indicators addressing the provision of specialist hospital services, for example, the provision of out-of-hours endoscopy, elderly review, radiology, and other diagnostic services. This may reflect the National Health Service current model of care of disseminated services amongst hospitals within a region rather than centralisation.

We found that the most frequently cited structure indicators refer to the annual case volumes of provider hospitals and their availability of set perioperative management protocols. The majority of structure indicators span the whole perioperative pathway: hospitals either provide access to 24 h computerised tomography scanning or they do not. Healthcare can be assessed by monitoring the settings in which it takes place.[35] This evaluation assumes that given the proper environment, instruments, and staff, good medical care is achieved.[36] This approach offers the advantage of dealing with fairly stable and accessible information that can be reliably surveyed.[37] The major limitation is that the relationship between structures and patient outcomes may not be well established.

In our review, 62% of structure indicators had no associated level of evidence compared with 47% of process indicators. Few perioperative structure indicators have been tested in prospective trials. This may be because systems and structural change is costly, and often requires large-scale investment. Changes in processes may be more feasible for the front-line clinician and researcher. Structural changes may include local or nationwide policy developments. However, writing a policy does not ensure it is widely implemented in practice. Qualitative research approaches may be useful tools for the evaluation of the impact of policy change.[26,38]

Process indicators offer great promise as quality improvement tools as they often define targets that have to be reached. They reflect the care that clinicians are delivering day to day and can be incorporated into routine data collection. Clinicians feel accountable for them, rather than for outcome measures that may be affected by other variables.[39] However, they have to be used cautiously, even if links to causal outcomes have been demonstrated. A clinician may perform well in one process but not in another. If the indicators do not cover all the processes that can affect outcomes, they may be misleading.[39]

Reviewing the most frequent aggregated process indicators of this review, we see that patients are recommended to have a well-documented preoperative assessment and consent process, with a risk of death estimated and communicated. Timely and appropriate antibiotics should be given to a warm patient, and in their recovery period they should be mobilized early with appropriate venothromboembolic prophylaxis. These are all straightforward and uncontroversial processes. The focus should be on performing these effective processes reliably and consistently. It has been reported that clinicians rarely deliver effective interventions more than 80% of the time.[40] Healthcare has turned to high reliability organizations (e.g. aviation) for guidance.[41] The use of checklists and other memory aids, and visible QI data analysis, such as run charts, could help prompt healthcare staff and even patients themselves to achieve important targets. Technological advances mean that compliance rates to quality indicators could be assisted and monitored, for example, with the Enhanced Recovery compliance mobile app.[42]

Indicators can also help reduce levels of waste, benchmark current care, and support patient choice of providers.[17] However, defining the right indicators alone is insufficient to close the feedback loop required for quality improvement. Benn and colleagues[43] investigated the use of quality indicators in anaesthesia and how to feedback the data to improve care. They concluded that effective feedback from quality indicators is timely, continuous, and tailored to the recipient. The goal of measurement is to learn, understand, and improve, so the measurement system must fit within a system geared for continual improvement.[3] This could include an electronic health record system which continually monitors and analyses routinely collected patient data. This could have inbuilt mechanisms to facilitate personalized timely feedback for targeted local improvement.

Limitations

Established methods for the systematic retrieval, appraisal, and synthesis of the literature were used. However, we also searched the unpublished and grey literature, including information available from quality initiatives and accreditation bodies, to maximise the likelihood of identifying all relevant work. This may have enhanced the sensitivity of our search strategy but led to including information that has not been peer-reviewed.

Only work published in English was included. This may have introduced language bias, and a number of clinical indicators may have been missed. It is possible that our search was not exhaustive despite using a comprehensive search strategy, but it is unlikely that we missed broad categories of important quality indicators.

Future work

This list of indicators should contribute to promote and support quality improvement initiatives in perioperative care. Gaps in evidence for the validity of indicators should be explored, by exploring causal relationships between the

structures, processes, and outcomes of healthcare. There may be scope in setting standards for describing the level of evidence for quality indicators.

This may inform development of a specific perioperative Quality Indicator Development Framework to aid the expansion of feasible, reliable, and valid perioperative indicators. There is also a need for more patient-centred clinical indicators, and indicators ensuring the equity of delivered care.

Conclusions

Despite widespread use, the majority of indicators for measurement of quality and safety in perioperative care are not supported by a high grade of scientific evidence. The reporting of the evidence underpinning these indicators is also poor. Most indicators focus on the effectiveness, safety, and efficiency of care, with patient-centred metrics found less frequently in the literature. There may be scope for clinical and academic communities to develop a specific perioperative Quality Indicator Development Framework to funnel potential quality indicators from the latest research and quality improvement practices into a formal development or consensus programmes.

Authors' contributions

Conception, design, acquisition, and analysis of data and drafting of article: M.C.
Acquisition and analysis of data: D.G.
Design, interpretation of data, revision, and drafting of article: S.R.M.

Declarations of interest

S.R.M. is Director of the National Institute of Academic Anaesthesia (NIAA) Health Services Research Centre, which has governance oversight of the Royal College of Anaesthetists' National Audit Projects, Perioperative Quality Improvement Programme, and National Emergency Laparotomy Audit. She is Chief Investigator and Project team lead of the Perioperative Quality Improvement Programme and a project team member of the National Emergency Laparotomy Audit and Royal College of Anaesthetists' 6th National Audit Project. S.R.M. is associate National Clinical Director for elective care with NHS England, which provides funding to Healthcare Quality Improvement Partnership (HQIP) for National Clinical Audits.

Funding

S.R.M. is funded by a Health Foundation Improvement Science Fellowship, the National Institute for Health Research (NIHR) Biomedical Research Centre funding scheme (UCLH) and for her role as Director of the NIAA Health Services Research Centre. P.M. is funded by an Australian National Health and Medical Research Council Practitioner Fellowship.

Appendix 1.

Search strategy

Systematic review of:

1. Database literature search (2005–2016)
2. Grey literature search (2005–2016)
3. Websites/documents (2005–2016)

1. Database literature search (2005–2016)

A. Medline (Ovid)
B. Embase (Ovid)
C. CINAHL
D. Cochrane library

2. Grey literature search

A. Google scholar
B. SIGLE–System for Information on Grey Literature in Europe
C. Expert opinion on unpublished indicators developed by quality initiatives and professional organizations
D. Databases and sources of international indicators:
   a. www.rand.org
   b. www.ahcpr.gov
   c. www.newcastle.ac.uk/qip
   d. http://nprdc.man.uk

