

Aus der Klinik für Anästhesiologie mit Schwerpunkt operative Intensivmedizin,
Campus Charité Mitte und Campus Virchow-Klinikum
der Medizinischen Fakultät Charité – Universitätsmedizin Berlin

DISSERTATION

Perioperative care and
the importance of Continuous Quality Improvement –
a controlled intervention study in three Tanzanian hospitals

zur Erlangung des akademischen Grades

Doctor medicinae (Dr. med.)

vorgelegt der Medizinischen Fakultät
Charité – Universitätsmedizin Berlin

von

Wiltrud Abels

aus Witten

Datum der Promotion: 08.12.2017

<u>Deckblatt</u>	1
<u>Inhaltsverzeichnis</u>	2
<u>Abstract in Deutsch</u>	3 - 4
<u>Abstract in Englisch</u>	5
<u>Eidesstattliche Versicherung</u>	6
<u>Ausführliche Anteilserklärung</u>	7 - 8
<u>Auszug aus dem ISI Web of Knowledge</u>	9 - 11
<u>Originalartikel</u>	12 - 31
<u>Supplement</u>	32 - 54
<u>Erratum</u>	55 - 57
<u>Curriculum vitae</u>	58
<u>Publikationsliste</u>	59
<u>Danksagung</u>	60 - 61

Einführung Chirurgische Basis- und Notfallversorgung kann nachweislich Invaliditäts- und Letalitätsraten in Subsahara-Afrika senken. In strukturschwachen Ländern ist jedoch die Mortalität von stationär aufgenommenen Patienten alarmierend hoch. Die vorliegende Studie untersuchte zwei Interventionen im Rahmen eines kontinuierlichen Qualitätsverbesserungsprogrammes zur Verbesserung der perioperativen Versorgungsqualität in der chirurgischen Abteilung eines tansanischen Krankenhauses der Regelversorgung. Die Resultate wurden verglichen mit a) der Versorgungsqualität in den chirurgischen Abteilungen zweier anderer Krankenhäuser, die im Studienzeitraum kein Qualitätsmanagement-Programm durchführten, und b) mit langfristigen Ergebnisindikatoren.

Methoden Alle Krankenhäuser benutzten ein Qualitätssicherungsinstrument zur jährlichen Überprüfung der Versorgungsqualität (Hospital Performance Assessment Tool). Veränderungen der unmittelbaren Ergebnisindikatoren für die prä- und postoperative Versorgung nach den jeweiligen Interventionen wurden mit langfristigen Ergebnisindikatoren verglichen (Komplikationsrate der Anästhesie, Gesamtleblichkeit in der Gruppe der chirurgischen Patienten). Die Implementationsstrategie in der präoperativen Versorgung beinhaltete die Einführung einer Checkliste, die Implementationsstrategie in der postoperativen Versorgung war die Erweiterung eines vorbestehendes Weiterbildungsprogramms um als Schwachstellen erkannte Themengebiete.

Ergebnisse Die unmittelbaren Ergebnisindikatoren für die präoperative Versorgung im Interventionskrankenhaus verbesserten sich über den Studienzeitraum (2009 52,5%; 2011 84,2%, $p < 0,001$). Die postoperative Versorgung verbesserte sich im ersten Jahr, um dann wieder abzufallen (2009 63,3%; 2010 70%; 2011 58,6%). In der Kontrollgruppe verschlechterte sich die präoperative Versorgung (2009 50,8%; 2011 32,8%, $p < 0,001$), während die postoperative Versorgung keine signifikanten Veränderungen zeigte. Die Komplikationsrate der Anästhesie im Interventionskrankenhaus sank über den Studienzeitraum (1,89% vor Intervention; 0,96% nach Intervention, $p = 0,006$). Die Letalität der chirurgischen Patienten im Interventionskrankenhaus fiel von 5,67% vor Intervention auf 2,93% nach Intervention ($p < 0,001$). Die Letalität der chirurgischen Patienten in der Kontrollgruppe war 4% vor Intervention und 3,8% nach Intervention ($p = 0,411$). Die Komplikationsrate der Anästhesie war in der Kontrollgruppe nicht verfügbar. Die langfristigen

Ergebnisindikatoren verbesserten sich im Interventionskrankenhaus mehr als in der Kontrollgruppe, dieser Effekt war jedoch nicht signifikant.

Diskussion Die Einführung einer Checkliste in der präoperativen Versorgung erschien in dieser Studie nachhaltiger, verglichen mit der Intervention in der postoperativen Versorgung. Der Grund hierfür ist möglicherweise eine Kombination mehrerer Aspekte, die die langfristige Qualitätsverbesserung begünstigen, hierunter eine unmittelbare Verfügbarkeit der Checkliste und ein direkt möglicher Abgleich mit dem geforderten Standard, sowie die Möglichkeit von Supervision und Unterricht am Krankenbett.

Die Dokumentation der langfristigen Ergebnisindikatoren stellte sich insgesamt lückenhaft dar. Unmittelbare Ergebnisindikatoren erschienen besser geeignet zur Steuerung eines kontinuierlichen Qualitätsverbesserungsprogramms.

Schlussfolgerung Zielgerichtete Interventionen können in der perioperativen Versorgung zu nachhaltiger Qualitätsverbesserung führen, wenn sie im Rahmen eines kontinuierlichen Qualitätsverbesserungsprogrammes einem multimodalen Ansatz folgen.

Introduction Some essential surgical services have been shown to reduce death and disability in Sub-Saharan Africa. However, in-patient mortality in Sub-Saharan hospitals is disturbingly high. The present study evaluates two interventions and their implementation approaches targeting the quality of perioperative services in a Tanzanian public hospital. Results were assessed in comparison to a) a control group of two other public hospitals in the same region without quality improvement program, and b) final patient outcome indicators.

Methods All hospitals annually assessed quality of services with the Hospital Performance Assessment Tool (HPAT). In pre- and postoperative care respectively, immediate outcome indicators (HPAT results) were compared to final outcome indicators (Anaesthetic Complication Rate, Surgical Case Fatality Rate), and to the control group before and after intervention.

Results Immediate outcome indicators for Preoperative Care in the intervention hospital improved from 52.5% in 2009 to 84.2% in 2011 ($p < 0.001$). Postoperative Inpatient Care was 63.3% in 2009, 70% in 2010 and 58.6% in 2011. In the control group, preoperative started at 50.8% (2009) and declined to 32.8% (2011, $p < 0.001$). Postoperative inpatient Care did not significantly change. Anaesthetic Complication Rate in the intervention hospital declined (1.89% before intervention; 0.96% after intervention, $p = 0.006$). Surgical Case Fatality Rate in the intervention hospital was 5.67% before intervention and 2.93% after intervention ($p < 0.001$), compared 4% before intervention and 3.8% after intervention ($p = 0.411$) in the control group. There was no Anaesthetic Complication Rate available in the control group. Compared to the control group, final outcome improved more in the intervention hospital, although the effect was not significant over the whole study period.

Discussion Changes in immediate outcome for Preoperative Care seemed more sustainable, possibly due to the fact that the introduction of a checklist combined several aspects of a potentially successful quality improvement intervention, amongst others availability at the point of care and a documented target standard. Documentation of final outcome indicators seemed inconsistent. Immediate outcome indicators appear more useful to direct the Continuous Quality Improvement approach in the intervention hospital.

Conclusion Specific targeted interventions in a Continuous Quality Improvement program have the potential to lead to sustainable improvement of the quality of perioperative services, if implemented in a multi-faceted approach.

„Ich, Wiltrud Abels, versichere an Eides statt durch meine eigenhändige Unterschrift, dass ich die vorgelegte Dissertation mit dem Thema: „Perioperative care and the importance of Continuous Quality Improvement – a controlled intervention study in three Tanzanian hospitals“ selbstständig und ohne nicht offengelegte Hilfe Dritter verfasst und keine anderen als die angegebenen Quellen und Hilfsmittel genutzt habe.

Alle Stellen, die wörtlich oder dem Sinne nach auf Publikationen oder Vorträgen anderer Autoren beruhen, sind als solche in korrekter Zitierung („Uniform Requirements for Manuscripts (URM)“ des ICMJE - www.icmje.org) kenntlich gemacht. Die Abschnitte zu Methodik (insbesondere praktische Arbeiten, statistische Aufarbeitung) und Resultaten (insbesondere Graphiken und Tabellen) entsprechen den URM (s.o.) und werden von mir verantwortet.

Mein Anteil an der ausgewählten Publikation entspricht dem, der in der untenstehenden gemeinsamen Erklärung mit der Betreuerin angegeben ist.

Die Bedeutung dieser eidesstattlichen Versicherung und die strafrechtlichen Folgen einer unwahren eidesstattlichen Versicherung (§156,161 des Strafgesetzbuches) sind mir bekannt und bewusst.

Wiltrud Abels

„Perioperative Care and the Importance of Continuous Quality Improvement— A Controlled Intervention Study in Three Tanzanian Hospitals”

Goetz Bosse**, Wiltrud Abels**, Ferdinand Mtatifikolo[†], Baltazar Ngoli, Bruno Neuner, Klaus –D. Wernecke, Claudia Spies

** Goetz Bosse and Wiltrud Abels contributed equally to this study

Beitrag der Doktorandin im Einzelnen (entsprechend den Angaben in der Veröffentlichung im Absatz „Author contributions“ mit Ausführungen zu den einzelnen Stichpunkten)

Studiendesign als kontrollierte Interventionsstudie

Die Doktorandin hatte maßgeblichen Anteil am Designentwurf der Studie als kontrollierte Interventionsstudie mit Vorher-Nachher- und Interhospitalvergleich in Bezug auf zwei spezifische Interventionen. Im Rahmen dieses Projektes ist die vorliegende Studie die erste, die sich mit den genauen Auswirkungen individueller Interventionen beschäftigt. Diese Idee hierzu hat die Doktorandin seit Beginn ihrer Mitarbeit im Projekt in 2008 verfolgt. Die Ausarbeitung und Weiterentwicklung erfolgte in gemeinsamen Diskussionen mit dem Co-Autor Dr. Götz Bosse, die formalen und inhaltlichen Kriterien wurden gemeinsam mit Frau Professor Spies und Dr. Bosse festgelegt.

Datenerhebung

Die Doktorandin hat einen Teil der Datenerhebung während eines Forschungsaufenthaltes in Tansania im November 2011 gemeinsam mit der in der Danksagung erwähnten tansanischen Kollegin Dr. Rehema Maggid selbst durchgeführt. Teile der Outcome-Daten in der Kontrollgruppe hat die Doktorandin gemeinsam mit Dr. Bosse aus der Papierdokumentationen der einzelnen Krankenhäuser erarbeitet.

Statistische Analyse der Daten und Modifizierung der statistischen Methode

Die Doktorandin hat den notwendigen Datensatz zusammengestellt, und den größten Teil der notwendigen Berechnungen selbstständig durchgeführt, sowie alle Tabellen und Graphiken erstellt, all dies in enger Kooperation mit Professor Wernecke. Im Rahmen des Projektes ist diese Studie die erste, die auf Ebene einzelner Items vergleicht und Angaben zur erhobenen Fallzahl macht, diese Optimierung ist durch die Doktorandin in enger Rücksprache mit Professor Wernecke erfolgt. Die Erstellung einer neuen

Schlüsselprozedur („Postoperative Inpatient Care“), um die Überprüfung der spezifischen Intervention in der postoperativen Versorgung möglich zu machen, ist eine Idee der Doktorandin und in Absprache mit Professor Wernecke, Professor Spies und Dr. Bosse von ihr durchgeführt worden.

Interpretation der Daten

Die Interpretation der Daten erfolgte gemeinschaftlich und gleichberechtigt mit Dr. Bosse in vielen Diskussionen. Hierbei kam die Erfahrung zum Tragen, die die Doktorandin durch mehrjährige intensive Literaturrecherche und insgesamt 3 mehrwöchige Forschungsaufenthalte am Studienort gesammelt hat. Durch die Dr. Bosses jahrelange Erfahrung im Projekt und die rahmengebende Supervision von Professor Spies erfolgt eine Strukturierung und Weiterentwicklung der Argumentationslinien.

Erstellung des Manuskripts; kritische Durchsicht und Revision des Manuskripts

Der Entwurf und die Modifikation aller Teile des Manuskripts in Englisch erfolgte durch die Doktorandin. In gemeinsamen und gleichberechtigten Besprechungen mit Dr. Bosse erfolgten dann Umformulierungen und Strukturierungen Absatz für Absatz, wo notwendig. Die Umsetzung der inhaltlichen und formalen Änderungen erfolgten wieder durch die Doktorandin, wiederholte Revisionen des Manuskripts erfolgten gemeinsam mit Dr. Bosse und Professor Spies. Dieses Procedere war das gleiche für die Revision des Manuskripts im Rahmen des Review-Prozesses. Alle Tabellen und Graphiken sind durch die Doktorandin erstellt worden.

Erstellen und Einreichen des Erratums

Das im Mai 2016 veröffentlichte Erratum ist durch die Doktorandin erstellt und durch Dr. Bosse und Frau Professor Spies kritisch durchgesehen worden.

Prof. Dr. med. Claudia Spies

Wiltrud Abels

Auszug aus dem ISI Web of Knowledge

ISI Web of KnowledgeSM

Journal Citation Reports[®]

2014 JCR Science Edition

Journal Summary List

Journals from: **subject categories MULTIDISCIPLINARY SCIENCES** [VIEW CATEGORY SUMMARY LIST](#)

Sorted by: **Impact Factor** [SORT AGAIN](#)

Journals 1 - 20 (of 57) [MARK ALL](#) [UPDATE MARKED LIST](#)

Ranking is based on your journal and sort selections.

