



EWMA · LONDON 2015

Submitted to EWMA
Journal based on
presentation given in
the free session Pressure
Ulcer 1



Primary Care Patient Safety (PISA) Research Group - Identifying priorities for pressure ulcer prevention in primary care

BACKGROUND

Pressure ulcers are harmful and largely avoidable. They cause needless pain and suffering for patients^{1,2} as well as increased morbidity, mortality and length of hospital stay.^{3,4} As a result, pressure ulcer prevention is a priority area for patient safety in healthcare organisations internationally.⁵⁻⁷ The majority of efforts have focused on improving pressure ulcer prevention and treatment in secondary care, but an opportunity exists to advance pressure ulcer prevention in primary care.

Patient safety incident reports contain free text descriptions of unsafe or poor quality care that are written by frontline healthcare professionals when any untoward event resulted in, or could have resulted in, harm to a patient.^{8,9} Such reports contain information, which can be used to model the sequence of events leading up to harmful outcomes, as well as the related contributory and contextual factors.^{10,11} In England and Wales, a National Reporting and Learning Service (NRLS) was established in 2003 as a repository to enable the generation of learning from safety incident reports.¹²

The Primary Care Patient Safety (PISA) Research Group led by Dr Andrew Carson-Stevens at the School of Medicine, Cardiff University, aims to advance the quality and safety of primary care through identifying learning from data like patient safety incident reports to support organisations and their teams to empirically design/ redesign their systems and to develop, test, implement and evaluate

changes in practice. The PISA Group was formed in January 2013 with funding from the National Institute for Health Research (NIHR) in order to characterise the largest sample of patient safety incident reports from general practice worldwide.¹³ To date, the PISA group has undertaken analyses of safety incident reports describing problems in care for patients during the transfer between secondary and primary care,¹⁴ vaccine safety in children,¹⁵ vulnerable children in primary care^{10,16} and safety incidents experienced by children in the general practice setting.^{17,18}

In collaboration with international experts from the Australian Institute for Healthcare Innovation (Hibbert and Makeham), the PISA group is examining free-text patient safety incident reports describing pressure ulcers written by frontline healthcare professionals with a view to identifying priority issues for pressure ulcer prevention in primary care and supporting the development of interventions.

METHODS

The PISA Group uses a three-stage mixed methods process to generate learning from a sample of reports received by the NRLS over a decade (2003-2013):

- **Stage 1:** Familiarisation and data coding – reading free-text and applying codes to represent the incident type, potential contributory factors, level and type of harm described in the safety incident report.
- **Stage 2:** Generation of data summaries – descriptive statistical analysis to identify the most frequent and harmful incident types.

Raymond Samuriwo^{1,2,3,4}Huw Prosser Evans¹Andrew Carson-Stevens^{1,6,7,8}Philippa Rees¹Peter Hibbert⁵Meredith Makeham⁵Huw Williams¹

on behalf of the Primary Care Patient Safety (PISA) Research Group

¹ Primary Care Patient Safety (PISA) Research Group, Division of Population Medicine, School of Medicine, Cardiff University, UK

² School of Healthcare Sciences, Cardiff University, UK

³ Cardiff Institute for Tissue Engineering and Repair (CITER), Cardiff University, UK

⁴ School of Healthcare, University of Leeds, UK

⁵ Australian Institute for Healthcare Innovation, Macquarie University, Sydney, Australia

⁶ Primary & Emergency Care Research (PRIME) Centre Wales, Cardiff University, UK

⁷ Department of Family Practice, University of British Columbia, Canada

⁸ Honorary Professor, Institute of Healthcare Policy and Practice, University of the West of Scotland, UK

Correspondence:
carson-stevensap@cardiff.ac.uk

Conflicts of interest: None

■ **Stage 3:** Interpretation of themes and learning – thematic analysis to understand the most common safety contributory themes, and consideration of the contexts within which they occurred. Clinicians and patient safety experts review the analyses to identify key areas for improvement in pressure ulcer prevention in primary care.

The method is described in more detail in a recently published study protocol.¹³

CONCLUSION

This study will be the first national-level (England and Wales) analysis of patient safety incident reports from primary care about pressure ulcers. It will empirically iden-

tify concepts to inform a quality improvement agenda for pressure ulcer prevention in primary care. When this study is completed in Spring 2016, its findings should be interpreted in conjunction with existing research and development efforts in the field of pressure ulcer prevention in primary care.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This project was funded by the National Institute for Health Research HS&DR (project number 12/64/118). However, the views and opinions expressed therein are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect those of the HS&DR, NIHR, NHS or the Department of Health.