3. Websites/documents

A. UK
B. USA
C. Canada
D. Australia/New Zealand

1. Database literature search (2005–2016)

A. **Medline (Ovid)**—25 644 articles

Limits, 10 yr (2005–2016), Humans, English

(exp "Quality Indicators, Health Care/"[MeSH] OR foc "Quality of health care/" [MeSH] OR Quality indi*.mp OR exp "Quality Assurance, Health Care/" [MeSH] OR exp "Outcome and Process Assessment (Health Care)"/ [MeSH] OR exp "Process Assessment (Health Care) [MeSH] OR Quality measure*.mp OR Performance measure*.mp OR Structure meas*.mp OR Structure indicator.mp OR Structure criter*.mp OR Structure quality indicators.mp OR Structure quality.mp OR Structure assessment.mp OR Structure health care.mp OR Quality criter*.mp OR Process measure*.mp OR exp "Standard of Care/" [MeSH] OR process assessment.mp OR health care quality.mp OR health care quality indicators.mp OR quality performance.mp OR quality assessment.mp) AND (exp "Perioperative Care/" [MeSH] OR periop*.mp OR perop*.mp OR peri-op*.mp OR per-op*.mp OR preop*.mp OR pre-op*.mp OR postop*.mp OR post-op*.mp OR intraop*.mp OR Intra-op*.mp OR exp "Perioperative Period/" [MeSH] OR perioperative complications.mp OR exp "Preoperative Care/" [MeSH] OR exp "Preoperative Period/" OR exp "Intraoperative Care/" [MeSH] OR exp "Intraoperative Period/" [MeSH] OR exp "Intraoperative Complications/" [MeSH] OR anaesth*.mp OR anesth*.mp OR exp "Anesthesia/" [MeSH] OR exp "Anesthesia, General/" [MeSH] OR exp "General Surgery/" [MeSH] OR exp "Postoperative Period/" [MeSH] OR exp "Postoperative Care/" [MeSH] OR surg*.mp OR operat*.mp OR exp "Specialties, surgical/" [MeSH] OR foc "Surgical procedures, operative/" [MeSH]

B. CINAHL Plus—1424 articles

Limits:10 yr (2005–2016), Adult, English

("Quality Indicators, Health Care/" OR "Quality of health care/" OR Quality indi*.mp OR Quality indicators in healthcare OR Quality indicators: a tool for quality monitoring and improvement OR Quality assurance in healthcare OR "Outcome and Process Assessment"/ OR "Process Assessment (Health

Care) OR Quality measure*.mp OR Performance measure* OR Structure meas* OR Structure indicator OR Structure criter* OR Structure qualit* OR Structure assessment OR Structure health care OR Quality criter* OR Process measure OR "Standard of Care/" OR process assessment OR health care quality OR health care quality indicators OR quality performance OR quality assessment) AND ("Perioperative Care/" OR periop* OR perop* OR peri-op* OR per-op* OR preop* OR pre-op* OR postop* OR post-op* OR intraop* OR Intra-op* OR "Perioperative Period/" OR perioperative complications = OR "Preoperative Care/" OR "Preoperative Period/" OR "Intraoperative Care/" OR "Intraoperative Period/" OR "Intraoperative Complications/" OR anaesth*.mp OR Anesth$.mp OR "Anesthesia/" OR "General Surgery/" OR "Postoperative Period/" OR "Postoperative Care/" OR surg*.mp OR operat*.mp OR "Specialties, surgical/")

C. EMBASE (Ovid)—8374 articles

Limits:10 yr (2005–2016), Humans, English

(foc "Health Care Quality/"[MeSH] OR Quality indi*.mp OR Quality measure*.mp OR Performance measure*.mp OR Structure meas*.mp OR Structure indicator.mp OR Structure criter*.mp OR Structure quality indicators.mp OR Structure quality.mp OR Structure assessment.mp OR Structure health care.mp OR Quality criter*.mp OR Process measure*.mp OR process assessment.mp OR health care quality.mp OR health care quality indicators.mp OR quality performance.mp OR quality assessment.mp) AND (Perioperative Care.mp OR peri-op*.mp OR perop*.mp OR peri-op*.mp OR per-op*.mp OR pre-op*.mp OR pre-op*.mp OR post-op*.mp OR intraop*.mp OR Intra-op*.mp OR exp "Perioperative Period/" [MeSH] OR perioperative complications.mp OR exp "Preoperative Care/" [MeSH] OR foc "Preoperative Period/" [MeSH] OR Intraoperative Care.mp OR foc "Intraoperative Period/" [MeSH] OR exp "Perioperative Complications/" [MeSH] OR anaesth*.mp OR anesth*.mp OR exp "Anesthesia/" [MeSH] OR exp "Anesthesia, General/" [MeSH] OR exp "General Surgery/" [MeSH] OR foc "Postoperative Period/" [MeSH] OR exp "Postoperative Care/" [MeSH] OR foc Surgery/ OR Surgical procedures, operative.mp)

D. Cochrane Library—8418 articles

Limits: 10 yr (2005–2016)

("Quality Indicators, Health Care/" OR "Quality of health care/" OR Quality indi*.mp OR "Quality Assurance, Health Care/" OR "Outcome and Process Assessment" OR "Process Assessment (Health Care) OR Quality measure*.mp OR Performance measure*.mp OR Structure meas*.mp OR Structure indicator.mp OR Structure criter*.mp OR Structure quality indicators.mp OR Structure quality.mp OR Structure assessment.mp OR Structure health care.mp OR Process measure*.mp OR "Standard of Care/" OR process assessment.mp OR health care quality.mp OR health care quality indicators.mp OR Quality performance.mp OR quality assessment.mp) AND ("Perioperative Care/" OR periop*.mp OR perop*.mp OR peri-op*.mp OR per-op*.mp OR preop*.mp OR pre-op*.mp OR post-op*.mp OR post-op*.mp OR intraop*.mp OR Intra-op*.mp OR "Perioperative Period/" OR perioperative complications.mp OR "Preoperative Care/" OR "Preoperative Period/" OR "Intraoperative Care/" OR "Intraoperative Period/" OR "Intraoperative Complications/" OR anaesth*.mp OR anesth*.mp OR "General Surgery/" OR "Postoperative Period/" OR "Postoperative Care/" OR surg*.mp OR operat*.mp)

2. Grey literature search (2005–2016)

A. Google scholar
B. SIGLE—System for Information on Grey Literature in Europe
C. Expert opinion on unpublished indicators developed by quality initiatives and professional organizations
D. Databases and sources of international indicators:
   a. www.rand.org
   b. www.ahcpr.gov
   c. www.newcastle.ac.uk/qip
   d. http://nprdc.man.uk

3. Websites/documents (2005–2016)

A. United Kingdom
B. United States
C. Canada
D. Australia / New Zealand

A. UK

- **Royal College of Anaesthetists (RCoA)**
  - 91. Anaesthesia Clinical Services Accreditation (ACSA)
  - Guidelines for the Provision of Anaesthetic Services (GPAS)
- **Royal College of Surgeons (RCoS)**
  - 94. The higher risk general surgical patient
  - 95. Emergency Surgery: Standards for unscheduled surgical care
  - 112. Getting it right first time
- **National Institute for Health and Care Excellence**
  - 96. Hip fracture
  - 97. Inflammatory bowel disease
  - 98. Surgical site infection
  - 108. Venous thromboembolism prophylaxis
    - o 109. UGRA
- **Information Services Division Scotland**
  - 110. Colorectal Cancer Quality Performance Indicators
  - 111. Cancelled planned operations
- **National Emergency Laparotomy Audit**
  - 89. Organizational report of the National Emergency Laparotomy Audit (NELA)—RCoA
  - 90. The first patient report of the NELA—RCoA
- **National Confidential Enquiry into Patient Outcome and Death**
  - 92. Knowing the risk
  - 93. An age old problem
- **Healthcare Quality Improvement Partnership datasets**