Mark	Rank	Abbreviated Journal Title (linked to journal information)	ISSN	JCR Data ^j					Eigenfactor [®] Metrics ^j		
				Total Cites	Impact Factor	5-Year Impact Factor	Immediacy Index	Articles	Cited Half-life	Eigenfactor [®] Score	Article Influence [®] Score
<input type="checkbox"/>	1	NATURE	0028-0836	617363	41.456	41.296	9.585	862	>10.0	1.49869	21.960
<input type="checkbox"/>	2	SCIENCE	0036-8075	557558	33.611	35.263	7.221	828	>10.0	1.22204	17.885
<input type="checkbox"/>	3	NAT. COMMUN	2041-1723	39396	11.470	11.904	1.706	2788	1.9	0.26326	5.723
<input type="checkbox"/>	4	P. NATL. ACAD. SCI. USA	0027-8424	586144	9.674	10.563	1.967	3579	8.4	1.41641	4.733
<input type="checkbox"/>	5	SCI. REP. UK	2045-2322	22336	5.578	5.597	0.722	3931	1.7	0.11476	2.075
<input type="checkbox"/>	6	ANN. NY. ACAD. SCI.	0077-8923	45541	4.383	3.838	1.106	246	9.9	0.06675	1.371
<input type="checkbox"/>	7	J. R. SOC. INTERFACE	1742-5689	7717	3.917	4.650	0.680	344	4.4	0.03088	1.701
<input type="checkbox"/>	8	RES. SYNTH. METHODS	1759-2879	369	3.898	4.000	0.185	27	2.9	0.00358	2.478
<input type="checkbox"/>	9	PLOS ONE	1932-6203	332716	3.234	3.702	0.489	30040	2.7	1.53341	1.209
<input type="checkbox"/>	10	P. JPN. ACAD. B. PHYS.	0386-2208	1080	2.652	3.096	0.182	33	5.2	0.00349	1.008
<input type="checkbox"/>	11	P. ROY. SOC. A-MATH. PHY.	1364-5021	17231	2.192	2.372	0.405	220	>10.0	0.01866	1.215
<input type="checkbox"/>	12	PHILOS. T. R. SOC. A	1364-503X	13391	2.147	3.038	1.287	293	8.4	0.03112	1.294
<input type="checkbox"/>	13	PEERJ	2167-8359	655	2.112	2.112	0.350	471	1.3	0.00277	0.752
<input type="checkbox"/>	14	NATURWISSENSCHAFTEN	0028-1042	6500	2.098	2.076	0.361	122	>10.0	0.00747	0.731
<input type="checkbox"/>	15	P. ROMANIAN ACAD. A	1454-9069	256	1.658	0.927	0.102	49	2.2	0.00078	0.198
<input type="checkbox"/>	16	CHINESE SCI. BULL.	1001-6538	10429	1.579	1.519	0.285	632	6.6	0.01997	0.415
<input type="checkbox"/>	17	JOVE-J. VIS. EXP.	1940-087X	4551	1.325		0.201	941	3.3	0.02280	
<input type="checkbox"/>	18	FRACTALS	0218-348X	650	1.220	0.702	0.444	27	>10.0	0.00067	0.226
<input type="checkbox"/>	19	INT. J. BIFURCAT. CHAOS	0218-1274	4576	1.078	1.113	0.233	219	8.5	0.00849	0.388
<input type="checkbox"/>	20	SCI. AM.	0036-8733	4738	1.070	1.373	0.231	108	>10.0	0.00513	0.666

Auszug aus dem ISI Web of Knowledge

ISI Web of KnowledgeSM

Journal Citation Reports[®]

2014 JCR Science Edition

Journal Summary List

Journals from: **subject categories MULTIDISCIPLINARY SCIENCES** [VIEW CATEGORY SUMMARY LIST](#)

Sorted by: **Impact Factor** [SORT AGAIN](#)

Journals 21 - 40 (of 57) [MARK ALL](#) [UPDATE MARKED LIST](#) [Ranking is based on your journal and sort selections.](#) **Page 2 of 3**

Mark	Rank	Abbreviated Journal Title (linked to journal information)	ISSN	JCR Data ^j						Eigenfactor [®] Metrics ^j	
				Total Cites	Impact Factor	5-Year Impact Factor	Immediacy Index	Articles	Cited Half-life	Eigenfactor [®] Score	Article Influence [®] Score
<input type="checkbox"/>	21	COMPLEXITY	1076-2787	608	1.041	1.342	0.514	37	8.4	0.00104	0.431
<input type="checkbox"/>	22	ADV COMPLEX SYST	0219-5259	513	0.968	0.992	0.083	24	6.2	0.00145	0.374
<input type="checkbox"/>	23	SCI ENG ETHICS	1353-3452	628	0.963	1.104	0.705	61	5.4	0.00153	0.360
<input type="checkbox"/>	24	S AFR J SCI	0038-2353	1848	0.957	1.101	0.266	64	>10.0	0.00166	0.319
<input type="checkbox"/>	25	CURR SCI INDIA	0011-3891	8014	0.926	0.944	0.407	356	9.9	0.00724	0.262
<input type="checkbox"/>	26	DISCRETE DYN NAT SOC	1026-0226	928	0.877	0.834	0.183	279	2.9	0.00242	0.182
<input type="checkbox"/>	27	SYMMETRY-BASEL	2073-8994	222	0.826	1.192	0.220	50	4.2	0.00133	0.472
<input type="checkbox"/>	28	MATH MODEL NAT PHENO	0973-5348	402	0.813	0.807	0.739	69	3.7	0.00232	0.422
<input type="checkbox"/>	29	REND LINCETI-SCI FIS	2037-4631	226	0.750	0.850	0.177	79	4.2	0.00086	0.289
<input type="checkbox"/>	30	AN ACAD BRAS CIENC	0001-3765	1547	0.734	1.032	0.149	175	9.2	0.00255	0.305
<input type="checkbox"/>	31	J ROY SOC NEW ZEAL	0303-6758	589	0.657	1.621	1.100	10	>10.0	0.00051	0.551
<input type="checkbox"/>	32	AM SCI	0003-0996	2000	0.557	0.700	0.102	59	>10.0	0.00143	0.428
<input type="checkbox"/>	33	ISSUES SCI TECHNOL	0748-5492	216	0.508	0.516	0.241	29	7.7	0.00058	0.234
<input type="checkbox"/>	34	SCIENTIST	0890-3670	233	0.505	0.325	0.118	68	9.3	0.00065	0.168
<input type="checkbox"/>	35	P EST ACAD SCI	1736-6046	418	0.455	0.494	0.854	48	8.6	0.00044	0.158
<input type="checkbox"/>	36	SAINS MALAYS	0126-6039	515	0.446	0.476	0.052	250	3.3	0.00115	0.077
<input type="checkbox"/>	37	TECHNOL REV	1099-274X	327	0.444	0.458	0.061	33	>10.0	0.00077	0.273
<input type="checkbox"/>	38	ACTA SCI-TECHNOL	1806-2563	146	0.400	0.369	0.060	100	3.1	0.00034	0.070
<input type="checkbox"/>	39	CHIANG MAI J SCI	0125-2526	253	0.371	0.468	0.038	130	4.5	0.00046	0.085
<input type="checkbox"/>	40	MAEJO INT J SCI TECH	1905-7873	119	0.367	0.419	0.000	24	4.5	0.00031	0.090

Auszug aus dem ISI Web of Knowledge

ISI Web of KnowledgeSM

Journal Citation Reports®

2014 JCR Science Edition

Journal Summary List

Journals from: subject categories MULTIDISCIPLINARY SCIENCES [VIEW CATEGORY SUMMARY LIST](#)

Sorted by: Impact Factor [SORT AGAIN](#)

Journals 41 - 57 (of 57)

Ranking is based on your journal and sort selections.

Mark	Rank	Abbreviated Journal Title (linked to journal information)	ISSN	JCR Data ⁱ						Eigenfactor® Metrics ⁱ	
				Total Cites	Impact Factor	5-Year Impact Factor	Immediacy Index	Articles	Cited Half-life	Eigenfactor® Score	Article Influence® Score
<input type="checkbox"/>	41	SCIENCEASIA	1513-1874	313	0.347	0.461	0.018	57	5.9	0.00061	0.112
<input type="checkbox"/>	42	IRAN J SCI TECHNOL A	1028-6276	131	0.342	0.384	0.029	35	5.2	0.00033	0.097
<input type="checkbox"/>	43	KUWAIT J SCI ENG	1024-8684	116	0.312	0.236		0	7.5	0.00016	0.054
<input type="checkbox"/>	44	INTERDISCIPL SCI REV	0308-0188	172	0.298	0.333	0.080	25	8.0	0.00027	0.140
<input type="checkbox"/>	45	FRONT LIFE SCI	2155-3769	17	0.294	0.364		0		0.00005	0.069
<input type="checkbox"/>	46	DEFENCE SCI J	0011-748X	377	0.292	0.441	0.013	77	6.4	0.00068	0.112
<input type="checkbox"/>	46	NATL ACAD SCI LETT	0250-541X	150	0.292	0.198	0.057	87	6.7	0.00024	0.045
<input type="checkbox"/>	48	CR ACAD BULG SCI	1310-1331	464	0.284	0.220	0.104	221	4.5	0.00065	0.035
<input type="checkbox"/>	48	NEW SCI	0262-4079	682	0.284	0.230	0.101	207	8.4	0.00195	0.112
<input type="checkbox"/>	50	HER RUSS ACAD SCI+	1019-3316	229	0.266	0.280	0.039	51	>10.0	0.00040	0.093
<input type="checkbox"/>	51	P NATL A SCI INDIA A	0369-8203	65	0.242	0.146	0.075	67		0.00013	0.035
<input type="checkbox"/>	52	ANTHROPOLOGIST	0972-0073	149	0.222	0.220	0.103	223	3.6	0.00015	0.028
<input type="checkbox"/>	53	ENDEAVOUR	0160-9327	399	0.217	0.266	0.000	26	>10.0	0.00024	0.120
<input type="checkbox"/>	54	J NATL SCI FOUND SRI	1391-4588	110	0.203	0.275	0.000	44	6.3	0.00015	0.052
<input type="checkbox"/>	55	R&D MAG	0746-9179	34	0.180	0.142	0.030	33		0.00010	0.042
<input type="checkbox"/>	56	T ROY SOC SOUTH AUST	0372-1426	410	0.136	0.416	0.278	18	>10.0	0.00016	0.132
<input type="checkbox"/>	57	KUWAIT J SCI	2307-4108	7	0.091	0.091	0.139	36		0.00001	0.019

Journals 41 - 57 (of 57)

RESEARCH ARTICLE

Perioperative Care and the Importance of Continuous Quality Improvement—A Controlled Intervention Study in Three Tanzanian Hospitals

Goetz Bosse¹*, Wiltrud Abels¹, Ferdinand Mtatifikolo², Baltazar Ngoli³, Bruno Neuner¹, Klaus-Dieter Wernecke⁴, Claudia Spies¹

1 Department of Anaesthesiology and Intensive Care Medicine, Campus Charité Mitte and Campus Virchow-Klinikum, Charité—University Medicine Berlin, Berlin, Germany, **2** Bombo Regional Hospital, Tanga City, Tanga Region, Tanzania, **3** Component Leader Quality Improvement, Tanzanian-German Program To Support Health (TGPSH), giz Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit GmbH, Dar-es-Salaam, Tanzania, **4** Charité—University Medicine Berlin, Germany and Sostana GmbH, Berlin, Germany

* These authors contributed equally to this work.

* goetz.bosse@charite.de



OPEN ACCESS

Citation: Bosse G, Abels W, Mtatifikolo F, Ngoli B, Neuner B, Wernecke K, et al. (2015) Perioperative Care and the Importance of Continuous Quality Improvement—A Controlled Intervention Study in Three Tanzanian Hospitals. PLoS ONE 10(9): e0136156. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0136156

Editor: Chiara Lazzeri, Azienda Ospedaliero-Universitaria Careggi, ITALY

Received: September 26, 2014

Accepted: July 31, 2015

Published: September 1, 2015

Copyright: © 2015 Bosse et al. This is an open access article distributed under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.

Data Availability Statement: All relevant original data are included within the paper. Final outcome data were obtained from the annual regional reports and hospital reports that were published through the Ministry of Health and Social Welfare in Tanzania and were included as a Supporting Information file to the paper.

Funding: The development project out of which the present study evolved was funded by the European ESTHER Alliance. Number of the GIZ Esther Project Phase 1 was 81130201. The funders had no role in study design, data collection and analysis, decision to

Abstract

Introduction

Surgical services are increasingly seen to reduce death and disability in Sub-Saharan Africa, where hospital-based mortality remains alarmingly high. This study explores two implementation approaches to improve the quality of perioperative care in a Tanzanian hospital. Effects were compared to a control group of two other hospitals in the region without intervention.

Methods

All hospitals conducted quality assessments with a Hospital Performance Assessment Tool. Changes in immediate outcome indicators after one and two years were compared to final outcome indicators such as Anaesthetic Complication Rate and Surgical Case Fatality Rate.

Results

Immediate outcome indicators for Preoperative Care in the intervention hospital improved (52.5% in 2009; 84.2% in 2011, $p < 0.001$). Postoperative Inpatient Care initially improved to then decline again (63.3% in 2009; 70% in 2010; 58.6% in 2011). In the control group, preoperative care declined from 50.8% (2009) to 32.8% (2011, $p < 0.001$), while postoperative care did not significantly change. Anaesthetic Complication Rate in the intervention hospital declined (1.89% before intervention; 0.96% after intervention, $p = 0.006$). Surgical Case Fatality Rate in the intervention hospital declined from 5.67% before intervention to 2.93% after intervention ($p < 0.001$). Surgical Case Fatality Rate in the control group was 4%

publish, or preparation of the manuscript. In the framework of a development cooperation, GIZ Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit GmbH provided support in the form of a grant for CS and salaries for B. Ngoli, as well as personal fees and per diems for GB and WA during their working periods in Tanzania, but did not have any additional role in the study design, data collection and analysis, decision to publish, or preparation of the manuscript.

Competing Interests: One of the authors, B. Ngoli, is employed by a commercial company "GIZ Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit GmbH". This does not alter the authors' adherence to PLOS ONE policies on sharing data and materials.

before intervention and 3.8% after intervention ($p = 0.411$). Anaesthetic Complication Rate in the control group was not available.

Discussion

Immediate outcome indicators initially improved, while at the same time final outcome declined (Surgical Case Fatality, Anaesthetic Complication Rate). Compared to the control group, final outcome improved more in the intervention hospital, although the effect was not significant over the whole study period. Documentation of final outcome indicators seemed inconsistent. Immediate outcome indicators seem more helpful to steer the Continuous Quality Improvement program.

Conclusion

Specific interventions as part of Continuous Quality Improvement might lead to sustainable improvement of the quality of care, if embedded in a multi-faceted approach.

Introduction

Surgery is an integral part of global health care with an estimated 234 million major surgical procedures performed annually. In 2004, countries spending less than 100 US\$ per head for health care accounted for a third of the global population. However, only 3.4% of all major surgery was carried out in these countries [1]. A similar disproportion had already been found 14 years earlier [2]. Today, essential surgical and anaesthetic services are increasingly acknowledged as possible key factors in reducing death and disability for developing countries, whilst remaining cost-effective [3–7].

In developing countries, mortality rates for patients undergoing major surgery have been suggested to range between 2.6% and 10%, depending upon hospital setting, type of anaesthesia and surgical procedure [1,8,9]. According to a review in 2012, perioperative mortality within 48 hours of surgery in developing countries was much lower than this figure [10]. However, the authors have been criticized for including too few studies from actual developing countries, thus underestimating mortality rates drastically [11]. Even in Europe, Pearse et al. found that average in-hospital mortality after non-cardiac surgery was as high as 4% with a broad confidence interval [12].

Searching for the reasons for high mortality rates, several authors have estimated that avoidable mistakes accounted for up to half of adverse events in surgical care in developing countries [13–15]. The World Health Organization stated that rates of avoidable deaths associated with surgery and anaesthesia in Sub-Saharan Africa depended upon the setting and could be 100–1000 times higher than in industrialized countries [16].

Avoidable mistakes can occur not only within, but also before and after the actual operation. In their 2012 review on perioperative mortality in developing countries, Bainbridge et al. defined the perioperative period as 48 hours after surgery [10]. Commonly, the perioperative period consist of pre-, intra-, and postoperative patient care. Preoperative care includes the preparation for surgery, including history taking and necessary diagnostics, documentation of risk factors, measures for limiting anxiety and adequate fasting orders. Intraoperative care includes the induction and maintenance of anaesthesia, monitoring of the patient and not at

least the surgical procedure itself. Postoperative care begins with the admission to the recovery room, where vital signs are monitored closely, and does not end before discharge.