REFERENCES

1. Grey JE, Harding KG, Enoch S. Pressure ulcers. *BMJ*. 2006;332(7539):472-5.
2. Briggs M, Collinson M, Wilson L, Rivers C, McGinnis E, Dealey C, et al. The prevalence of pain at pressure areas and pressure ulcers in hospitalised patients. *BMC Nursing*. 2013;12(1):19.
3. Berlowitz D. Incidence and Prevalence of Pressure Ulcers. In: Thomas MDDR, Compton MDGA, editors. *Pressure Ulcers in the Aging Population*. Aging Medicine. 1: Humana Press; 2014. p. 19-26.
4. Dealey C, Posnett J, Walker A. The cost of pressure ulcers in the United Kingdom. *Journal of Wound Care*. 2012;21(6):261-4.
5. Dubois CA, D'Amour D, Tchouaket E, Clarke S, Rivard M, Blais R. Associations of patient safety outcomes with models of nursing care organization at unit level in hospitals. *Int J Qual Health Care*. 2013;25(2):110-7.
6. Sales AE, Schalm C, Baylon MAB, Fraser KD. Data for improvement and clinical excellence: report of an interrupted time series trial of feedback in long-term care. *Implementation Science*. 2014;9:161.
7. Unbeck M, Sterner E, Elg M, Fossum B, Thor J, Pukk Härenstam K. Design, application and impact of quality improvement 'theme months' in orthopaedic nursing: A mixed method case study on pressure ulcer prevention. *International Journal of Nursing Studies*. 2013;50(4):527-35.
8. Reznick MA, Barton BA. Improved incident reporting following the implementation of a standardized emergency department peer review process. *International Journal for Quality in Health Care*. 2014;26(3):278-86.
9. Mitchell I, Schuster A, Smith K, Pronovost P, Wu A. Patient safety incident reporting: a qualitative study of thoughts and perceptions of experts 15 years after 'To Err is Human'. *BMJ Quality & Safety*. 2015; Article In Press.
10. Rees P, Carson-Stevens A, Williams H, Panesar S, Edwards A. Quality improvement informed by a reporting and learning system. *Archives of Disease in Childhood*. 2014;99(7):702-3.
11. Carson-Stevens A, Edwards A, Panesar S, Parry G, Rees P, Sheikh A, et al. Reducing the burden of iatrogenic harm in children. *The Lancet*. 2015;385(9978):1593-4.
12. Howell A-M, Burns EM, Bouras G, Donaldson LJ, Athanasiou T, Darzi A. Can Patient Safety Incident Reports Be Used to Compare Hospital Safety? Results from a Quantitative Analysis of the English National Reporting and Learning System Data. *PLoS ONE*. 2015;10(12):e0144107.
13. Carson-Stevens A, Hibbert P, Avery A, Butlin A, Carter B, Cooper A, et al. A cross-sectional mixed methods study protocol to generate learning from patient safety incidents reported from general practice. *BMJ Open*. 2015;5(12).
14. Williams H, Edwards A, Hibbert P, Rees P, Prosser Evans H, Panesar S, et al. Harms from discharge to primary care: mixed methods analysis of incident reports. *British Journal of General Practice*. 2015;65(641):e829-e37.
15. Rees P, Edwards A, Powell C, Evans HP, Carter B, Hibbert P, et al. Pediatric immunization-related safety incidents in primary care: A mixed methods analysis of a national database. *Vaccine*. 2015;33(32):3873-80.
16. Omar A, Rees P, Evans HP, Williams H, Cooper A, Bannerjee S, et al. Vulnerable children and their care quality issues: a descriptive analysis of a national database. *BMJ Quality & Safety*. 2015;24(11):732-3.
17. Rees P, Edwards A, Panesar S, Powell C, Carter B, Williams H, et al. Safety Incidents in the Primary Care Office Setting. *Pediatrics*. 2015.
18. Rees P, Edwards A, Powell C, Williams H, Hibbert P, Makeham M, et al. Identifying priorities for improved child healthcare: A mixed methods analysis of safety incident reports. *BMJ Quality & Safety*. 2015;24(11):730-1.