B. USA

- **American Society of Anesthesiologists (ASA)** www.asahq.org
  - Standards, guidelines and practice parameters
    - 119. ASA standards for basic monitoring
    - 120. ASA basic standards for preanesthesia care
    - 121. ASA documentation of anesthesia care
    - 122. ASA standards for postanesthesia care
  - ASA Committee on Performance and Outcome Program
- **Anaesthesia Quality Institute (AQI): National Anaesthesia Clinical Outcomes Registry (NACOR)**
  - 114. AQI—Intraoperative
  - 115. AQI—Postanaesthesia care unit discharge
  - 116. AQI Qualified Clinical Data Registry (QCDR) measure specification

- 117. AQI—Procedural sedation
- 118. AQI—Recommended indicators

- **American Medical Association (AMA)**
  - AMA Physician Consortium for Performance Improvement Program
  - AMA Clinical practice improvement and patient safety
- **Ambulatory Care Quality Alliance (AQA)**
  - 125. AQA Approved measures chart 2009
- **National Quality Forum (NQF)**
  - 124. Endorsement summary: surgery
- **[CMS/CDC (SCIP)]—Centers for Disease Control and Prevention—Surgical Care Improvement Project**
- **Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS):** Physician Quality Reporting System (PQRS): Qualified Clinical Data Registry (QCDR): Hospital Inpatient Quality Reporting (HIQR)
  - 123. PQRS measures dataset
- **The Joint Commission (TJC)/SCIP**
- **Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality (AHRQ)**
- International Quality Indicator Project — Maryland
  - SCIP Measures
- Maryland Hospital Association/International Quality Indicator Project (MHA/IQIP)
- **Veterans Health Administration (VHA)**
- **SCIP**
  - 113. SCIP core measure set

C. Canada

- Canadian Anaesthesiologist Society Guidelines

D. Australia and New Zealand

- Australian Council on Healthcare Standards (ACHS)—Care Evaluation Program—need help and a bit more
  - National Health and Medical Research Council (NHMRC)
- Australian Commission on Safety and Quality in Healthcare Initiative (ACSHQ)
- Australian New Zealand College of Anaesthetists (ANZCA)

Appendix 2.

Data extraction form

Structure and process indicators in perioperative care

Article first author: last name, initial	
Journal name	
Publication year	
Article type	1. Audit (A) 2. Clinical practice guideline (CPG) 3. Case study (CS) 4. Expert consensus (EC) 5. Literature review (LR) 6. Review (R) 7. Survey (S) 8. Service evaluation (SE) 9. Systematic literature review (SLR) 10. Validation study (VS)
Developer name	
Developer description	1. Accreditation body (AB) 2. Hospital (H) 3. Other (O) 4. Professional organization (PO) 5. Quality initiative (QI) 6. University (U)
Number of developer sites used for indicator validation	1. Single site (S) 2. Multi-site (M) 3. NA
Developer country	1. UK 2. USA 3. Canada 4. Australia 5. New Zealand 6. Europe, Country
Indicator area	1. Structure 2. Process
Type of care	1. Elective (EL) 2. Emergency (EM) 3. Both (B)
Indicator name	
Indicator definition	
Indicator origin	
Indicator disease/surgery Specific	1. Yes 2. No
Disease/surgery name	1. Breast (B) 2. Colorectal (C) 3. Elderly (E) 4. General surgery (G) 5. Hip fracture (H) 6. Orthopaedic (O) 7. Oesophageal cancer (OC) 8. Pancreas (P) 9. Urology (U) 10. Vascular (V)
Timing of indicator	1. All (A) 2. Preoperative (PR) 3. Intraoperative (I) 4. Postoperative (PO)
Level of evidence for indicator	1. Level 1a, 1b, 1c 2. Level 2a, 2b, 2c 3. Level 3a, 3b 4. Level 4 5. Level 5 6. None 7. NA
Number of patients in evidence	
Dimensions of quality	• **Safe (S)**: Avoiding harm to patients from the care that is intended to help them. • **Effective (EC)**: Providing services based on scientific knowledge to all who could benefit and refraining from providing services to those not likely to benefit (avoiding underuse and misuse, respectively). • **Patient-centred (P)**: Providing care that is respectful of and responsive to individual patient preferences, needs, and values, and ensuring that patient values guide all clinical decisions.

Continued

Structure and process indicators in perioperative care	
	• **Timely (T)**: Reducing waits and sometimes harmful delays for both those who receive and those who give care. • **Efficient (EN)**: Avoiding waste, including waste of equipment, supplies, ideas, and energy. • **Equitable (EQ)**: Providing care that does not vary in quality because of personal characteristics such as gender, ethnicity, geographic location, and socioeconomic status.
Data extractor comments	

Supplementary data

Supplementary data related to this article can be found at https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bja.2017.10.001.