A study from the Netherlands found that the majority of critical incidents occurred pre- and postoperatively, not intraoperatively. Thus, it was emphasized that patient safety in the operating room alone, e.g. with the WHO Surgical Safety checklist, might be insufficient, when quality of care in the pre- and postoperative phases are neglected [17]. Traditionally, surgery has focused on the operation itself. However, only if we consider all three phases of perioperative care as equally important, we might be able to improve patient outcome. This accounts for both developed as well as developing countries.

The health care system in Tanzania is structured in levels, with health care facilities providing different levels of specification and emergency services. According to the Ministry of Health and Social Welfare in Tanzania, the lowest level is the village health service, followed by dispensary services, health centre services, district hospitals, regional hospitals and referral/consultant hospitals [18]. All hospitals in this study are district and regional hospitals, with emergency and surgical services. A study from 2011 reports severe structural shortcomings and lack of personnel in facilities providing emergency services and surgical services in Tanzania [19].

In 2005, the authors implemented the Hospital Performance Assessment Tool (HPAT) in all governmental hospitals in Tanga Region, Tanzania, to review the quality of health care services and identify areas in need of improvement [20]. As introduced in earlier studies, the results of the HPAT assessments can be considered as immediate outcome indicators as they assess the adherence to a target standard and give a result for an individual process immediately after it has ended [21]. Immediate outcome indicators augment final outcome indicators like e.g. mortality or case fatality, such as the Surgical Case Fatality Rate (SCFR). Next to structure and process, both kinds of outcome indicators are part of the HPAT assessments.

In 2009, a continuous quality improvement (CQI) approach was implemented in the intervention hospital by the Tanzanian partners. CQI is based on the idea of the Deming cycle [22] and has similarities with the Plan-Do-Study-Act (PDSA) cycle as outlined by the National Health Service (NHS) [23]. CQI aims to gradually improve care quality through a circle of: quality assurance, analysis of results, designing target-specific interventions, implementing change and re-evaluating effects through re-assessment (quality assurance) again. The approach has been suggested to potentially be valuable in developing countries, where challenges were multifaceted and often difficult to identify [24]. In our CQI approach, a detailed list of interventions (action plan) was implemented as a result of every assessment in the regional hospital over the period 2009–2011. A quality team (QT) concerned with monitoring the implementation of quality interventions was appointed from the hospital's health workers.

In 2009, within the feedback meeting in the intervention hospital, the newly founded quality team identified several aspects of surgical care in their institution that were in need of improvement:

- In preoperative care, a preoperative visit was virtually non-existent, leading to a lack of information about any past medical history, bleeding disorders, medication or allergies. It was supposed that this was likely to entail complications during anaesthesia and contributed to the high anaesthetic complication rate in the hospital.
- In postoperative care, it was found that wound dressings were not changed at appropriate intervals, supposedly increasing infectious complications and eventually mortality; vital signs and urine input and output was not measured sufficiently, potentially leading to the non-detection of blood loss after major surgery or renal failure, which was considered to be associated with a high Surgical Case Fatality Rate (SCFR).

Concerning these challenges in pre- and postoperative care, the quality team decided on two specific interventions. In the field of preoperative care, a compulsory standardized checklist for the preoperative anaesthetic visit was introduced. For postoperative care, pre-existing weekly educational sessions were amended by topics from the clinical process of postoperative care, such as changing wound dressings, input/output documentation, and management of nasogastric tubes.

Aim of the study

The aim of this study was to assess the effects of different quality improvement interventions and their respective implementation strategies in pre- and postoperative care between 2009 and 2011 in the intervention hospital. They were compared to a control group of two hospitals in the region with quality assessments but without interventions. Immediate and final outcome indicators (Surgical Case fatality Rate and Anaesthetic Complication rate) were used to evaluate quality changes.

Methods

This study builds upon two previous studies by the same authors [20,21]. While the first two studies introduced the HPAT instrument and evaluated feasibility, this study goes beyond that by specifically investigating targeted interventions that had been identified through the annual hospital performance assessment and were specifically designed to improve quality of services in the intervention hospital.

Ethical approval

In this prospective, controlled study data authorization and ethical committee approval was obtained from the National Institute of Medical Research in Tanzania as an amendment to ethical clearance reference number NIMR/HQ/P.12/Vol.VIII/27. For the routine collection of quantitative assessment data in the framework of the annual quality assurance it was decided by the ethic committee that it was not necessary to further obtain patients' written consent. The assessments were part of the internal quality assessment by the hospital management and no patient had to undergo additional and/or invasive procedures.

Study setting

Tanga Region is in Northeastern Tanzania. In the 2012 census, the population of the region was counted to be 2,045,205 people. There are six governmental hospitals in the region providing emergency and surgical services as district and regional hospitals. The intervention hospital is the regional hospital, and as such the reference institution for the whole region. According to the Ministry of Health in Tanzania, the difference between district hospital and regional hospital is supposed to be a higher density of specialist services [18]. Indeed, the intervention hospital provides e.g. ophthalmological services and advanced lab services. However, during the study period, there was no specialist general surgeon present in the intervention hospital. Between 2009 and 2011, the most common surgical diagnoses for inpatients in the intervention hospital were hernia and varicocele, appendicitis, intestinal obstruction and septic wounds. Almost 50% of the operations were emergency procedures. At baseline in 2009, all hospitals in this study sometimes had more patients than beds on the surgical wards. Antibiotic suspension solutions were shared among patients, if available. Drug sideboards were rarely locked, but anyways almost always empty, and patients were required to buy their medication themselves from the pharmacy on the hospital grounds. Disinfection was not always available, neither

were gloves. Side rooms and toilets were often dirty, bedpans or-buckets had to be emptied into shared toilets and examination tables were not cleaned after use. Blood pressure machines were not always functioning well, if available at all. There was no intensive care unit in none of the hospitals. In the files of surgical patients, allergies, medication and past medical history was only irregularly documented in all of the hospitals. Postoperatively, monitoring of vital signs like blood pressure and fever as well as urine input/output was almost never documented as often as the orders required.

Intervention hospital and control group

There are six governmental hospitals in Tanga Region, five district hospitals and one district/regional hospital. The district/regional hospital is the reference institution for all other hospitals in the region. As the regional hospital, it is supposed to provide more specialized care and a higher level of expertise. It is also bigger than the other hospitals. However, during the course of this study there was no specialized general or orthopaedic surgeon working at the regional hospital. Thus, it mainly served as the district hospital for the largest city in the region with roughly the quarter of a million inhabitants. The main difference between the intervention hospital and the district hospitals was the administrative function, which primarily did not affect clinical procedures. The Hospital Performance Assessment Tool (HPAT) used in this study can be used to assess clinical procedures in district and regional hospitals. In this study, the regional hospital will be referred to as the intervention hospital, because it was the only hospital with a full continuous quality improvement (CQI) approach. In the other five hospitals in Tanga Region, there were only annual assessments of care quality and feedback meetings, but no interventions to improve areas with low performance or other quality improvements efforts. One of the district hospitals was not included into the control group because it was a former missionary hospital thus being different in structural quality and process organization. In another district hospital there had been an attempt to introduce an action plan in 2009 that had not been followed up. At baseline, only two of the remaining three hospitals were similar in terms of bed capacity and number of major surgical operations. Hence, the control group eventually consisted of these two district hospitals. They were pooled together in the control group of this study to allow comparison to the intervention hospital. The groups were comparable in number of beds and number of operations, number of medical personnel and number of surgical wards. However, a detailed list of individual hospital characteristics has been given in the results section and limitations are discussed later in the manuscript ([Table 1](#)). A similar comparison of a control group with the intervention hospital has been used in an earlier study [[21](#)].

Hospital Performance Assessment Tool (HPAT) and continuous quality improvement

All assessments in this study have been performed with a quality assessment tool, which has been published by the authors in earlier articles, the Hospital Performance Assessment Tool (HPAT) [[20,21](#)]. The HPAT is structured along Donabedian's structure, process and outcome (SPO) model of quality [[25](#)]. It includes 1162 items organized in 55 key procedures for process quality and 11 procedures for structural quality. Key procedures are based on evidence-based recommendations and national as well as international guidelines. They were carefully adapted to the local setting before their first application in 2006 in Tanga region. This is in line with Bainbridge et al. who have called for evidence-based best practice in developing countries in order to reduce the total perioperative and anaesthesia-related mortality [[10](#)]. Thus, quality of services is assessed against a target standard. In the surgical part of the HPAT there are a total

Table 1. Individual hospital characteristics of the control group 2009 to 2011.

Hospital characteristics	2009	2010	2011
Intervention hospital			
Bed Capacity	392	392	392
Number of health workers	370	382	382
Medical Doctors / Assistant Medical Officers	27	33	33
Number of major surgical operations	1495	1558	1558
Control group total			
Bed Capacity	220	120	229
Number of health workers	159	197	286
Medical Doctors / Assistant Medical Officers	16	15**	31
Number of major surgical operations	1211	1574	1775
Control group hospital 1			
Bed Capacity	119	120	120
Number of health workers	36*	34*	120
Medical Doctors /Assistant Medical Officers	7	1**	12
Number of major surgical operations	594	975	1112
Control group hospital 2			
Bed Capacity	101	109	109
Number of health workers	123	163	166
Medical doctors / Assistant Medical Officers	9	14	19
Number of major surgical operations	617	599	663

Figures were taken from the annual hospital reports of the intervention hospital and the regional primary health care (PHC) reports (please see supplementary files: [S1 Table](#), [S2 Table](#), [S3 Table](#), [S4 Table](#), [S5 Table](#), [S6 Table](#), [S7 Table](#))

*the number of health workers seems inconsistently documented (supplementary file: [S1 Table](#), [S2 Table](#))

** the number of medical doctors in the second control group hospital is missing in 2010, thus this number is likely to be underestimated (see supplementary file: [S5 Table](#)).

doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0136156.t001

of 12 key procedures with 176 items [21]. For every key procedure there is a checklist that is used for on-site observation and/or patient file review. The result of every key procedure is an immediate outcome indicator that specifically reflects the key procedure it derives from. The immediate outcome indicator expresses to what extent the target standard expressed with the checklist is adhered to. E.g., one immediate outcome indicator in this study is if wound dressings are changed according to orders. If the indicator is fulfilled it will help to detect wound infections and initiate timely treatment. Thus, the interaction of all immediate outcome indicators, along with hospital-independent factors leads to the final outcome, e.g. the Surgical Case Fatality Rate (CFR). Final outcome indicators in this study are Anaesthetic Complication Rate (ACR) and Surgical Case Fatality Rate (SCFR). They were derived from the annual hospital reports of the intervention hospital, from the annual regional hospital reports, and from the documentation of the surgical departments in the control group hospitals. The distinction between immediate and final outcome indicators has been established and described in detail in an earlier publication [21].

All HPAT assessments were part of ongoing routine annual quality assessments that have been conducted in all hospitals in Tanga region since 2006. Part of the HPAT approach are feedback meetings after every assessment, where results were analysed, presented and discussed with the health workers from the respective facility. Assessments and feedback meetings have been conducted every year in all hospitals since 2006. In the 2009 feedback meeting in

intervention hospital, the hospital management decided to use assessment results to not only identify areas with low performance but also improve them with specific quality improvement interventions. A quality team was appointed from all groups of health workers, as described in a previous study [21]. The team was to identify areas with low performance, design specific interventions, implement them and evaluate changes in the next HPAT assessment feedback meeting one year later. This approach is similar to the plan-do-study-act cycle [23], the Deming cycle [22,26] and constitutes a continuous quality improvement (CQI) approach. All the other hospitals in the study did not introduce such an approach, although they would have had the possibility.

Specific interventions for pre- and postoperative care

In the field of surgery, two aspects of surgical care were found in need of improvement, namely pre- and postoperative care. As described in the introduction, a preoperative visit was virtually non-existent, leading to a lack of information about the patient's past medical history, bleeding disorders, medication or allergies. It was supposed that this was likely to entail complications during anaesthesia and contributed to the high anaesthetic complication rate in the hospital. In postoperative care, it was found that wound dressings were not changed at appropriate intervals, supposedly increasing infectious complications and eventually mortality; vital signs and urine input and output was not measured sufficiently, potentially leading to the non-detection of blood loss after major surgery or renal failure, which was considered to be associated with a high Surgical Case Fatality Rate (SCFR). These aspects were reflected in two key procedure checklists in the HPAT. One was the checklist "preoperative care", the other was a combination of items from the existing checklists "postoperative care", "ward round", and "service quality", which was termed "postoperative inpatient care" for this study. The latter included amongst others the changing of wound dressings at adequate intervals, the documentation of input and output, the application of pain medication, and the proper use of nasogastric tubes.

The interventions designed to meet these challenges were:

- For preoperative care: The introduction of a compulsory standardized checklist for the anaesthetic visit the day before surgery. The underlying implementation approach was multi-faceted and integrated several characteristics of a successful implementation [27,28]: provision of a) an evidence-based target standard for the measurement of clinical performance, b) an educational tool for on-the-job training, and c) a matrix for supervision and feedback.
- For postoperative care: The introduction of educational sessions on selected items in the performance of postoperative care, such as: application of pain medication, management of nasogastric tubes, wound dressings, and documentation of intake and output in patient files. The implementation approach here was to amend a pre-existing continuing education program in the framework of the weekly department meetings.

The implementation of interventions was to be conducted immediately and changes were to be evaluated in the next HPAT assessment. The head surgeon and head nurse were accountable for the implementation within the department and provided supervision for the use of the checklist in preoperative care, as well as gave the presentation on postoperative care.

Assessment method

Both key procedures "preoperative care" and "postoperative inpatient care" consist of a checklist of items. Both procedures are given in Fig 1 and Fig 2.