References

1. Dimick JB, Chen SL, Taheri PA, Henderson WG, Khuri SF, Campbell DAJ. Hospital costs associated with surgical complications: a report from the private-sector national surgical quality improvement program. *J Am Coll Surg* 2004; **199**: 531–7
2. Berwick DM. Measuring physicians' quality and performance: adrift on Lake Wobegon. *JAMA* 2009; **302**: 2485–6
3. Pronovost PJ, Nolan T, Zeger S, Miller M, Rubin H. How can clinicians measure safety and quality in acute care? *Lancet* 2004; **363**: 1061–7
4. Mainz J. Defining and classifying clinical indicators for quality improvement. *Int J Qual Health Care* 2003; **15**: 523–30
5. Schifftner TL, Grunwald GK, Henderson WG, Main D, Khuri SF. Relationship of processes and structures of care in general surgery to postoperative outcomes: a hierarchical analysis. *J Am Coll Surg* 2007; **204**: 1166–77
6. Donabedian A. Special article: the quality of care: how can it be assessed? *JAMA* 1988; **260**: 1743–8
7. Haller G, Stoelwinder J, Myles PS, McNeil J. Quality and safety indicators in anesthesia: a systematic review. *Anesthesiology* 2009; **110**: 1158–75
8. Boney O, Moonesinghe SR, Myles PS, Grocott MPW. Standardizing endpoints in perioperative research. *Can J Anaesth* 2016: 159–68
9. Myles PS, Grocott MPW, Boney O, Moonesinghe SR. Standardizing end points in perioperative trials: Towards a core and extended outcome set. *Br J Anaesth* 2016; **116**: 586–9
10. Lohr KN, Schroeder SA. A strategy for quality assurance in medicare. *N Engl J Med* 1990; **322**: 707–12
11. Campbell SM, Braspenning J, Hutchinson A, Marshall MN. Research methods used in developing and applying quality indicators in primary care. *BMJ* 2003; **326**: 816–9
12. Howick J, Chalmers I, Glasziou P, et al. *The 2011 Oxford CEBM levels of evidence (introductory document)*. Oxford Centre for Evidence-Based Medicine; 2011. Available from: http://www.cebm.net/index.aspx?o=5653. [Accessed 30 June 2016]
13. Devillé WL, Buntinx F, Bouter LM, et al. Conducting systematic reviews of diagnostic studies: didactic guidelines. *BMC Med Res Methodol* 2002; **2**: 9
14. Moher D, Liberati A, Tetzlaff J, Altman DG, PRISMA Group. Preferred reporting items for systematic reviews and meta-analyses: the PRISMA statement. *PLoS Med* 2009; **6**, e1000097
15. Higgins JPT, Green S, editors. *Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions Version* 5.1.0. The Cochrane Collaboration; 2011. Available from: http://handbook.cochrane.org [updated March 2011]
16. Haddaway NR, Collins AM, Coughlin D, Kirk S. The role of google scholar in evidence reviews and its applicability to grey literature searching. *PLoS One* 2015; **10**, e0138237
17. Mainz J. Developing evidence-based clinical indicators: a state of the art. *Int J Qual Health Care* 2003; **15**(Suppl. 1). i5–11
18. Audisio RA, Gennari R, Sunouchi K, et al. Preoperative assessment of cancer in elderly patients: a pilot study. *Support Cancer Ther* 2003; **1**: 55–60
19. MacMahon S, Collins R. Reliable assessment of the effects of treatment on mortality and major morbidity, II: observational studies. *Lancet* 2017; **357**: 455–62
20. Norris SL, Atkins D, Bruening W, et al. Observational studies in systematic reviews of comparative effectiveness: AHRQ and the effective health care program. *J Clin Epidemiol* 2011; **64**: 1178–86
21. Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Schunemann HJ, Tugwell P, Knottnerus A. GRADE guidelines: a new series of articles in the journal of clinical epidemiology. *J Clin Epidemiol* 2011; **64**: 380–2
22. Hyder JA, Niconchuk J, Glance LG, et al. What can the national quality forum tell us about performance measurement in anesthesiology? *Anesth Analg* 2015; **120**: 440–8
23. Porter ME. What is value in health care? *N Engl J Med* 2010; **363**: 2477–81
24. Stark PA, Myles PS, Burke JA. Development and psychometric evaluation of a postoperative quality of recovery score: the QoR-15. *Anesthesiology* 2013; **118**: 1332–40
25. Core outcome measures in effectiveness trials initiative. Available from: http://www.comet-initiative.org. [Accessed 25 March 2017]
26. Moonesinghe SR. Innovation good… evaluation essential. A plea for formal evaluation of new pathways of care and ways of working. *Br J Anaesth* 2016; **116**: 151–3
27. Wollersheim H, Hermens R, Hulscher M, et al. Clinical indicators: development and applications. *Neth J Med* 2007; **65**: 15–22
28. McGlynn EA. Choosing and evaluating clinical performance measures. *Jt Comm J Qual Improv* 1998; **24**: 470–9
29. Santana MJ, Stelfox HT. Development and evaluation of evidence-informed quality indicators for adult injury care. *Ann Surg* 2014; **259**: 186–92
30. Shojania KG, Grimshaw JM. Evidence-based quality improvement: the state of the science. *Health Aff* 2005; **24**: 138–50
31. Shekelle P, Eccles MP, Grimshaw JM, Woolf SH. When should clinical guidelines be updated? *BMJ Br Med J* 2001; **323**: 155
32. Mattke S. When should measures be updated? Development of a conceptual framework for maintenance of

quality-of-care measures. *Qual Saf Health Care* 2008; **17**: 182–6
33. Eichhorn JH, Cooper JB, Cullen DJ, Maier WR, Philip JH, Seeman RG. Standards for patient monitoring during anesthesia at harvard medical school. *JAMA* 1986; **256**: 1017–20
34. American Society of Anesthesiologists. *Standards for Basic Anesthetic Monitoring*. 2015. https://www.asahq.org/~/media/Sites/ASAHQ/Files/Public/Resources/standards-guidelines/standards-for-basic-anesthetic-monitoring.pdf. [Accessed 30 June 2016]
35. Donabedian A. Evaluating the quality of medical care. *Milbank Mem Fund Q* 1966; **83**: 691–729
36. Weinerman ER. Appraisal of medical care programs. *Am J Pub Health* 1950; **40**: 1129–34
37. NELA project team. *First organisational report of the national emergency laparotomy audit*. London: Royal College of Anaesthetists; 2014
38. Pope C, Mays N. Reaching the parts other methods cannot reach: an introduction to qualitative methods in health and health services research. *BMJ Br Med J* 1995; **311**: 42–5
39. Rubin HR, Pronovost P, Diette GB. The advantages and disadvantages of process-based measures of health care quality. *Int J Qual Heal Care* 2001; **13**: 469–74
40. Resar RK. Making noncatastrophic health care processes reliable: learning to walk before running in creating high-reliability organizations. *Health Serv Res* 2006; **41**: 1677–89
41. Weick KE, Sutcliffe KM, Obstfeld D. Organizing for high reliability: processes of collective mindfulness. *Cris Manag* 2008; **3**: 81–123
42. Mythen MG. *Enhanced Recovery App (ER-App): using data to improve perioperative quality in elective surgery*. 2015. Available from: http://www.health.org.uk/programmes/innovating-improvement/projects/enhanced-recovery-app-er-app-using-data-improve. [Accessed 25 March 2017]
43. Benn J, Arnold G, Wei I, Riley C, Aleva F. Using quality indicators in anaesthesia: feeding back data to improve care. *Br J Anaesth* 2012; **109**: 80–91
44. *Healthcare quality improvement partnership national clinical audit programme: national joint registry*. 2015. Available from: http://www.hqip.org.uk/national-programmes/a-z-of-nca/. [Accessed 30 June 2016]
45. *Healthcare quality improvement partnership national clinical audit programme: adult cardiac surgery*. 2015. Available from: http://www.hqip.org.uk/national-programmes/a-z-of-nca/. [Accessed 30 June 2016]
46. *Healthcare quality improvement partnership national clinical audit Programme: national vascular registry*. 2015. Available from: http://www.hqip.org.uk/national-programmes/a-z-of-nca/. [Accessed 30 June 2016]
47. *Healthcare quality improvement partnership national clinical audit programme: bowel cancer audit*. 2015. Available from: http://www.hqip.org.uk/national-programmes/a-z-of-nca/. [Accessed 30 June 2016]
48. *Healthcare quality improvement partnership national clinical audit programme: national audit oesophageal gastric cancer*. 2015. Available from: http://www.hqip.org.uk/national-programmes/a-z-of-nca/. [Accessed 30 June 2016]
49. *Healthcare quality improvement partnership national clinical audit programme: national emergency laparotomy audit*. 2015. Available from: http://www.nela.org.uk/. [Accessed 30 June 2016]
50. *Healthcare quality improvement partnership national clinical audit programme: prostate cancer audit*. 2015. Available from: http://www.hqip.org.uk/national-programmes/a-z-of-nca/. [Accessed 30 June 2016]
51. *Healthcare quality improvement partnership national clinical audit programme: National Hip Fracture Audit*. 2015. Available from: http://www.hqip.org.uk/national-programmes/a-z-of-nca/. [Accessed 30 June 2016]
52. *AQA: compendium of approved performance measures*. 2009. Available from: https://studylib.net/doc/5816447/aqa-compendium-of-approved-performance-measures. [Accessed 30 June 2016]
53. *National Institute for Health and Care Excellence: ultrasound-guided regional nerve block*. 2009. Available from: https://www.nice.org.uk/guidance/ipg285. [Accessed 30 June 2016]
54. Vimlati L, Gilsanz F, Goldik Z. Quality and safety guidelines of postanaesthesia care: working party on post anaesthesia care. *Eur J Anaesthesiol* 2009; **26**: 715–21
55. *NSQ Agency for Clinical Innovation: the orthogeriatric model of care: clinical practice guide*. 2010. Available from: https://www.aci.health.nsw.gov.au/__data/assets/pdf_file/0013/153400/aci_orthogeriatrics_clinical_practice_guide.pdf. [Accessed 30 June 2016]
56. *American Society of Anesthesiologists: standards for basic anesthetic monitoring*. 2010. Available from: https://www.asahq.org/~/media/Sites/ASAHQ/Files/Public/Resources/standards-guidelines/standards-for-basic-anesthetic-monitoring.pdf. [Accessed 30 June 2016]
57. *American Society of Anesthesiologsts: basic standards for preanethesia care*. 2010. Available from: http://www.asahq.org/~/media/Sites/ASAHQ/Files/Public/Resources/standards-guidelines/basic-standards-for-preanesthesia-care.pdf. [Accessed 30 June 2016]
58. *Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services: surgical care improvement project measures*. 2010. Available from: https://www.ahrq.gov/professionals/clinicians-providers/guidelines-recommendations/index.html. [Accessed 30 June 2016]
59. National Institute for Health and Care Excellence. *Quality standard 3: venous thromboembolism in adults: reducing the risk in hospital*. 2010. Available from: https://www.nice.org.uk/guidance/qs3. [Accessed 30 June 2016]
60. *Agency for healthcare research and quality structure indicators*. 2011. Available from: https://www.ahrq.gov/. [Accessed 30 June 2016]
61. The Royal College of Surgeons of England: Emergency surgery. *Standards for unscheduled surgical care*. 2011. Available from: https://www.rcseng.ac.uk/-/media/files/rcs/about-rcs/regional/rcs_emergency_surgery_2011_web.pdf. [Accessed 30 June 2016]
62. National Institute for Health and Care Excellence. *Quality Standard 16: hip fracture in adults*. 2012. Available from: https://www.nice.org.uk/guidance/qs16. [Accessed 30 June 2016]
63. National Quality Forum. *Endorsement summary: Surgery*. 2012. Available from: http://www.qualityforum.org/News_And_Resources/Endorsement_Summaries/Surgery_Endorsement_Summary.aspx. [Accessed 30 June 2016]
64. Wickham N, Gallus AS, Walters BNJ, Wilson A, NHMRC VTE Prevention Guideline Adaptation Committee.