Preoperative care had 8 items, postoperative inpatient care had 10 items. Checklist items were assessed on a Likert scale with either 0, 1, or 2: Zero (0) expressed 0% of the standard was

No.	Item	n ₁	n ₂	n ₃																Comment	How to do it / Explanation
1	Was the patient seen by an anaesthetist the day before operation?																				Take 10 files and check for anaesthetic notes; Apply the 1/3 rule: <1/3 give 0, >1/3 but <2/3 give 1, >2/3 give 2
2	Did the anaesthetist document the anaesthetic history?																				History needs to be more than one sentence, needs to include present history, past medical, social history etc.; Apply the 1/3 rule
3	Have contributing illnesses been documented?																				Take 10 files and check for anaesthetic notes, if no contributing illnesses, it must be documented; Apply the 1/3 rule
4	Are allergies documented?																				Same as above; Apply the 1/3 rule
5	Are the necessary lab results documented (at least HB and FBS)?																				If only one is documented give 1, if none give 0
6	Did the patient get any form of premedication?																				Take 10 files and check for anaesthetic notes, check if it is given (nurse signature); Apply the 1/3 rule
7	Was fasting ordered?																				Take 10 files and check for anaesthetic notes; Apply the 1/3 rule
8	Has the patient signed a consent form?																				Take 10 files and check for anaesthetic notes; Apply the 1/3 rule
	Total sum achieved																			%	
	Total sum possible																				
	not applicable = "x"																				

Fig 1. HPAT assessment checklist for Preoperative Care. Whenever possible, ten observations or file reviews should be conducted for key procedures in process quality. Single items were assessed with 0/2 = not available/performed = 0%, 1/2 = partly available/irregularly performed = 50% or 2/2 = available/performed = 100%.

doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0136156.g001

adhered to and the item was not performed/not available. One (1) expressed 33.3%–66.6% of the standard was adhered to and the item was irregularly performed/not always available. Two (2) expressed 66.67%–100% of the standard was adhered to or fully performed/always available. E.g., if wound dressing were to be changed every day over the course of 7 days, than a “0” was given, when it was done less than twice; a “1” was given when it was done more often than twice but less than 5 times; a 2 was given when it was done 5 times and more often. The application of the rule for specific items was described in a “How to do it” section within the assessment checklists. This column explains explicitly how every item was to be assessed, and a cut off level was described for every individual item. Assessments were conducted in the same fashion in all hospitals in this study. Two observers assessed all items individually and compared their results later on in order to limit observer bias. In case of disagreement, assessments were repeated. They were supervised by the Regional Health Management Team. Assessments were conducted annually and took an average of three working days in all hospitals, respectively.

Immediate outcome indicators for the two key procedures under survey in this study are given as average percentage of all items. Amongst others, Nachtigall et al. have described that 70% of adherence to standards can improve patient outcome [24]. In our approach, it was agreed within the quality team that 80% was the benchmark for good quality, as described in a previous publication [21].

Comparison of results

Differences in immediate outcome indicators from the baseline (2009) and within the intervention period 2010 to 2011 were compared over time as well as between intervention hospital and control group. Surgical Case Fatality Rates (SCFR) was calculated from the annual hospital

No.	Item	n ₁	n ₂	n _x														Comment	How to do it / Explanation
1	Are orders fulfilled?																		Apply the 1/3 rule: count orders; count how many are fulfilled; <1/3 give 0, >1/3 but <2/3 give 1, >2/3 give 2
2	Are wounds dressed once a day or according to orders?																		Apply the 1/3 rule
3	Does staff wash or disinfect their hands before and after contact?																		Rinsing is not enough, give 1
4	Does staff adhere to hygienic procedures when in contact with patients (when taking blood, putting up a drip or giving blood)?																		Watch all procedures, then apply 1/3 rule
5	Does staff document care?																		Apply 1/3 rule
6	Are input and output checked every 4 hours within the first 24 hours (in case of major surgery)?																		Summary made once a day
7	Was the absence of bleeding checked for at least twice in the first 24 hours?																		Check for documentation (10 files); Apply 1/3 rule
8	Is analgesic medication given?																		Take 10 files, check if it is given (nurse signature); Apply 1/3 rule
9	Does the patient have an (open) i.v. line?																		Check whether it is open, if not give 1
10	Are notes and observations checked by a doctor once a day?																		Check in 10 files for Dr's signature; Apply 1/3 rule
	Total sum achieved																	%	

Fig 2. HPAT assessment checklist for Postoperative Inpatient Care. Whenever possible, ten observations or file reviews should be conducted for key procedures in process quality. Single items were assessed with 0/2 = not available/performed = 0%, 1/2 = partly available/irregularly performed = 50% or 2/2 = available/performed = 100%.

doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0136156.g002

reports of the intervention hospital. It was compared over time and between intervention hospital and control group. Anaesthetic Complication Rate was calculated from the annual report of the intervention hospital and compared over time.

Statistical analysis

Quantitative results were expressed and compared as fractions and proportions [%]. Confidence intervals for changes in immediate outcome indicators were given. In addition, the significance of changes in immediate outcome indicators was tested with chi-square-tests. All tests were carried out in exact versions because of small and unbalanced sample sizes. A two-tailed $p < 0.05$ was considered statistically significant. Analysis was done with IBM SPSS Statistics, Version 21, IBM Corporation and other(s) 1989, 2012. In order to relate immediate outcomes with final outcomes, data were stratified into years. Confidence intervals for the differences were given. Significance of changes in stratified final outcome indicators were tested with the Breslow and Day test for homogeneity of odds ratios in the strata as well as the Mantel-Haenszel test, as appropriate. Testing was done with StatXact, Version 6, CYTEL Software Corp., Cambridge, MA 02139, USA.

Results

Hospital characteristics

See [Table 1](#).

Table 2. Structural quality in the intervention hospital 2009 to 2011.

Intervention hospital Structural quality	2009 (t ₁) [%]	2010 (t ₂) [%]	2011 (t ₃) [%]	p value t ₁ –t ₂	p value t ₂ –t ₃	p value t ₁ –t ₃
Surgical department	44/76 [57.9]	148/228 [64.9]	156/224 [69.6]	0.38	0.546	0.11

Significance was tested 2010 (t₂) against 2009 (t₁), 2011 (t₃) against 2010 (t₂) and 2011 (t₃) against 2009 (t₁).

doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0136156.t002

Structural quality

Immediate outcome indicators for structural quality in the surgical department and the operating theatre of the intervention hospital did not significantly improve. In the control group, structural quality declined over the study period from 67.1% (2009) to 50% (2011, $p = 0.003$). For overall structural quality in the intervention hospital and the control group see Tables 2 and 3.

Process quality—Preoperative Care

Immediate outcome indicators for Preoperative Care in the intervention hospital improved significantly in the first year after intervention (52.5% (2009) to 78.4% (2010), $p < 0.001$) and remained stable after that (84.2% (2011), $p = 0.15$; please refer to Table 4). While in 2009, only 4 out of 10 patients received a documented preoperative visits by an anaesthetist, all assessed preoperative patients received a visit the day before operation in 2010 and 2011. Anaesthetic history was documented in 50% (10/20) in 2009, and in 100% (30/30) in 2011.

Process quality—Postoperative Inpatient Care

Immediate outcome indicators for Postoperative Inpatient Care in the intervention hospital improved in the first year after the start of the intervention, although not significantly (63.3% (2009) to 70% (2010), $p = 0.33$; please refer to Table 6). In 2011, the overall level of performance quality declined again to a level comparable to the baseline (58.6% (2011), $p = 0.49$). E. g., input and output were checked in 50% (4/8) in 2009, 55% (11/20) in 2010 and 40.1% (9/22) in 2011. However, the changing of wound dressing improved from 50% (1/2) in 2009 to 83.3% (5/6) in 2010 to 100% (6/6) in 2011.

In the control group, the quality of Postoperative Inpatient Care declined in 2010, and improved again in 2011 up to a level similar to 2009 (for all immediate outcome indicators, see Table 7).

Outcome quality—Final outcome indicators

The Surgical Case Fatality Rate (SCFR) in the intervention hospital declined significantly after 2009 (5.67% (before intervention) to 2.93% (after intervention), $p < 0.001$; please refer to Table 8), but not in the control group (4% (before intervention) to 3.8% (after intervention), $p = 0.411$; please refer to Table 8).

Table 3. Structural quality in the control group 2009 to 2011.

Control group Structural quality	2009 (t ₁) [%]	2010 (t ₂) [%]	2011 (t ₃) [%]	p value t ₁ –t ₂	p value t ₂ –t ₃	p value t ₁ –t ₃
Surgical department	102/152 [67.1]	75/150 [50]	75/150 [50]	0.003*↓.	1	0.003*↓.

Significance was tested 2010 (t₂) against 2009 (t₁), 2011 (t₃) against 2010 (t₂) and 2011 (t₃) against 2009 (t₁). Significant decline was marked *↓.

doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0136156.t003

Table 4. Immediate outcome indicators for Preoperative Care in the intervention hospital 2009 to 2011.

Intervention hospital Preoperative Care	2009 t ₁ [%]	2010 t ₂ [%]	2011 t ₃ [%]	p value t ₁ –t ₂	p value t ₂ –t ₃	p value t ₁ –t ₃
Was the patient seen by an anesthetist the day before operation?	8/20 [40]	22/22 [100]	30/30 [100]	< 0.001*↑	1	< 0.001*↑
Did she/he document the anesthetic history?	10/20 [50]	22/22 [100]	30/30 [100]	< 0.001*↑	1	< 0.001*↑
Have contributing illnesses been documented?	8/20 [40]	9/22 [40.9]	20/30 [66.7]	1	0.092	0.085
Are allergies documented?	10/20 [50]	0/22 [0]	17/30 [56.7]	< 0.001*↓	< 0.001*↑	0.774
Are the necessary lab results documented (at least HB and FBS)?	8/20 [40]	22/22 [100]	15/30 [50]	< 0.001*↑	< 0.001*↓	0.569
Did the patient get any form of premedication?	4/20 [20]	8/8 [100]	30/30 [100]	< 0.001*↑	1	< 0.001*↑
Was fasting ordered?	16/20 [80]	22/22 [100]	30/30 [100]	< 0.043*↑	1	< 0.001*↑
Did the patient sign a consent form?	20/20 [100]	22/22 [100]	30/30 [100]	1	1	1
overall score [%]	84/160 [52.5]	127/162 [78.4]	202/240 [84.2]	< 0.001*↑	0.149	< 0.001*↑
difference of scores				-0.2590	-0.0577	-0.3167
95% CI of differences				-0.3544– –0.1560	-0.1383– 0.0187	-0.4038– –0.2249

Immediate outcome indicators from 2009, 2010, 2011. 2009 is the baseline assessment. Significance was tested 2010 (t₂) against 2009 (t₁), 2011 (t₃) against 2010 (t₂) and 2011 (t₃) against 2009 (t₁). Significant improvement is marked with *↑. Significant decline was marked *↓. Confidence interval is given for the differences of overall immediate outcome of the key procedure in 2009, 2010 and 2011.

In the control group, the quality of Preoperative Care did significantly decrease over the whole study period (see Table 5). Patients received anaesthetic visits the day before operation in less than 25% over the whole study period (7/32 in 2009, 0/28 in 2010 and 2011).

doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0136156.t004

The rate of anaesthetic complications in the intervention hospital declined significantly after 2009 (1.89% (before intervention) to 0.96% (after intervention), $p = 0.006$; please refer to Table 9). The rate of anaesthetic complications in the control group was not available over the whole study period.

Table 5. Immediate outcome indicators for Preoperative Care in the Control Group 2009 to 2011.

Control group Preoperative Care	2009 t ₁ [%]	2010 t ₂ [%]	2011 t ₃ [%]	p value t ₁ –t ₂	p value t ₂ –t ₃	p value t ₁ –t ₃
Was the patient seen by an anesthetist the day before operation?	7/32 [21.9]	0/28 [0]	0/28 [0]	0.012*↓	1	0.012*↓
Did she/he document the anesthetic history?	22/32 [68.8]	0/28 [0]	0/28 [0]	<0.001*↓	1	<0.001*↓
Have contributing illnesses been documented?	16/32 [50]	0/28 [0]	20/28 [71.4]	<0.001*↓	<0.001*↑	0.117
Are allergies documented?	9/32 [28.1]	0/28 [0]	0/28 [0]	0.002*↓	1	0.002*↓
Are the necessary lab results documented (at least HB and FBS)?	25/32 [78.1]	8/28 [28.6]	16/28 [57.1]	<0.001*↓	0.058	0.101
Did the patient get any form of premedication?	4/32 [12.5]	0/28 [0]	0/28 [0]	0.116	1	0.116
Was fasting ordered?	22/32 [68.8]	3/28 [10.7]	13/28 [46.4]	<0.001*↓	0.007*↓	0.116
Did the patient sign a consent form?	25/32 [78.1]	14/28 [50]	14/28 [50]	0.031*↓	1	0.031*↓
overall score [%]	130/256 [50.8]	25/192 [13.02]	63/192 [32.8]	<0.001*↓	<0.001*↑	<0.001*↓
difference of scores				0.3776	-0.1979	0.1797
95% CI of differences				0.2956– 0.4505	-0.2781– –0.1147	0.0875– –0.2668

Immediate outcome indicators from 2009, 2010, 2011. 2009 is the baseline assessment. Significance was tested 2010 (t₂) against 2009 (t₁), 2011 (t₃) against 2010 (t₂) and 2011 (t₃) against 2009 (t₁). Significant improvement is marked with *↑. Significant decline was marked *↓. Confidence interval is given for the differences of overall immediate outcome of the key procedure in 2009, 2010 and 2011.

doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0136156.t005

Table 6. Immediate outcome indicators for Postoperative Inpatient Care in the intervention hospital 2009 to 2011.

Intervention Hospital Postoperative Inpatient Care	2009 t1 [%]	2010 t2 [%]	2011 t3 [%]	p value t1 —t2	p value t2 —t3	p value t1 — t3
Are orders fulfilled?	1/2 [50]	5/6 [83.3]	5/6 [83.3]	1	1	1
Are wounds dressed once a day?	1/2 [50]	5/6 [83.3]	6/6 [100]	1	1	1
Does staff wash or disinfect their hands before and after contact?	0/2 [0]	4/6 [66.7]	2/6 [33.3]	0.429	0.567	1
Does staff adhere to hygienic procedures when in contact with patients (when taking blood, putting up a drip or giving blood)?	1/2 [50]	6/6 [100]	4/6 [66.7]	0.25	0.455	1
Does staff document care?	1/2 [50]	4/6 [66.7]	3/6 [50]	1	1	1
Are input / output checked every 4 hours for the first 24 hours?	4/8 [50]	11/20 [55]	9/22 [40.1]	1	0.537	0.698
Is absence of bleeding checked at least twice?	7/20 [35]	10/32 [31.3]	3/22 [13.7]	1	0.199	0.152
Is analgesic medication given?	20/20 [100]	32/32 [100]	22/22 [100]	1	1	1
Does the patient have an (open) iv line?	8/12 [66.7]	20/24 [83.3]	12/22 [54.5]	0.397	0.054	0.717
Are notes and observation charts checked by Dr and documented once a day?	12/20 [60]	21/32 [65.6]	16/22 [72.7]	0.771	0.767	0.515
overall score [%]	57/90 [63.3]	119/170 [70.0]	82/140 [58.6]	0.329	0.042*↓	0.493
difference of scores				-0.0667	0.1143	0.0476
95% CI of differences				-0.1879– 0.0507	0.0075– 0.2189	-0.0818– 0.1716

Immediate outcome indicators from 2009, 2010, 2011. 2009 is the baseline assessment. Significance was tested 2010 (t2) against 2009 (t1), 2011 (t3) against 2010 (t2) and 2011 (t3) against 2009 (t1). Significant improvement is marked with *↑. Significant decline was marked *↓. Confidence interval is given for the differences of overall immediate outcome of the key procedure in 2009, 2010 and 2011.

doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0136156.t006

Stratified analysis of SCFR with respect to the years 2009 and 2011 resulted in significantly different odds ratios of strata (Breslow and Day test, $p < 0.0001$), i.e. SCFR was different in those years between hospital and control (odds ratio before intervention 1.42, odds ratio after intervention 0.76). Details for the SCFR before and after intervention are given in Table 8. SCFR differed significantly between hospital and control both before and after intervention ($p \leq 0.01$ each), but the common odds ratio over the years of 1.05 was not significant ($p = 0.52$, Mantel-Haenszel test).