Prevention of venous thromboembolism in patients admitted to Australian hospitals: summary of national health and medical research council clinical practice guideline. *Intern Med J* 2012; **42**: 698–708
65. *The Australian council on healthcare standards: Australasian clinical indicator report 15th edition (2006-2013)*. 2014. Available from: http://www.achs.org.au/media/87723/ach079_clinical_indicators_approved_tag.pdf. [Accessed 30 June 2016]
66. American Society of Anesthesiologists. *Statement on documentation of anesthesia care*. 2013. Available from: http://www.asahq.org/~/media/Sites/ASAHQ/Files/Public/Resources/standards-guidelines/statement-on-documentation-of-anesthesia-care.pdf. [Accessed 30 June 2016]
67. Lassen K, Coolsen MME, Slim K, et al. Guidelines for perioperative care for pancreaticoduodenectomy: Enhanced Recovery After Surgery (ERAS®) Society recommendations. *World J Surg* 2012; **37**: 240–58
68. National Institute for Health and Care Excellence. *Quality standard 49: surgical site infections: prevention and treatment*. 2013. Available from: https://www.nice.org.uk/guidance/cg74. [Accessed 30 June 2016]
69. American Society of Anesthesiologists. *Standards for postanesthesia care*. 2014. Available from: http://www.asahq.org/~/media/Sites/ASAHQ/Files/Public/Resources/standards-guidelines/standards-for-postanesthesia-care.pdf. [Accessed 30 June 2016]
70. Anesthesia Quality Institute. *Quality improvement intraoperative measures*. 2015. Available from: https://www.aqihq.org/. [Accessed 30 June 2016]
71. Anesthesia Quality Institute. *Quality improvement PACU discharge measures*. 2015. Available from: https://www.aqihq.org/. [Accessed 30 June 2016]
72. *Surgical care improvement project core measure set*. 2015. Available from: http://www.jointcommission.org/assets/1/6/Surgical%20Care%20Improvement%20Project.pdf. [Accessed 30 June 2016]
73. Anesthesia Quality Institute. *QCDR measure specification*. 2015. Available from https://www.aqihq.org/, . [Accessed 30 June 2016]
74. Anesthesia Quality Institute. *Procedural sedation measures*. 2015. Available from: https://www.aqihq.org/. [Accessed 30 June 2016]
75. Anesthesia Quality Instititute. *Recommended indicators*. 2015. Available from: https://www.aqihq.org/. [Accessed 30 June 2016]
76. Information Services Division Scotland I. *Cancelled planned operations*. 2015. Available from: http://www.isdscotland.org/Health-Topics/Waiting-Times/Publications/2015-11-03/2015-11-03-Cancellations-Summary.pdf?. [Accessed 30 June 2016]
77. Information Services Division Scotland I. *Colorectal cancer quality performance indicators*. 2015. Available from: http://www.isdscotland.org/Health-Topics/Quality-Indicators/Publications/2015-06-23/2015-06-23-Colorectal-QPI-Report.pdf?. [Accessed 30 June 2016]
78. Merchant R, Chartrand D, Dain S, et al. Guidelines to the practice of anesthesia - revised edition 2015. *Can J Anaesth* 2015; **62**: 54–67
79. National Institute for Health and Care Excellence. *Quality standard 81: inflammatory bowel disease*. 2015. Available from: https://www.nice.org.uk/guidance/qs81. [Accessed 30 June 2016]
80. *Physician quality reporting system measures dataset*. 2015. Available from: https://pqrs.cms.gov/dataset/2016-PQRS-Measure-131-11-17-2015/6pvt-amq7/data. [Accessed 30 June 2016]
81. NELA project team. *First patient report of the national emergency laparotomy audit. RCoA London*. 2015. Available from: http://www.nela.org.uk/reports. [Accessed 30 June 2016]
82. Gort M, Broekhuis M, Regts G. How teams use indicators for quality improvement – a multiple-case study on the use of multiple indicators in multidisciplinary breast cancer teams. *Soc Sci Med* 2013; **96**: 69–77
83. National Confidential Enquiry into Patient Outcome and Death. *Time to get control? Gastrointestinal haemorrhage*. 2015. Available from: http://www.ncepod.org.uk/2015gih.html. [Accessed 30 June 2016]
84. McGory ML, Shekelle PG, Ko CY. Development of quality indicators for patients undergoing colorectal cancer surgery. *J Natl Cancer Inst* 2006; **98**: 1623–33
85. Meredith DS, Katz JN. Procedure volume as a quality measure for total joint replacement. *Clin Exp Rheumatol* 2007; **25**: 37–43
86. McGory ML, Kao KK, Shekelle PG, et al. Developing quality indicators for elderly surgical patients. *Ann Surg* 2009; **250**: 338–47
87. Weiser TG, Makary MA, Haynes AB, et al. Standardised metrics for global surgical surveillance. *Lancet* 2009; **374**: 1113–7
88. Goossens-Laan CA, Kil PJ, Roukema JA, Bosch JL, De Vries J. Quality of care indicators for muscle-invasive bladder cancer. *Urol Int* 2011; **86**: 11–8
89. Kalish BT, Vollmer CM, Kent TS, Nealon WH, Tseng JF, Callery MP. Quality assessment in pancreatic surgery: what might tomorrow require? *J Gastrointest Surg* 2013; **17**: 86–93
90. McGory ML. Quality indicators for the care of colorectal cancer in vulnerable elders. *J Am Geriatr Soc* 2007; **55**: S277–84
91. Arora VM, McGory ML, Fung CH. Quality indicators for hospitalization and surgery in vulnerable elders. *J Am Geriatr Soc* 2007; **55**: 347–58
92. Passman MA. Mandated quality measures and economic implications of venous thromboembolism prevention and management. *Am J Surg* 2010; **199**: S21–31
93. Wang TT, Ahmed K, Khan MS, Dasgupta P. Quality-of-care framework in urological cancers: where do we stand? *BJU Int* 2012; **109**: 1436–43
94. Dimick JB, Birkmeyer JD, Upchurch GRJ. Measuring surgical quality: what's the role of provider volume? *World J Surg* 2005; **29**: 1217–21
95. Bratzler DW, Hunt DR. The surgical infection prevention and surgical care improvement projects: national initiatives to improve outcomes for patients having surgery. *Clin Infect Dis* 2006; **43**: 322–30
96. Fry DE. Surgical site infections and the surgical care improvement project (SCIP): evolution of national quality measures. *Surg Infect* 2008; **9**: 579–84
97. Dixon E, Datta I, Sutherland FR, Vauthey JN. Blood loss in surgical oncology: neglected quality indicator? *J Surg Oncol* 2009; **99**: 508–12
98. Courrech Staal EF, Wouters MW, Boot H, Tollenaar RA, van Sandick JW. Quality-of-care indicators for oesophageal cancer surgery: A review. *Eur J Surg Oncol* 2010; **36**: 1035–43
99. Del Turco MR, Ponti A, Bick U, et al. Quality indicators in breast cancer care. *Eur J Cancer* 2010; **46**: 2344–56