Discussion

The main findings of this study are:

1. Changes in structural quality were independent from changes in process quality.
2. Through the CQI approach, immediate outcome indicators for preoperative care in the intervention hospital improved. Improvements were associated with a decrease in the Surgical Case Fatality Rate and the Anaesthetic Complication Rate.
3. The comparison of pre- and postoperative implementation strategies in the intervention hospital showed that in the first year both implementation approaches lead to improvement in immediate outcome indicators. After two years, it seems that the improvement was not sustainable in Postoperative Inpatient Care.
4. Initial improvements in performance quality were associated with both decreased Surgical Case Fatality Rate and Anaesthetic Complication Rate in the intervention hospital.

Table 7. Immediate outcome indicators for Postoperative Inpatient Care in the Control Group 2009 to 2011.

Control group Postoperative Inpatient Care	2009 t ₁ [%]	2010 t ₂ [%]	2011 t ₃ [%]	p value t ₁ –t ₂	p value t ₂ –t ₃	p value t ₁ –t ₃
Are orders fulfilled?	3/4 [75]	2/4 [50.0]	2/4 [50.0]	1	1	1
Are wounds dressed once a day?	2/4 [50]	2/4 [50.0]	2/4 [50.0]	1	1	1
Does staff wash or disinfect their hands after contact?	3/4 [75]	0/4 [0]	0/4 [0]	0.143	1	1
Does staff adhere to hygienic procedures when in contact with patients (when taking blood, putting up a drip etc.)?	3/4 [75]	2/4 [50.0]	2/4 [50.0]	1	1	1
Does staff document care?	3/4 [75]	2/4 [50.0]	2/4 [50.0]	1	1	1
Is the input /output checked every 4 hours for the first 24 hours (in case of major operation)?	17/34 [50]	6/18 [33.3]	19/26 [73.1]	0.379	0.014*↑	0.11
Is absence of bleeding checked at least twice?	15/34 [44.1]	3/18 [16.7]	7/26 [26.9]	0.068	0.489	0.036*↓
Is anti-pain medication applied?	54/54 [100]	17/18 [94.4]	26/26 [100]	0.25	0.409	n.a.
Does the patient have an (open) iv line?	47/54 [74]	18/18 [100]	26/26 [100]	0.181	1	0.09
Are notes and observation charts checked by Dr and documented once a day?	35/40 [87]	3/18 [16.7]	13/26 [50]	0.172	<0.001*↓	<0.001*↓
overall immediate outcome [%]	123/176 [69.9]	55/110 [50]	99/150 [66]	0.001*↓	0.011	0.476
difference				0.1989	-0.1600	0.0389
95% CI of differences				0.0825– 0.3102	-0.2961 –0.0389	-0.0618 –0.1398

Immediate outcome indicators from 2009, 2010, 2011. 2009 is the baseline assessment. Significance was tested 2010 (t₂) against 2009 (t₁), 2011 (t₃) against 2010 (t₂) and 2011 (t₃) against 2009 (t₁). Significant improvement is marked with *↑. Significant decline was marked *↓. Confidence interval is given for the differences of overall immediate outcome of the key procedure in 2009, 2010 and 2011.

doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0136156.t007

However, final outcome data were partly not available and documentation of final outcome indicators appeared questionable. Thus, final outcome indicators alone seem not sensitive enough a measuring and/or steering tool for changes and improvements in pre- and postoperative care in this setting.

Structural quality

In our study, structural quality seemed to be hardly associated with process quality. Process quality did not always decrease or increase along with structural quality, let alone to the same amount. As Peabody et al. pointed out in 2006 for the World Bank, structural improvements by themselves rarely improve the health of a population in developing countries [29]. We agree with Reerink et al. who said that it was not sensible to exclusively focus on improving structural quality in order to improve patient outcome; but rather to strengthen process quality, as they are different entities [30,31].

CQI and improvement

Through embedding HPAT results into a continuous quality improvement strategy, preoperative service quality in the intervention hospital seemed to improve lastingly over the course of the study. Postoperative interventions did only initially improve and declined again. These

Table 8. Surgical Case Fatality Rate for the intervention hospital and the control group before and after intervention.

	before intervention [%]	after intervention [%]	p value before—after
SCFR intervention hospital	5.67% n = 3,035	2.93% n = 3,654	<0.001*↓
	172/3035	107/3654	
Difference [%]			2.74
CI of difference [%]			1.77–3.75
SCFR control group total	4.0%	3.8%	0.411
	n = 11040	n = 13664	
	447/11040	525/13664	
p-value	< 0.001	0.009	
Difference [%]	1.62	-0.91	
CI of difference [%]	0.76–2.57	-1.52 —0.24	
Odds Ratio [95%-CI]	1.42 [1.2–1.7]	0.76 [0.6–0.9]	
SCFR control group hospital 1	3.89% n = 6,831	3.73% n = 8,797	
	266/6831	328/8797	
	< 0.001	0.029	
Odds Ratio [95%-CI]	1.48 [1.2–1.8]	0.78 [0.6–0.9]	
SCFR control group hospital 2	4.3% n = 4209	4.04% n = 4867	
	181/4209	197/4867	
	0.008	0.007	
Odds Ratio [95%-CI]	1.34 [1.1–1.7]	0.72 [0.6–0.9]	

Figures were taken from the annual hospital reports, the annual regional reports and individual hospitals' documentations. SCFR = Surgical Case Fatality Rate; before intervention = 2009; after intervention = 2010 or 2011, resp., as there was not always available in both years

doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0136156.t008

findings do not prove that integrating interventions into a continuous quality improvement program is a prerequisite for sustainability. However, they suggest it, as CQI has been proposed to be especially useful for developing countries, where deep-rooted challenges might have to be improved in a continuous process rather than resolved “overnight” [24]. In this study, CQI interventions in the intervention hospital lead to better immediate outcome indicators, while at the same time the Surgical Case Fatality Rate and the Anaesthetic Complication Rate decreased as compared to the control group.

Comparison of implementation approaches

Through the implementation approach of introducing a compulsory standardized checklist, the intervention in preoperative care appears to have had a significant positive effect on the

Table 9. Anaesthetic Complication Rate for the intervention hospital before and after intervention.

	before intervention	after intervention	
ACR intervention hospital	1.89% n = 2,431	0.96% n = 2,710	0.006*↓
	46/2431	26/2710	
difference [%]			0.93
CI of difference [%]			0.29–1.63
ACR control group	n.a.	n.a.	

ACR = Anaesthetic Complication Rate. Significance was tested a) before intervention (2009) against after intervention (2010, as there was no data available for 2011). Significant decline was marked with *↓.

doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0136156.t009

immediate outcome indicators, which lasted over the whole study periods. It is well known that checklists increase standardization in work processes and avoid reliance on memory, thereby decreasing the chances of human error [32]. In its 1999 report “To err is human”, the Institute of Medicine recommended verification processes such as checklists in order to minimize the human factor in complex medical processes [33]. We agree to that. However, we suggest that there are more reasons why the use of a checklist has a good potential for sustainable improvement. Checklists combine several aspects of a successful implementation approach. They represent the target standard from which they derive. They can be applied as an educational tool, are available at the point of care, serve as a matrix for on-the-job-training, and give immediate feedback on completion of a task. They make performance measurable and can positively motivate in case of improved performance. They can be used for supervision and control of the actual performance in daily practice. Other large-scale interventions are reported, where checklists lead to quality improvements. As a well-known example, after its worldwide introduction, the Surgical Safety Checklist by the World Health Organization has been recognised as a generally effective measure in order to increase patient safety in the operating room [14]. In 2013, a Quality Rounds Checklist could sustainably increase compliance with evidence-based standards and decrease complications in a trauma intensive care unit [34]. Through its multifaceted character they might be a cornerstone to improve patient safety sustainably.

In Postoperative Inpatient Care the implementation strategy was to amend the pre-existing continuing education program. Follow-up, on-the-job-training, supervision or feedback mechanisms were not included. After an initial increase in performance, improvements could not be sustained. We believe that the introduction of educational sessions alone can only be the starting point or an accompanying feature of an intervention, but seems to lack important aspects to maintain improved performance. Several authors tried to describe those additional aspects. In a qualitative study on the implementation of a perinatal audit in South Africa, several factors were identified to play a central role for implementation and sustainability. Amongst those factors were supervisory activities and feedback meetings [27]. A study on the implementation of the guidelines for Integrated Management of Childhood Illnesses (IMCI) found that performance feedback was a promising technique for improving adherence to the guidelines and the quality of care [28]. In Kenyan district hospitals, Ayieko et al found that a “full intervention” in paediatric care with local facilitation, supervision and face-to-face feedback was associated with greater quality improvement after 18 months than a merely “partial” intervention where those aspects were absent [35].

In their 2012 review, Hulscher et al tested 23 studies from all over the world for determinants of sustainable quality improvement interventions. There was no significant factor that for sure guaranteed success and sustainable improvement. However, the chance of long-term success was higher, whenever data collection on specific areas in need of improvement continued [36]. We agree with this view. Thus, in our program, implementation approaches for interventions are multifaceted and interventions themselves are assessed and re-assessed annually.

Umar et al. found that it might be effective to adopt a rather slow “little-steps” approach involving health workers to develop a quality culture and a management scheme with targeted interventions from the scratch [37]. In Benin, trained workers performed better when they were supervised after they received training on Integrated Management of Childhood Illnesses (IMCI) guidelines [38]. Continuing education after training on IMCI guidelines improved adherence in Morocco [39]. Thus, although in our study the introduction of a checklist has been proven to be lastingly effective, it has to be pointed out that it alone might not automatically lead to sustainably improved clinical processes and hence outcome. Aveling et al. expressed similar criticism towards the surgical safety checklist [40]. It seems crucially

important to not only introduce but to continuously support and supervise the use of a checklist in order to have a sustainable effect.

In essence, a multi-faceted approach and continuation seem valuable. We suggest this to be the true difference between introduction and implementation. The best intervention seems to be doomed to fail if it is not hold through, and it also seems of utmost importance to follow-up and re-evaluate existing interventions rather than break up and plan new ones.

Availability of final outcome indicators

In this study, the documentation of final outcome indicators was not always found to be trustworthy. Final outcome indicators were not always available, and documentation in the hospital reports seemed oftentimes inconsistent. This has also been described by other authors. As early as 1990, Nordberg et al. stated that it was difficult to assess the outcome of surgical care in East Africa because of problems in recording and reporting [2]. In 2009, Weiser et al. still found that the lack of standardised and well documented outcome measures for surgical care in developing countries seemed to be a global challenge [41].

Outcome-based monitoring is still the gold standard worldwide and reflects the success of any quality improvement program. If the quality of final outcome indicators is not assured, it seems difficult to use them for monitoring, evaluating and steering health care improvement programs. Thus, documentation and exactness in this field is mandatory. According to Donabedian, final patient outcome indicators are the desired ends of health care and cannot be neglected [21,42]. Amongst others, the WHO-based Health Metrics Network has acknowledged the challenge of completing and standardizing the collection of useful outcome measures. Until this collection is complete and documentation is reliable, it might make sense to rely on immediate outcome indicators as they are faster to generate and reflect immediately the situation, which in return helps to steer the program.

Limitations

There are some severe limitations to this study.

First, the hospitals in this study are not all of the same size. Technically, the intervention hospital is a regional reference hospital. In theory, a regional hospital should provide a greater level of expertise and a higher level of clinical and nursing care capability. According to the definition of tertiary care, there are supposed to be specialist services available at the regional hospital. This requirement was met in our intervention hospital in most of the departments. To name a few examples, the regional hospital provides specialist services such as dental surgery, has an ophthalmological outpatient department, and a specialist surgeon for gynaecology and obstetrics services. However, during our study period, there was no specialist general or orthopaedic surgeon working at the regional hospital. Thus the surgical department in the regional hospital was comparable to the surgical departments in the control group.

Still, the regional hospital served the biggest city in the region and probably has more severe cases than the control group hospitals. Beyond doubt comparisons in the quality of health services are limited if they are not derived from similar patient groups and usually, scoring systems are needed for defining individual risk levels. These depend e.g. upon age, severity of disease, co-morbidities and past medical history [43]. In this study, data was obtained from routine quality assessments and thus specific case mix adjustment has not been applied. It has also been said that when process measures are assessed for quality improvement, the problem of case mix largely ends where appropriate processes of care for specific patient groups have been defined [43]. This is the case in the structure of the HPAT, where high risk patients depend on different standards than non-risk patients. Different risk groups might require

different standards; however, all patients require that their standard is adhered to. In this way, basic stratification took place. This has been described in earlier studies [21].

Secondly, it is likely that the Hawthorne effect played no small role in our approach, as it must be assumed to do in most settings where observations take place. However, we think that the Hawthorne effect might have weighed less over the years, as assessments have become more and more part of the clinical routine since they had started in 2006. Also, assessments are conducted as peer assessments, which might have further reduced the Hawthorne effect.

Self-assessments bear a risk that individuals might want to make “their” hospital’s services appear better than they are. Thus, we used a system of two observers making independent observations and agreeing on one assessment result after comparing their individual ones. They were also supervised by the Regional Health Management Team, and we counterchecked the observations with file reviews.

Only one hospital in this study introduced an intervention to improve the quality of services. However, the quality assurance approach was the same for all district hospitals in Tanga Region. All the hospitals have used the Hospital Performance Assessment Tool (HPAT) and held feedback meetings to reflect upon the results since 2006. In 2009, the hospital management of the intervention hospital decided to go further and designed targeted interventions to very specifically improve areas where quality of services was low. They were not advised to do so and also all other hospitals would have had the freedom to do this or introduce other quality improvement activities. In our view, this self-directed course together with the self-assessment approach in the HPAT could be a crucial prerequisite of successful and hopefully sustainable quality improvement.

Conclusion

Both interventions showed initial improvements in the quality of care in the intervention hospital compared to the control group. These improvements in performance quality seemed independent from changes in structural quality. However, the introduction of a standardized checklist on preoperative care was followed by more lasting improvements than including specific activities in a pre-existing framework of educational sessions in the field of postoperative care. The checklist reflected the target standard, was always available at the point of care, and could be used for a matrix for further improvement activities. All these aspects together may have led to better results for a longer time than one single implementation aspect, such as education, for postoperative care. Further studies will be needed to test these categories.

Along with improvements in pre- and postoperative care, Anaesthetic Complication Rate and Surgical Case Fatality Rate in the intervention hospital did decline over the study period. These findings are limited by the fact that final outcome indicators oftentimes seemed unreliable and not consistently documented. Thus, some doubts remain that results could be incidental. Well documented final patient outcome indicators in hospital-dependent quality of care are still urgently needed because only good documentation can truthfully reflect changes in patient long-term outcome. They also may reflect the success of a quality improvement program.