100. Nygren J, Thacker J, Carli F, et al. Guidelines for perioperative care in elective rectal/pelvic surgery: Enhanced Recovery After Surgery (ERAS) society recommendations. *Clin Nutr* 2012; **31**: 801–16
101. Collins JB, Verheyden CN, Mahabir RC. Core measures: implications for plastic surgery. *Plast Reconstr Surg* 2013; **131**: 1266–71
102. Mohammed S, Fisher EW. Quality metrics in pancreatic surgery. *Surg Clin North Am* 2013; **93**: 693–709
103. Broder MS, Payne-Simon L, Brook RH. Measures of surgical quality: what will patients know by 2005? *J Eval Clin Pract* 2005; **11**: 209–17
104. Main DS, Henderson WG, Pratte K, et al. Relationship of processes and structures of care in general surgery to postoperative outcomes: a descriptive analysis. *J Am Coll Surg* 2007; **204**: 1157–65
105. Wick EC, Gibbs L, Indorf LA, Varma MG, Garcia-Aguilar J. Implementation of quality measures to reduce surgical site infection in colorectal patients. *Dis Colon Rectum* 2008; **51**: 1004–9
106. Tillman M, Wehbe-Janek H, Hodges B, Smythe WR, Papaconstantinou HT. Surgical care improvement project and surgical site infections: can integration in the surgical safety checklist improve quality performance and clinical outcomes? *J Surg Res* 2013; **184**: 150–6
107. Yoo S, Kim S, Lee K-H, et al. Electronically implemented clinical indicators based on a data warehouse in a tertiary hospital: its clinical benefit and effectiveness. *Int J Med Inform* 2014; **83**: 507–16
108. Emond YE, Stienen JJ, Wollersheim HC, et al. Development and measurement of perioperative patient safety indicators. *Br J Anaesth* 2015; **114**: 963–72
109. Gockel I, Ahlbrand C, Arras M, et al. Quality management and key performance indicators in oncologic esophageal surgery. *Dig Dis Sci* 2015; **60**: 3536–44
110. Currie CT, Hutchison JD. Audit, guidelines and standards: clinical governance for hip fracture care in Scotland. *Disabil Rehabil* 2005; **27**: 1099–105
111. National Confidential Enquiry into Patient Outcome and Death. *An age old problem. A review of the care received by elderly patients undergoing surgery*. 2010. Available from: http://www.ncepod.org.uk/2010eese.html. [Accessed 30 June 2016]
112. Watkins JM, Qadan M, Battista C, Polk Jr HC. A closer look at surgical quality measures across different surgical specialties. *Am J Surg* 2010; **200**: 90–6
113. Gray JE, Laronga C, Siegel EM, et al. Degree of variability in performance on breast cancer quality indicators: findings from the Florida Initiative for Quality Cancer Care. *J Oncol Pract* 2011; **7**: 247–51
114. National Confidential Enquiry into Patient Outcome and Death. *Knowing the risk. A review of the perioperative care of surgical patients*. 2011. Available from: http://www.ncepod.org.uk/2011poc.html. [Accessed 30 June 2016]
115. Rosenberger LH, Politano AD, Sawyer RG. The surgical care improvement project and prevention of postoperative infection, including surgical site infection. *Surg Infect* 2011; **12**: 163–8
116. Royal College of Surgeons. *The higher risk general surgical patient. Towards improved care for a forgotten group*. 2011. Available from: https://www.rcseng.ac.uk/library-and-publications/college-publications/docs/the-higher-risk-general-surgical-patient/. [Accessed 30 June 2016]
117. Andersson AE, Bergh I, Karlsson J, Eriksson BI, Nilsson K. The application of evidence-based measures to reduce surgical site infections during orthopedic surgery - report of a single-center experience in Sweden. *Patient Saf Surg* 2012; **6**: 11
118. Kwon S, Florence M, Grigas P, et al. Creating a learning healthcare system in surgery: Washington State's Surgical Care and Outcomes Assessment Program (SCOAP) at 5 years. *Surgery* 2012; **151**: 146–52
119. Urman RD, Sarin P, Mitani A, Philip B, Eappen S. Presence of anesthesia resident trainees in day surgery unit has mixed effects on operating room efficiency measures. *Ochsner J* 2012; **12**: 25–9
120. Sutherland T, Belojf J, Lightowler M, Liu X, Nascimben L, Urman DR. Process measures to improve perioperative prophylactic antibiotic compliance. *Health Care Manag* 2014; **33**: 289–96
121. British Orthopaedic Association. *Getting it right first time. A national review of adult elective orthopaedic services in England*. 2015. Available from: https://www.boa.ac.uk/wp-content/uploads/2015/03/GIRFT-National-Report-Mar15.pdf. [Accessed 30 June 2016]
122. Pronovost PJ, Armstrong CM, Demski R, et al. Creating a high-reliability health care system. *Acad Med* 2015; **90**: 165–72
123. *The Royal College of Anaesthetists Accreditation Standards (ACSA)*. 2015. Available from: https://www.rcoa.ac.uk/system/files/ACSA-STANDARDS-FULL-2015.pdf. [Accessed 30 June 2016]
124. Liang MI, ElNaggar AC, Nekkanti S, et al. Setting the bar: compliance with ovarian cancer quality indicators at a national cancer institute-designated comprehensive cancer center. *Gynecol Oncol* 2015; **138**: 689–93
125. Gwatirisa JJ. Trimodal venous thromboembolism prophylaxis in total knee replacement: A quality improvement project for best care practices. *J Vasc Nurs* 2015; **33**: 119–26
126. Costa Ada Jr S, Leao LE, Novais MA, Zucchi P. An assessment of the quality indicators of operative and non-operative times in a public university hospital. *Einstein* 2015; **13**: 594–9
127. Steelman VM, Perkhounkova YS, Lemke JH. The gap between compliance with the quality performance measure "perioperative temperature management" and normothermia. *J Healthc Qual* 2015; **37**: 333–41
128. Marshall DA, Christiansen T, Smith C, et al. Continuous quality improvement program for hip and knee replacement. *Am J Med Qual* 2015; **30**: 425–31
129. Fearon KCH, Ljungqvist O, Von Meyenfeldt M, et al. A consensus review of clinical care for patients undergoing colonic resection. *Clin Nutr* 2005; **24**: 466–77
130. Wind J, Polle SW, Fung Kon Jin PHP, et al. Systematic review of enhanced recovery programmes in colonic surgery. *Br J Surg* 2006; **93**: 800–9
131. Lemmens L, van Zelm R, Vanhaecht K, Kerkkamp H. Systematic review: indicators to evaluate effectiveness of clinical pathways for gastrointestinal surgery. *J Eval Clin Pract* 2008; **14**: 880–7
132. American Society of Anesthesiologists. *Practice guidelines for preoperative fasting and the use of pharmacologic agents to reduce the risk of pulmonary aspiration: application to healthy patients undergoing elective procedures*. 2011. Available from: https://www.asahq.org/~/media/sites/asahq/files/public/