Supporting Information

S1 Table. From control group hospital 1 regional report 2009.
(DOCX)

S2 Table. From control group hospital 1 regional report 2010.
(DOCX)

S3 Table. From control group hospital 1 regional report 2011.
(DOCX)

S4 Table. From control group hospital 2 regional report 2009.
(DOCX)

S5 Table. From control group hospital 2 regional report 2010.
(DOCX)

S6 Table. From control group hospital 2 regional report 2011.
(DOCX)

S7 Table. From intervention hospital reports 2009–2011.
(PDF)

Acknowledgments

We would like to say our thanks to all health workers in the district hospitals in Tanga region Tanzania; and to the staff and administration of Bombo Hospital in Tanga, Tanzania, for their long-term commitment and hard work to achieve better quality in health care every day, step by step.

Author Contributions

Conceived and designed the experiments: GB WA FM FM B. Ngoli CS. Performed the experiments: GB WA FM. Analyzed the data: GB WA B. Neuner KW CS. Contributed reagents/materials/analysis tools: GB WA B. Ngoli B. Neuner KW CS. Wrote the paper: GB WA B. Neuner KW CS. Obtained ethical approval: GB WA B. Ngoli CS. Coordinated logistics and support in Germany: CS B. Neuner. Coordinated logistics and support in Tanzania: FM B. Ngoli.

References

1. Weiser TG, Regenbogen SE, Thompson KD, Haynes AB, Lipsitz SR, et al. (2008) An estimation of the global volume of surgery: a modelling strategy based on available data. *Lancet* 372: 139–144. doi: [10.1016/S0140-6736\(08\)60878-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(08)60878-8) PMID: [18582931](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/18582931/)
2. Nordberg E (1990) Surgical operations in eastern Africa: a review with conclusions regarding the need for further research. *East Afr Med J* 67: 1–28.
3. Spiegel DA, Gosselin RA (2007) Surgical services in low-income and middle-income countries. *Lancet* 370: 1013–1015. PMID: [17889228](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/17889228/)
4. Ozgediz D, Riviello R (2008) The "other" neglected diseases in global public health: surgical conditions in sub-Saharan Africa. *PLoS Med* 5: e121. doi: [10.1371/journal.pmed.0050121](https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pmed.0050121) PMID: [18532875](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/18532875/)
5. Bae JY, Groen RS, Kushner AL (2011) Surgery as a public health intervention: common misconceptions versus the truth. *Bulletin of the World Health Organization* 89: 395–395.
6. Farmer PE, Kim JY (2008) Surgery and global health: a view from beyond the OR. *World J Surg* 32: 533–536. doi: [10.1007/s00268-008-9525-9](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00268-008-9525-9) PMID: [18311574](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/18311574/)
7. (2008) A crucial role for surgery in reaching the UN millennium development goals. *PLoS Med* 5: e182. doi: [10.1371/journal.pmed.0050182](https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pmed.0050182) PMID: [18752346](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/18752346/)
8. Ouro-Bang'na Maman AF, Tomta K, Ahouangbevi S, Chobli M (2005) Deaths associated with anaesthesia in Togo, West Africa. *Trop Doct* 35: 220–222. PMID: [16354475](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/16354475/)
9. Yip MK, Ng KJ (2002) Risk-adjusted surgical audit with the POSSUM scoring system in a developing country. *Physiological and Operative Severity Score for the Enumeration of Mortality and morbidity*. *Br J Surg* 89: 110–113. PMID: [11851674](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/11851674/)
10. Bainbridge D, Martin J, Arango M, Cheng D (2012) Perioperative and anaesthetic-related mortality in developed and developing countries: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Lancet* 380: 1075–1081. doi: [10.1016/S0140-6736\(12\)60990-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(12)60990-8) PMID: [22998717](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/22998717/)
11. Pollach G (2013) Anaesthetic-related mortality in sub-Saharan Africa. *Lancet* 381: 199.

12. Pearse RM, Moreno RP, Bauer P, Pelosi P, Metnitz P, et al. (2012) Mortality after surgery in Europe: a 7 day cohort study. *Lancet* 380: 1059–1065. doi: [10.1016/S0140-6736\(12\)61148-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(12)61148-9) PMID: [22998715](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/22998715/)
13. Heywood AJ, Wilson IH, Sinclair JR (1989) Perioperative mortality in Zambia. *Ann R Coll Surg Engl* 71: 354–358. PMID: [2604342](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/2604342/)
14. Haynes AB, Weiser TG, Berry WR, Lipsitz SR, Breizat AH, et al. (2009) A surgical safety checklist to reduce morbidity and mortality in a global population. *N Engl J Med* 360: 491–499. doi: [10.1056/NEJMsa0810119](https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMsa0810119) PMID: [19144931](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/19144931/)
15. Schlack WS, Boermeester MA (2010) Patient safety during anaesthesia: incorporation of the WHO safe surgery guidelines into clinical practice. *Curr Opin Anaesthesiol* 23: 754–758. doi: [10.1097/ACO.0b013e3283400b26](https://doi.org/10.1097/ACO.0b013e3283400b26) PMID: [20930622](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/20930622/)
16. WHO (2009) WHO Guidelines for Safe Surgery 2009: Safe Surgery Saves Lives. WHO Guidelines for Safe Surgery 2009: Safe Surgery Saves Lives. Geneva.
17. de Vries EN, Prins HA, Bennink MC, Neijenhuis P, van Stijn I, et al. (2012) Nature and timing of incidents intercepted by the SURPASS checklist in surgical patients. *BMJ Qual Saf* 21: 503–508. doi: [10.1136/bmjqs-2011-000347](https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjqs-2011-000347) PMID: [22447822](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/22447822/)
18. Ministry of Health and Social Welfare (MoH) T Health Services System (Structure).
19. Penoyer T, Cohen H, Kibatala P, Magoda A, Saguti G, et al. (2012) Emergency and surgery services of primary hospitals in the United Republic of Tanzania. *BMJ Open* 2: e000369. doi: [10.1136/bmjopen-2011-000369](https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjopen-2011-000369) PMID: [22307096](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/22307096/)
20. Bosse G, Ngoli B, Leshabari MT, Külker R, Dämmrich T, et al. (2011) Quality of care and the need for assessment—Introducing staff-conducted quality assurance as a steering tool for improvement of Tanzanian hospitals. *East Afr J Public Health* 2011 Sep; 8(3):199–204. PMID: [23120956](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/23120956/)
21. Bosse G, Mtatifikolo F, Abels W, Strosing C, Breuer JP, et al. (2013) Immediate outcome indicators in perioperative care: a controlled intervention study on quality improvement in hospitals in Tanzania. *PLoS One* 8: e65428. doi: [10.1371/journal.pone.0065428](https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0065428) PMID: [23776482](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/23776482/)
22. Deming WE (1982) Out of the Crisis. Cambridge: Massachusetts Institute of Technology,.
23. Langley G.L. NKM, Nolan T.W., Norman C.L., Provost L.P (2009) The Improvement Guide: A Practical Approach to Enhancing Organizational Performance (2nd Edition). San Francisco: Jossey Bas.
24. Agyepong IA, Sollecito WA, Adjei S, Veney JE (2001) Continuous quality improvement in public health in Ghana: CQI as a model for primary health care management and delivery. *Qual Manag Health Care* 9: 1–10.
25. Donabedian A (1980) Exploration in Quality: Assessment and Monitoring. Vol.1: The Definition of Quality and Approaches to its Assessment; MI: Health Administration Press SoPH, University of Michigan., editor: Ann Harbour.
26. Deming WE (1990) Some notes on management in a hospital. *J Soc Health Syst* 2: 74–77. PMID: [2132335](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/2132335/)
27. Belizan M, Bergh AM, Cilliers C, Pattinson RC, Voce A Stages of change: A qualitative study on the implementation of a perinatal audit programme in South Africa. *BMC Health Serv Res* 11: 243. doi: [10.1186/1472-6963-11-243](https://doi.org/10.1186/1472-6963-11-243) PMID: [21958353](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/21958353/)
28. Kelley E, Geslin C, Djibrina S, Boucar M (2001) Improving performance with clinical standards: the impact of feedback on compliance with the integrated management of childhood illness algorithm in Niger, West Africa. *Int J Health Plann Manage* 16: 195–205. PMID: [11596557](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/11596557/)
29. Peabody JW TM, Robalino DA, et al. (2006) Improving the Quality of Care in Developing Countries. In: Jamison DT BJ, Measham AR, et al., editor. Disease Control Priorities in Developing Countries 2nd edition. Washington (DC): World Bank;.
30. Reerink IH, Sauerborn R (1996) Quality of primary health care in developing countries: recent experiences and future directions. *Int J Qual Health Care* 8: 131–139. PMID: [8792168](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/8792168/)
31. van den Broek NR, Graham WJ (2009) Quality of care for maternal and newborn health: the neglected agenda. *BJOG* 116 Suppl 1: 18–21. doi: [10.1111/j.1471-0528.2009.02333.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1471-0528.2009.02333.x) PMID: [19740165](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/19740165/)
32. de Vries EN, Hollmann MW, Smorenburg SM, Gouma DJ, Boermeester MA (2009) Development and validation of the SURgical PATient Safety System (SURPASS) checklist. *Qual Saf Health Care* 18: 121–126. doi: [10.1136/qshc.2008.027524](https://doi.org/10.1136/qshc.2008.027524) PMID: [19342526](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/19342526/)
33. IoM (2000) To Err Is Human—Building a Safer Health System. Washington, D.C.: Institute of Medicine.
34. Teixeira PG, Inaba K, Dubose J, Melo N, Bass M, et al. (2013) Measurable outcomes of quality improvement using a daily quality rounds checklist: two-year prospective analysis of sustainability in a surgical intensive care unit. *J Trauma Acute Care Surg* 75: 717–721. doi: [10.1097/TA.0b013e3281829d27b6](https://doi.org/10.1097/TA.0b013e3281829d27b6) PMID: [24064888](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/24064888/)

35. Ayieko P, Ntoburi S, Wagai J, Opondo C, Opiyo N, et al. (2011) A multifaceted intervention to implement guidelines and improve admission paediatric care in Kenyan district hospitals: a cluster randomised trial. *PLoS Med* 8: e1001018. doi: [10.1371/journal.pmed.1001018](https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pmed.1001018) PMID: [21483712](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/21483712/)
36. Hulscher ME, Schouten LM, Grof RP, Buchan H (2013) Determinants of success of quality improvement collaboratives: what does the literature show? *BMJ Qual Saf* 22: 19–31. doi: [10.1136/bmjqs-2011-000651](https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjqs-2011-000651) PMID: [22879447](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/22879447/)
37. Umar N, Litaker D, Terris DD (2009) Toward more sustainable health care quality improvement in developing countries: the "little steps" approach. *Qual Manag Health Care* 18: 295–304. doi: [10.1097/QMH.0b013e3181bee28d](https://doi.org/10.1097/QMH.0b013e3181bee28d) PMID: [19851237](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/19851237/)
38. Rowe AK, Onikpo F, Lama M, Osterholt DM, Rowe SY, et al. (2009) A multifaceted intervention to improve health worker adherence to integrated management of childhood illness guidelines in Benin. *Am J Public Health* 99: 837–846. doi: [10.2105/AJPH.2008.134411](https://doi.org/10.2105/AJPH.2008.134411) PMID: [19299681](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/19299681/)
39. Naimoli JF, Rowe AK, Lyaghfour A, Larbi R, Lamrani LA (2006) Effect of the Integrated Management of Childhood Illness strategy on health care quality in Morocco. *Int J Qual Health Care* 18: 134–144. PMID: [16423842](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/16423842/)
40. Aveling EL, McCulloch P, Dixon-Woods M (2013) A qualitative study comparing experiences of the surgical safety checklist in hospitals in high-income and low-income countries. *BMJ Open* 3: e003039. doi: [10.1136/bmjopen-2013-003039](https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjopen-2013-003039) PMID: [23950205](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/23950205/)
41. Weiser TG, Makary MA, Haynes AB, Dziekan G, Berry WR, et al. (2009) Standardised metrics for global surgical surveillance. *Lancet* 374: 1113–1117. doi: [10.1016/S0140-6736\(09\)61161-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(09)61161-2) PMID: [19782877](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/19782877/)
42. Donabedian A (1980) Methods for deriving criteria for assessing the quality of medical care. *Med Care Rev* 37: 653–698. PMID: [10298019](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/10298019/)
43. Grof R BR, Moss F (2004) *Quality Improvement Research*. London: BMJ Publishing Group.

DISTRICT:HANDENI
YEAR: 2009
Table 2: Demographic indicators *(from computer printout: "Additional Reports MTUHA") (from table D 1.6)*

Total population		286.319
Growth rate		
Births (4.6%)		11.445
Children <1year (4.0%)		10.589
Children <5 years (20%)		50.409
Women 15-49 years (20%)		68.906

2.1 Health facilities, infrastructure, equipment

Table 3: Health facilities per type and ownership and number of beds

(from computer printout: "Additional Reports MTUHA") (from F005 Part 1 and 4)

Type of facility	Government HF	Nr of beds	NGO HF	Nr of beds	Private HF	Nr of beds	Total Nr. HF	Total Nr. of beds
Hospitals	1	119	1	56	0	0	2	175
Health centers	3	60	0	0	0	0	3	60
Dispensaries	31		1		3		35	0
TOTAL	35	179	2	56	3	0	40	235

Comments: There is an increase of 1 dispensary from 30 to 31 health facility year 2009.

Table 4: Availability of amenities in health facilities *(from table D 2.4)*

Availability of amenities	Water	Electricity	Toilet	Refuse pit/placenta pit	Sewerage
Nr of HF	35	14	40	40	1
% of HF	87,50	35,00	100,00	100,00	2,50
Comments: All facilities have toilets and refuse pits.					

Supplement

Table 6: Availability of essential equipment in working order (from table D 2.1)

Equipment	Adult scale	Baby scale	BP machine	Delivery kit	Fetoscope	Fridge	Sterilizer	Stethoscope
Nr of HF with at least one	40	40	15	20	40	34	28	40
% of HF with at least one	100,00	100,00	37,50	50,00	100,00	85,00	70,00	100,00
Comments: Most health facilities have non functioning BP machines								

2.2 Human resources

Table 7 (a): District staff report – Only Government owned Institutions!

(from MTUHA Report Navigator: Reports – Resource Management – Annual Data – Staffing Data (from D001)

Category	Requirement (according to "Staffing Levels for Health				Staff Available			
	Gov. Hospital / CHMT	Gov. Rural Health Center	Gov. Dispensaries	Total	Gov. Hospital / CHMT	Gov. Rural Health Center	Gov. Dispensaries	Total
District Medical Officer	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
District Dental Officer	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	1
District Health Officer	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	1
District Nursing Officer	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	1
District Pharmacist	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	1
District Laboratory Technologist	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	1
District Health Secretary	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	1
Medical Doctor (incl. MO i/c)	2	0	0	2	0	0	0	0
Specialist Doctor	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Dental Surgeon	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Specialist Dental Surgeon	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Pharmacist	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Chemists	0	0	0	0				0

Supplement

Assistant Medical Officer	14	4	0	18	7	1	0	8
Assistant Dental Officer	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	1
Medical Assistant / Clinical Officer	32	12	74	118	16	6	22	44
Dental assistant / Dental therapist	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Rural Medical Aid	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	6
Nursing Officer / Public Health Nurse A	36	6	0	42	13	2	1	16
Nurse tutor	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Trained Nurse/ Midwife/ Public Health Nurse B	45	12	74	131	32	12	12	56
MCH Aid	0	8	0	8	1	2	5	8
Medical Laboratory Technician	3	0	0	3	0	0	0	0
Radiographer	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	1
Dental Technician	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Optometry Technician	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Orthopedic Technician	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Physiotherapist	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Chemical Laboratory Technician	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Health Officer				0		0	8	8
Medical Records Officers	5	0	0	5	0	0	0	0
Pharmaceutical Technician	2	0	0	2	0	0	0	0
Launderers	4	0	0	4	0	0	0	0
Catering officers	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Health Secretary	2	0	0	2	0	0	0	0
Mortuary Attendant	2	0	0	2	1	0	0	1
Medical Attendant	30	12	35	77	44	51	24	119
All other	23	27	0	50	8	0	0	8
TOTAL STAFF	212	81	183	476	130	74	78	282
Comments: Acute shortage of staff								

4. In-Patient Data

4.3 Special services

Table 24: Surgical operations performed in District Hospital per type (*from Theatre Register*)

Major operations	Number	Minor operations	Number
1. Laparotomy	93	1. Evacuation	143
2. Caesarian Section	309	2. D&C	18
3. Herniorrhaphy	58	3. Circumcision	103
4. Hydrocelectomy	45	4. Reduction of fracture	354
5. Tubal ligation	104	5. Surgical toilet	136
6. Orchidectomy	22	6. Other	1120
7. Amputation	9		
8. Hysterectomy	15		
9. Ophthalmologic	0		
10. Other	39		
Total	694	Total	1874
Comments: Caesarian section has decreased from 339 in 2008 to 309 in 2009			

DISTRICT:HANDENI
YEAR: 2010
Table 2: Demographic indicators *(from computer printout: "Additional Reports MTUHA") (from table D 1.6)*

Total population		292.567
Growth rate		
Births		11.541
Children <1year		10.695
Children <5 years		50.886
Women 15-49 years		70.852
Comments: These indicators are form NBS		

2.1 Health facilities, infrastructure, equipment

Table 3: Health facilities per type and ownership and number of beds *(from computer printout: "Additional Reports MTUHA") (from F005 Part 1 and 4)*

Type of facility	Government HF	Nr of beds	NGO HF	Nr of beds	Private HF	Nr of beds	Total Nr. HF	Total Nr. of beds
Hospitals	1	120	1	56	0	0	2	176
Health centers	3	60	0	0	0	0	3	60
Dispensaries	33	0	1	0	3	0	37	0
TOTAL	37	180	2	56	3	0	42	236
Comments: There is an increase of Health Facilities from 40 to 42 health facilities year 2010.								

Table 4: Availability of amenities in health facilities *(from table D 2.4)*

Availability of amenities	Water	Electricity	Toilet	Refuse pit/placenta pit	Sewerage
Nr of HF	42	14	42	42	1
% of HF	100,00	33,33	100,00	100,00	2,38
Comments: All facilities have toilets and refuse pits.					

Supplement

2.2 Human resources

Table 7 (a): District staff report – Only Government owned Institutions!

(from MTUHA Report Navigator: Reports – Resource Management – Annual Data – Staffing Data (from D001))

Category	Requirement					Staff Available		
	(according to "Staffing Levels for Health							
	Gov. Hospital / CHMT	Gov. Rural Health Center	Gov. Dispensaries	Total	Gov. Hospital / CHMT	Gov. Rural Health Center	Gov. Dispensaries	Total
District Medical Officer	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	1
District Dental Officer	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	1
District Health Officer	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	1
District Nursing Officer	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	1
District Pharmacist	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	1
District Laboratory Technologist	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	1
District Health Secretary	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	1
Medical Doctor (incl. MO i/c)	2	0	0	2	0	0	0	0
Specialist Doctor	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Dental Surgeon	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Specialist Dental Surgeon	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Pharmacist	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Chemists	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Assistant Medical Officer	14	4	0	18	10	2	0	12
Assistant Dental Officer	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	1
Medical Assistant / Clinical Officer	32	12	74	118	14	6	23	43
Dental assistant / Dental therapist	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Rural Medical Aid	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	3
Nursing Officer / Public Health Nurse A	44	6	0	50	13	3	1	17

Supplement

Nurse tutor	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Trained Nurse/ Midwife/ Public Health Nurse B	100	12	74	186	35	10	13	58
MCH Aid	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	7
Medical Laboratory Technician	3	0	0	3	1	0	0	1
Radiographer	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	1
Dental Technician	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Optometry Technician	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Orthopedic Technician	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Physiotherapist	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Chemical Laboratory Technician	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Health Officer	5	23	0	28	6	1	0	7
Medical Records Officers	5	0	0	5	0	0	0	0
Pharmaceutical Technician	2	0	0	2	0	0	0	0
Launderers	4	3	0	7	0	0	0	0
Catering officers	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Health Secretary	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Mortuary Attendant	2	0	0	2	1	0	0	1
Medical Attendant	72	12	70	154	30	21	37	88
All other	23	27	0	50	8	0	0	8
TOTAL STAFF	321	99	218	638	131	44	79	254
Comments: Acute shortage of trained staff								

4. In-Patient Data

Supplement

4.3 Special services

Table 24: Surgical operations performed in District Hospital per type (from Theatre Register)

Major operations	Number	Minor operations	Number
1. Laparotomy	83	1. Evacuation	102
2. Caesarian Section	410	2. D&C	37
3. Herniorrhaphy	51	3. Circumcision	115
4. Hydrocelectomy	40	4. Reduction of fracture	98
5. Tubal ligation	113	5. Surgical toilet	110
6. Orchidectomy	4	6. Other	2921
7. Amputation	4		
8. Hysterectomy	16		
9. Ophthalmologic	0		
10. Other	254		
Total	975	Total	3383
Comments: Caesarian section rate was in normal range - 7.8 %			

DISTRICT: HANDENI
YEAR: 2011

Table 2: Demographic indicators (from computer printout: "Additional Reports MTUHA") (from table D 1.6)

Total population		332.025
Growth rate	2,20%	7.305
Births (4.6%)	4,60%	15.273
Children <1year (4.0%)	4,00%	13.281
Children <5 years (21%)	21,00%	69.725

Supplement

Women 15-49 years (18%)	18,00%	59.765
-------------------------	--------	--------

2.1 Health facilities, infrastructure, equipment

Table 3: Health facilities per type and ownership and number of beds
(from computer printout: "Additional Reports MTUHA") (from F005 Part 1 and 4)

Type of facility	Govern-ment HF	Nr of beds	NGO HF	Nr of beds	Private HF	Nr of beds
Hospitals	1	120	1	56	0	0
Health centers	3	60	0	0	0	0
Dispensaries	36	0	1	0	2	0
TOTAL	40	180	2	56	2	0
Comments: There is an increase of Health facilities from 42 to 44 health facilities this year 2011.						

Table 4: Availability of amenities in health facilities (from table D 2.4)

Availability of amenities	Water	Electricity	Toilet	Refuse pit/placenta pit	Sewerage
Nr of HF	44	23	44	44	2
% of HF	100	54,7	100	100	4%
Comments: 14 Health facilities being connected to electric supply from TANESCO while 9 are using solar power system					

Table 6: Availability of essential equipment in working order (from table D 2.1)

Equipment	Adult scale	Baby scale	BP machine	Delivery kit	Fetoscope	Fridge
Nr of HF with at least one	25	42	23	30	44	34
% of HF with at least one	56,82	95,45	52,27	68,18	100,00	77,27
Comments: Most Health facilities have non functioning BP Machine						

2.2 Human resources

Table 7 (a): District staff report – Only Government owned Institutions!
(from MTUHA Report Navigator: Reports – Resource Management – Annual Data – Staffing Data (from D001)

Supplement

Category	Requirement (according to "Staffing Levels for Health Facilities/Institutions" from MOH)				Staff Av	
	Gov. Hospital / CHMT	Gov. Rural Health Center	Gov. Dispen-saries	Total	Gov. Hospital / CHMT	Gov. Rural Health Center
District Medical Officer	1	0		1	1	0
District Dental Officer	1	0	0	1	1	0
District Health Officer	1	0	0	1	1	0
District Nursing Officer	1	0	0	1	1	0
District Pharmacist	1	0	0	1	1	0
District Laboratory Technologist	1	0	0	1	1	0
District Health Secretary	1	0	0	1	1	0
Medical Doctor (incl. MO i/c)	2	0	0	2	1	0
Specialist Doctor	0	0	0	0	0	0
Dental Surgeon	0	0	0	0	0	0
Specialist Dental Surgeon	0	0	0	0	0	0
Pharmacist	2	0	0	2	1	0
Chemists	0	0	0	0	0	0
Assistant Medical Officer	14	3	0	17	10	2
Assistant Dental Officer	1	0	0	1	1	0
Medical Assistant / Clinical Officer	32	12	74	118	12	6
Dental assistant / Dental therapist	1	0	0	1	0	0
Rural Medical Aid	0	0	0	0	0	0
Nursing Officer / Public Health Nurse A	44	6	0	50	14	3
Nurse tutor	0	0	0	0	0	0
Trained Nurse/ Midwife/ Public Health Nurse B	100	12	74	186	24	8
MCH Aid	0	0	0	0	1	1
Medical Laboratory Technician	3	0	0	3	2	0

Supplement

Radiographer	1	0	0	1	1	0
Dental Technician	1	0	0	1	0	0
Optometry Technician	0	0	0	0	0	0
Orthopedic Technician	0	0	0	0	0	0
Physiotherapist	1	0	0	1	0	0
Chemical Laboratory Technician	0	0	0	0	0	0
Health Officer	5	23	0	28	5	5
Medical Records Officers	6	0	0	6	0	0
Pharmaceutical Technician	2	0	0	2	0	0
Launderers	4	3	0	7	0	0
Catering officers	0	0	0	0	0	0
Health Secretary	1	0	0	1	0	0
Mortuary Attendant	2	0	0	2	0	0
Medical Attendant	40	30	74	144	39	19
All other				0	2	0
TOTAL STAFF	269	89	222	580	120	44
Comments: Acute shortage of trained staff.						

4. In-Patient Data

4.3 Special services

Table 24: Surgical operations performed in District Hospital per type (*from Theatre Register*)

Major operations	Number	Minor operations	Number
1. Laparotomy	66	D&C	0

Supplement

2. Caesarian Section		377	Reduction/pop	67
3. Herniorrhaphy		67	I&D	
4. Hydrocelectomy		44	Excision	25
5. Tubal ligation		489	Desloughing	
6. Orchidectomy		4	S/Toilet & suturing	95
7. Amputation		3	FB removal	
8. Hysterectomy		18	S/pin insertion	
9. Ophthalmologic		0	Evacuation	183
10. Other		44	Others	77
Total		1112	Total	447
Comments: Total major operations was 1112				

DISTRICT: Lushoto YEAR: 2009

Table 2: Demographic indicators *(from computer printout: "Additional Reports MTUHA") (from table D 1.6)*

Total population		487.132
Growth rate		
Births (4.6%)		18.307
Children <1year (4.0%)		16.938
Children <5 years (21%)		78.849
Women 15-49 years (18%)		124.550
Comments: Projected population.		

2.1 Health facilities, infrastructure, equipment

Table 3: Health facilities per type and ownership and number of beds

Supplement

(from computer printout: "Additional Reports MTUHA") (from F005 Part 1 and 4)

Type of facility	Government HF	Nr of beds	NGO HF	Nr of beds	Private HF	Nr of beds	Total HF	Nr.	Total Nr. of beds
Hospitals	1	101	1	104	0	0	2		205
Health centers	6	94	1	37	0	0	7		131
Dispensaries	33	0	8	0	1	0	42		0
TOTAL	40	195	10	141	1	0	51		336
Comments: Two NGO Dispensary closed due to managerial problems.									

Table 4: Availability of amenities in health facilities (from table D 2.4)

Availability of amenities	Water	Electricity	Toilet	Refuse pit/placenta pit	Sewerage
Nr of HF	50	21	50	50	7
% of HF	98,039216	41,18	98,03921569	98,039216	13,72549

Table 6: Availability of essential equipment in working order (from table D 2.1)

Equipment	Adult scale	Baby scale	BP machine	Delivery kit	Fetoscope	Fridge	Sterilizer	Stethoscope
Nr of HF with at least one	47	48	51	25	48	46	51	51
% of HF with at least one	92,16	94,12	100,00	49,02	94,12	90,20	100,00	100,00
Comments: At least most of essential equipments are available at the health facilities.								

2.2 Human resources

Table 7 (a): District staff report – Only Government owned Institutions!

(from MTUHA Report Navigator: Reports – Resource Management – Annual Data – Staffing Data (from D001)

Category	Requirement according to "Staffing Levels for Health					Staff Available			Over-staffing / Understaffing
	Gov. Hospital / CHMT	Gov. Rural Health Center	Gov. Dispensaries	Total	Gov. Hospital / CHMT	Gov. Rural Health Center	Gov. Dispensaries	Total	Total
District Medical Officer	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	0

Supplement

District Dental Officer	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	0
District Health Officer	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	0
District Nursing Officer	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	0
District Pharmacist	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	0
District Laboratory Technologist	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	0
District Health Secretary	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	0
Medical Doctor (incl. MO i/c)	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	-1
Specialist Doctor	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Dental Surgeon	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	-1
Specialist Dental Surgeon	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Pharmacist	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	0
Chemists	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Assistant Medical Officer	5	7	0	12	9	0	0	9	-3
Assistant Dental Officer	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	-1
Medical Assistant / Clinical Officer	21	21	64	106	18	8	30	56	-50
Dental assistant / Dental therapist	1	7	0	8	1	0	0	1	-7
Rural Medical Aid	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Nursing Officer / Public Health Nurse A	10	7	0	17	2	9	0	11	-6
Nurse tutor	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Trained Nurse/ Midwife/ Public Health Nurse B	38	56	64	158	19	9	4	32	-126
MCH Aid	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Medical Laboratory Technician	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	0
Radiographer	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	-1
Dental Technician	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	-1
Optometry Technician	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	-1
Orthopedic Technician	1	0	0	1	0	0		0	-1
Physiotherapist	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	-1
Chemical Laboratory Technician	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Health Officer	6	7	0	13	1	5	0	6	-7
Medical Records Officers	2	7	0	9	2	0	0	2	-7
Pharmaceutical Technician	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	-1
Launderers	4	0	0	4	2	0	0	2	-2
Catering officers	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Health Secretary	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	0

Supplement

Mortuary Attendant	2	4	0	6	2	0	0	2	-4
Medical Attendant	25	28	32	85	40	59	64	163	78
All other	23	27	0	50	17	5	0	22	-28
TOTAL STAFF	156	171	160	487	123	95	98	316	-171
Comments: Chronic shortage of staff at all level.(As per Establishment- IKAMA).									