resources/standards-guidelines/practice-guidelines-for-preoperative-fasting.pdf. [Accessed 30 June 2016]
133. De Hert S, Imberger G, Carlisle J, et al. Preoperative evaluation of the adult patient undergoing non-cardiac surgery. *Eur J Anaesthesiol* 2011; **28**: 684–722
134. American Society of Anesthesiologists. *Practice guidelines for acute pain management in a perioperative setting*. 2012. Available from: http://www.asahq.org/~/media/sites/asahq/files/public/resources/standards-guidelines/practice-guidelines-for-acute-pain-management-in-the-perioperative-setting.pdf. [Accessed 30 June 2016]
135. Cerantola Y, Valerio M, Persson B, et al. Guidelines for perioperative care after radical cystectomy for bladder cancer: Enhanced Recovery After Surgery (ERAS) society recommendations. *Clin Nutr* 2013; **32**: 879–87
136. Dikken JL, Stiekema J, van de Velde CJ, et al. Quality of care indicators for the surgical treatment of gastric cancer: a systematic review. *Ann Surg Oncol* 2013; **20**: 381–98
137. Gustafsson UO, Scott MJ, Schwenk W, et al. Guidelines for perioperative care in elective colonic surgery: Enhanced Recovery After Surgery (ERAS) society recommendations. *World J Surg* 2013; **37**: 259–84
138. Halverson AL, Sellers MM, Bilimoria KY, et al. Identification of process measures to reduce postoperative readmission. *J Gastrointest Surg* 2014; **18**: 1407–15
139. Gagliardi AR, Simunovic M, Langer B, Stern H, Brown AD. Development of quality indicators for colorectal cancer surgery, using a 3-step modified Delphi approach. *Can J Surg* 2005; **48**: 441
140. Birkmeyer JD, Sun Y, Goldfaden A, Birkmeyer NJO, Stukel TA. Volume and process of care in high-risk cancer surgery. *Cancer* 2006; **106**: 2476–81
141. Hollenbeck BK, Roberts WW, Wolf JS. Importance of perioperative processes of care for length of hospital stay after laparoscopic surgery. *J Endourol* 2006; **20**: 776–81
142. Hedrick TL, Turrentine FE, Smith RL, et al. Single-institutional experience with the surgical infection prevention project in intra-abdominal surgery. *Surg Infect* 2007; **8**: 425–36
143. Hollenbeck BK, Wei Y, Birkmeyer JD. Volume, process of care, and operative mortality for cystectomy for bladder cancer. *Urology* 2007; **69**: 871–5
144. Holt PJE, Poloniecki JD, Gerrard D, Loftus IM, Thompson MM. Meta-analysis and systematic review of the relationship between volume and outcome in abdominal aortic aneurysm surgery. *Br J Surg* 2007; **94**: 395–403
145. Makary MA, Epstein J, Pronovost PJ, Millman EA, Hartmann EC, Freischlag JA. Surgical specimen identification errors: a new measure of quality in surgical care. *Surgery* 2007; **141**: 450–5
146. Kaplan GG, McCarthy EP, Ayanian JZ, Korzenik J, Hodin R, Sands BE. Impact of hospital volume on postoperative morbidity and mortality following a colectomy for ulcerative colitis. *Gastroenterology* 2008; **134**: 680–7
147. Bhattacharyya T, Freiberg AA, Mehta P, Katz JN, Ferris T. Measuring the report card: The validity of pay-for-performance metrics in orthopedic surgery. *Health Aff* 2009; **28**: 526–32
148. Bilimoria KY, Bentrem DJ, Lillemoe KD, Talamonti MS, Ko CY. Assessment of pancreatic cancer care in the United States based on formally developed quality indicators. *J Natl Cancer Inst* 2009; **101**: 848–59
149. Kreckler S, Catchpole KR, New SJ, Handa A, McCulloch PG. Quality and safety on an acute surgical ward: an exploratory cohort study of process and outcome. *Ann Surg* 2009; **250**: 1035–40
150. Kuwabara K, Matsuda S, Fushimi K, Ishikawa KB, Horiguchi H, Fujimori K. Impact of hospital case volume on the quality of laparoscopic colectomy in Japan. *J Gastrointest Surg* 2009; **13**: 1619–26
151. Ball CG, Pitt HA, Kilbane ME, Dixon E, Sutherland FR, Lillemoe KD. Peri-operative blood transfusion and operative time are quality indicators for pancreatoduodenectomy. *HPB* 2010; **12**: 465–71
152. Bozic KJ, Maselli J, Pekow PS, Lindenauer PK, Vail TP, Auerbach AD. The influence of procedure volumes and standardization of care on quality and efficiency in total joint replacement surgery. *J Bone Joint Surg Am* 2010; **92**: 2643–52
153. Brokelmann J, Backer K. Clinical indicators for ambulatory surgery. *Amb Surg* 2010; **16**: 34–7
154. Brooke BS, Meguid RA, Makary MA, Perler BA, Pronovost PJ, Pawlik TM. Improving surgical outcomes through adoption of evidence-based process measures: intervention specific or associated with overall hospital quality? *Surgery* 2010; **147**: 481–90
155. Chen T, Chang Y, Ku S, Chung K. Statistical process control as a tool for controlling operating room performance: retrospective analysis and benchmarking. *J Eval Clin Pract* 2010; **16**: 905–10
156. Sedlack JD. The utilization of six sigma and statistical process control techniques in surgical quality improvement. *J Healthc Qual* 2010; **32**: 18–26
157. Gastmeier P, Sohr D, Breier A, Behnke M, Geffers C. Prolonged duration of operation: an indicator of complicated surgery or of surgical (mis)management? *Infection* 2011; **39**: 211–5
158. Mu Y, Edwards JR, Horan TC, Berrios-Torres SI, Fridkin SK. Improving risk-adjusted measures of surgical site infection for the national healthcare safety network. *Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol* 2011; **32**: 970–86
159. SooHoo FN, Lieberman RJ, Farng E, Park S, Jain S, Ko YC. Development of quality of care indicators for patients undergoing total hip or total knee replacement. *BMJ Qual Saf* 2011; **20**: 153–7
160. Comber H, Sharp L, Timmons A, Keane FB. Quality of rectal cancer surgery and its relationship to surgeon and hospital caseload: A population-based study. *Color Dis* 2012; **14**: 692–700
161. Mathoulin-Pelissier S, Becouarn Y, Belleannee G, et al. Quality indicators for colorectal cancer surgery and care according to patient-, tumor-, and hospital-related factors. *BMC Cancer* 2012; **19**(12): 297
162. Kondo A, Zierler KB, Hagino H. Comparison of care process and patient outcomes after hip-fracture surgery in acute-care hospitals in Japan and the United States. *Int J Orthop Trauma Nurs* 2012; **16**: 195–205
163. Renzi C, Sorge C, Fusco D, Agabiti N, Davoli M, Perucci CA. Reporting of quality indicators and improvement in hospital performance: the P.Re.Val.E. Regional Outcome Evaluation Program. *Health Serv Res* 2012; **47**: 1880–901
164. Vrijens F, Stordeur S, Beirens K, Devriese S, Eycken Van E, Vlayen J. Effect of hospital volume on processes of care and 5-year survival after breast cancer: A population-based study on 25 000 women. *Breast* 2012; **21**: 261–6

165. Bergman S, Martelli V, Monette M, et al. Identification of quality of care deficiencies in elderly surgical patients by measuring adherence to process-based quality indicators. *J Am Coll Surg* 2013; **217**: 858–66
166. Bilimoria KY, Chung J, Ju MH, et al. Evaluation of surveillance bias and the validity of the venous thromboembolism quality measure. *JAMA* 2013; **310**: 1482–9
167. Nojiri Y, Okamura K, Tanaka Y, et al. Influence of hospital surgical volume of radical prostatectomy on quality of perioperative care. *Int J Clin Oncol* 2013; **18**: 898–904
168. Kwon S, Thompson R, Dellinger P, Yanez D, Farrohki E, Flum D. Importance of perioperative glycemic control in general surgery: a report from the surgical care and outcomes assessment program. *Ann Surg* 2013; **257**: 8–14
169. Bergman S, Deban M, Martelli V, et al. Association between quality of care and complications after abdominal surgery. *Surgery* 2014; **156**: 632–9
170. Cataife G, Weinberg DA, Wong HH, Kahn KL. The effect of surgical care improvement project (SCIP) compliance on surgical site infections (SSI). *Med Care* 2014; **52**: S66–73
171. Keenan JE, Speicher PJ, Thacker JKM, Walter M, Kuchibhatla M, Mantyh CR. The preventive surgical site infection bundle in colorectal surgery. *JAMA Surg* 2014; **149**: 1045
172. Kitazawa T, Matsumoto K, Fujita S, et al. Perioperative patient safety indicators and hospital surgical volumes. *BMC Res Notes* 2014; **7**: 117
173. Leonard D, Penninckx F, Kartheuser A, Laenen A, Eycken Van E, PROCARE. Effect of hospital volume on quality of care and outcome after rectal cancer surgery. *Br J Surg* 2014; **101**: 1475–82
174. Richman JS, Itani KMF, Deierhoi RJ, Henderson WG, Hawn MT. Improved outcomes associated with a revised quality measure for continuing perioperative beta-blockade. *JAMA Surg* 2014; **149**: 1031–7
175. Singh A, Yian EH, Dillon MT, Takayanagi M, Burke MF, Navarro RA. The effect of surgeon and hospital volume on shoulder arthroplasty perioperative quality metrics. *J Shoulder Elbow Surg* 2014; **23**: 1187–94
176. Stordeur S, Vlayen J, Vrijens F, et al. Quality indicators for oesophageal and gastric cancer: a population-based study in Belgium, 2004-2008. *Eur J Cancer Care* 2015; **24**: 376–86
177. Scott AV, Stonemetz JL, Wasey, et al. Compliance with surgical care improvement project for body temperature management (SCIP Inf-10) is associated with improved clinical outcomes. *Anesthesiology* 2015; **123**: 116–25
178. Gourin CG, Starmer HM, Herbert RJ, et al. Quality of care and short- and long-term outcomes of laryngeal cancer care in the elderly. *Laryngoscope* 2015; **125**: 2323–9
179. Scally CP, Yin H, Birkmeyer JD, Wong SL. Comparing perioperative processes of care in high and low mortality centers performing pancreatic surgery. *J Surg Oncol* 2015; **112**: 866–71
180. Dimick JB, Nicholas LH, Ryan AM, Thumma JR, Birkmeyer JD. Bariatric surgery complications before vs after implementation of a national policy restricting coverage to centers of excellence. *JAMA* 2013; **309**(8): 792–9. https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.2013.755

Handling editor: J.G. Hardman