4. In-Patient Data

4.3 Special services

Table 24: Surgical operations performed in District Hospital per type (from Theatre Register)

Major operations	Number	Minor operations	Number
1. Laparotomy	38	1. Evacuation	18
2. Caesarian Section	287	2. D&C	0
3. Herniorrhaphy	25	3. Circumcision	3
4. Hydrocelectomy	11	4. Reduction of fracture	290
5. Tubal ligation	49	5. Surgical toilet	135
6. Orchidectomy	1	6. Other	135
7. Amputation	0	M.V. A	89
8. Hysterectomy	6	Foreign bodies	3
9. Ophthalmologic	162		
10. Other	38		
Total	617	Total	673

Comments: There were slightly increase of caesarian section from 263(2008) to 287.

DISTRICT: LUSHOTO
YEAR: 2010

Table 2: Demographic indicators (from computer printout: "Additional Reports MTUHA") (from table D 1.6)

Total population		496.917
Growth rate		

Supplement

Births		18.459
Children <1year		17.106
Children <5 years		79.589
Women 15-49 years		128.042

2.1 Health facilities, infrastructure, equipment

Table 3: Health facilities per type and ownership and number of beds

(from computer printout: "Additional Reports MTUHA") (from F005 Part 1 and 4)

Type of facility	Government HF	Nr of beds	NGO HF	Nr of beds	Private HF	Nr of beds	Total Nr. HF	Total Nr. of beds
Hospitals	1	109	1	120	0	0	2	229
Health centers	7	128	1	37	0	0	8	165
Dispensaries	32	0	9	0	1	0	42	0
TOTAL	40	237	11	157	1	0	52	394

Table 4: Availability of amenities in health facilities (from table D 2.4)

Availability of amenities	Water	Electricity	Toilet	Refuse pit/placenta pit	Sewerage
Nr of HF	52	31	52	52	7
% of HF	100,00	59,62	100,00	100,00	13,46
Comments: 10 health facilities instolled sollar electrification					

Table 6: Availability of essential equipment in working order (from table D 2.1)

Equipment	Adult scale	Baby scale	BP machine	Delivery kit	Fetoscope	Fridge	Sterilizer	Stethoscope
Nr of HF with at least one	52	48	52	48	48	46	52	52
% of HF with at least one	100,00	92,31	100,00	92,31	92,31	88,46	100,00	100,00
Comments: There is increase of delivery kit from 25 to 48 and most of them was assembled								

Supplement

2.2 Human resources

Table 7 (a): District staff report – Only Government owned Institutions!

(from MTUHA Report Navigator: Reports – Resource Management – Annual Data – Staffing Data (from D001))

Category	Requirement (according to "Staffing Levels for Health					Staff Available			
	Gov. Hospital / CHMT	Gov. Rural Health Center	Gov. Dispensaries	Total		Gov. Hospital / CHMT	Gov. Rural Health Center	Gov. Dispensaries	Total
District Medical Officer	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1
District Dental Officer	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1
District Health Officer	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1
District Nursing Officer	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1
District Pharmacist	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1
District Laboratory Technologist	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1
District Health Secretary	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1
Medical Doctor (incl. MO i/c)	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1
Specialist Doctor	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Dental Surgeon	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
Specialist Dental Surgeon	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Pharmacist	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
Chemists	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Assistant Medical Officer	5	7	0	12	13	0	0	0	13
Assistant Dental Officer	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1
Medical Assistant / Clinical Officer	21	21	64	106	15	10	22	47	
Dental assistant / Dental therapist	1	7	0	8	2	0	0	2	
Rural Medical Aid	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	
Nursing Officer / Public Health Nurse A	10	7	0	17	22	4	0	26	

Supplement

Nurse tutor	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Trained Nurse/ Midwife/ Public Health Nurse B	38	56	64	158	24	6	7	37
MCH Aid	0	0	0	0	2	4	12	18
Medical Laboratory Technician	1	0	0	1	2	0	0	2
Radiographer	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	1
Dental Technician	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Optometry Technician	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Orthopedic Technician	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Physiotherapist	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Chemical Laboratory Technician	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Health Officer	6	7	0	13	3	3	0	6
Medical Records Officers	2	7	0	9	0	0	0	0
Pharmaceutical Technician	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Launderers	4	0	0	4	0	0	0	0
Catering officers	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Health Secretary	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	1
Mortuary Attendant	2	4	0	6	2	0	0	2
Medical Attendant	25	28	32	85	48	39	58	145
All other	23	30	0	53	19	17	16	52
TOTAL STAFF	156	174	160	490	163	83	116	362
Comments: We have shortage of staff of about 26% of all cadres								

4. In-Patient Data

4.3 Special services

Table 24: Surgical operations performed in District Hospital per type (from Theatre Register)

Major operations	Number	Minor operations	Number
1. Laparotomy	36	1. Evacuation	15
2. Caesarian Section	379	2. D&C	21

Supplement

3. Herniorrhaphy	42	3. Circumcision	45
4. Hydrocelectomy	13	4. Reduction of fracture	48
5. Tubal ligation	29	5. Surgical toilet	57
6. Orchidectomy	0	6. Other	10
7. Amputation	1		
8. Hysterectomy	5		
9. Ophthalmologic	94		
10. Other			
Total	599	Total	196
Comments: There was an increase of caesarian section from 287 in 2009 to 397 in 2010.			

DISTRICT: LUSHOTO

YEAR: 2011

Table 2: Demographic indicators *(from computer printout: "Additional Reports MTUHA") (from table D 1.6)*

Total population		507.303
Growth rate	2,20%	11.161
Births (4.6%)	4,60%	23.336
Children <1year (4.0%)	4,00%	20.292
Children <5 years (21%)	21,00%	106.534
Women 15-49 years (18%)	18,00%	91.315

Supplement

2.1 Health facilities, infrastructure, equipment

Table 3: Health facilities per type and ownership and number of beds

(from computer printout: "Additional Reports MTUHA") (from F005 Part 1 and 4)

Type of facility	Government HF	Nr of beds	NGO HF	Nr of beds	Private HF	Nr of beds
Hospitals	1	109	1	120	0	0
Health centers	7	104	1	39	0	0
Dispensaries	34	0	9	0	1	0
TOTAL	42	213	11	159	1	0
Comments: One dispensary was increased from 32 to 33						

Table 4: Availability of amenities in health facilities (from table D 2.4)

Availability of amenities	Water	Electricity	Toilet	Refuse pit/placenta pit	Sewerage
Nr of HF	53	40	53	53	9
% of HF	100	76	100	100	17
Comments: Hfacilities being connected to electric supply from TANESCO while 9 they are using solar power system.					

Table 6: Availability of essential equipment in working order (from table D 2.1)

Equipment	Adult scale	Baby scale	BP machine	Delivery kit	Fetoscope	Fridge
Nr of HF with at least one	50	43	53	35	53	48
% of HF with at least one	94,34	81,13	100,00	66,04	100,00	90,57
Comments: Only 35 (71%) out of 49 health facilities have delivery kits.						

2.2 Human resources

Table 7 (a): District staff report – Only Government owned Institutions!

(from MTUHA Report Navigator: Reports – Resource Management – Annual Data – Staffing Data (from D001)

Supplement

Category	Requirement (according to "Staffing Levels for Health Facilities/Institutions" from MOH)				Staff Available	
	Gov. Hospital / CHMT	Gov. Rural Health Center	Gov. Dispen-saries	Total	Gov. Hospital / CHMT	Gov. Rural Health Center
District Medical Officer	1	0	0	1	1	0
District Dental Officer	1	0	0	1	1	0
District Health Officer	1	0	0	1	1	0
District Nursing Officer	1	0	0	1	1	0
District Pharmacist	1	0	0	1	1	0
District Laboratory Technologist	1	0	0	1	1	0
District Health Secretary	1	0	0	1	1	0
Medical Doctor (incl. MO i/c)	2	0	0	2	1	0
Specialist Doctor	0	0	0	0	0	0
Dental Surgeon	1	0	0	1	0	0
Specialist Dental Surgeon	0	0	0	0	0	0
Pharmacist	2	0	0	2	0	0
Chemists	0	0	0	0	0	0
Assistant Medical Officer	7	7	0	14	13	0
Assistant Dental Officer	1	0	0	1	1	0
Medical Assistant / Clinical Officer	21	21	64	106	18	8
Dental assistant / Dental therapist	1	7	0	8	2	0
Rural Medical Aid	0	0	0	0	0	0
Nursing Officer / Public Health Nurse A	10	7	0	17	19	3
Nurse tutor	0	0	0	0	0	0
Trained Nurse/ Midwife/ Public Health Nurse B	38	63	64	165	29	20
MCH Aid	0	0	0	0	0	0
Medical Laboratory Technician	1	0	0	1	2	0
Radiographer	1	0	0	1	1	0

Supplement

Dental Technician	1	0	0	1	0	0
Optometry Technician	1	0	0	1	0	0
Orthopedic Technician	1	0	0	1	0	0
Physiotherapist	1	0	0	1	0	0
Chemical Laboratory Technician	0	0	0	0	0	0
Health Officer	6	7	0	13	3	3
Medical Records Officers	2	7	0	9	0	0
Pharmaceutical Technician	1	0	0	1	0	0
Launderers	4	0	0	4	0	0
Catering officers	0	0	0	0	0	0
Health Secretary	1	0	0	1	1	0
Mortuary Attendant	2	4	0	6	2	0
Medical Attendant	34	28	32	94	58	37
All other	23	30	0	53	9	7
TOTAL STAFF	169	181	160	510	166	78

4. In-Patient Data

4.3 Special services

Table 24: Surgical operations performed in District Hospital per type (*from Theatre Register*)

Major operations	Number	Minor operations	Number
1. Laparotomy	25	D&C	20
2. Caesarian Section	368	Reduction/pop	129
3. Herniorrhaphy	34	I&D	43
4. Hydrocelectomy	10	Excision	7
5. Tubal ligation	26	Disloughing	70
6. Orchidectomy	0	S/Toilet & suturing	96
7. Amputation	3	FB removal	6
8. Hysterectomy	7	S/pin insertion	5
9. Ophthalmologic	136	Evacuation	21
10. Other	54	Others	610
Total	663	Total	987

Supplement

Comments:

There is slight reduction of caesarian section from 379 in (2010) to 368 (2011)

CORRECTION

Correction: Perioperative Care and the Importance of Continuous Quality Improvement—A Controlled Intervention Study in Three Tanzanian Hospitals

Goetz Bosse, Wiltrud Abels, Ferdinand Mtatifikolo, Baltazar Ngoli, Bruno Neuner, Klaus-Dieter Wernecke, Claudia Spies

There are errors in Tables 5 and 7. During review, the size of the control group was reduced from three to two hospitals. Tables 5 and 7 were not completely updated to reflect this change. Please see the corrected tables here.



OPEN ACCESS

Citation: Bosse G, Abels W, Mtatifikolo F, Ngoli B, Neuner B, Wernecke K, et al. (2016) Correction: Perioperative Care and the Importance of Continuous Quality Improvement—A Controlled Intervention Study in Three Tanzanian Hospitals. PLoS ONE 11 (5): e0156206. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0156206

Published: May 19, 2016

Copyright: © 2016 Bosse et al. This is an open access article distributed under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.

Die Autoren des Artikels reichten am 03.03.2016 ein Erratum ein. Die Veröffentlichung erfolgte am 19.05.2016.

Table 5. Immediate outcome indicators for Preoperative Care in the Control Group 2009 to 2011.

Control group Preoperative Care	2009 t ₁ [%]	2010 t ₂ [%]	2011 t ₃ [%]	p value t ₁ —t ₂	p value t ₂ —t ₃	p value t ₁ —t ₃
Was the patient seen by an anesthetist the day before operation?	7/32 [21.9]	0/24 [0]	0/24 [0]	0.012*↓	1	0.012*↓
Did she/he document the anesthetic history?	22/32 [68.8]	0/24 [0]	0/24 [0]	<0.001*↓	1	<0.001*↓
Have contributing illnesses been documented?	16/32 [50]	0/24 [0]	20/24 [83.3]	<0.001*↓	<0.001*↑	0.012*↑
Are allergies documented?	9/32 [28.1]	0/24 [0]	0/24 [0]	0.002*↓	1	0.002*↓
Are the necessary lab results documented (at least HB and FBS)?	25/32 [78.1]	8/24 [33.3]	16/24 [66.7]	<0.001*↓	0.042*↑	0.375
Did the patient get any form of premedication?	4/32 [12.5]	0/24 [0]	0/24 [0]	0.116	1	0.116
Was fasting ordered?	22/32 [68.8]	3/24 [12.5]	13/24 [54.2]	<0.001*↓	0.005*↑	0.282
Did the patient sign a consent form?	25/32 [78.1]	14/24 [58.3]	14/24 [58.3]	0.146	1	0.146
overall score [%]	130/256 [50.8]	25/192 [13.02]	63/192 [32.8]	<0.001*↓	<0.001*↑	<0.001*↓
difference of scores				0.3776	-0.1979	0.1797
95% CI of differences				0.2956– 0.4505	-0.2781 – -0.1147	0.0875– 0.2668

Immediate outcome indicators for Preoperative Care in the control group 2009–2011. Significance was tested 2010 (t₂) against 2009 (t₁), 2011 (t₃) against 2010 (t₂), and 2011(t₃) against 2009 (t₁). Significant improvement was marked with *↑, significant decline is marked with *↓. Confidence interval was given for the differences of overall immediate outcome of the key procedure in 2009, 2010, 2011. Resulting from the correction of Table 5, the following significant changes in immediate outcome indicators are new: significant improvement between t₁ and t₃ in “Have contributing illnesses been documented?”; significant improvement between t₂ and t₃ in “Are the necessary lab results documented (at least HB and FBS)?” HB = hemoglobin FBS = full blood survey; significant improvement between t₂ and t₃ in “Was fasting ordered”. The following result is not significant anymore after our correction: no significant change between t₁ and t₂ as well as between t₁ and t₃ in “Did the patient sign a consent form?”

doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0156206.t001

Die Autoren des Artikels reichten am 03.03.2016 ein Erratum ein. Die Veröffentlichung erfolgte am 19.05.2016.

Table 7. Immediate outcome indicators for Postoperative Inpatient Care in the Control Group 2009 to 2011.

Control group Postoperative Inpatient Care	2009 t ₁ [%]	2010 t ₂ [%]	2011 t ₃ [%]	p value t ₁ —t ₂	p value t ₂ —t ₃	p value t ₁ —t ₃
Are orders fulfilled?	3/4 [75]	2/4 [50.0]	2/4 [50.0]	1	1	1
Are wounds dressed once a day?	2/4 [50]	2/4 [50.0]	2/4 [50.0]	1	1	1
Does staff wash or disinfect their hands after contact?	3/4 [75]	0/4 [0]	0/4 [0]	0.143	1	1
Does staff adhere to hygienic procedures when in contact with patients (when taking blood, putting up a drip etc.)?	3/4 [75]	2/4 [50.0]	2/4 [50.0]	1	1	1
Does staff document care?	3/4 [75]	2/4 [50.0]	2/4 [50.0]	1	1	1
Is the input /output checked every 4 hours for the first 24 hours (in case of major operation)?	17/34 [50]	6/18 [33.3]	19/26 [73.1]	0.379	0.014*↑	0.11
Is absence of bleeding checked at least twice?	15/34 [44.1]	3/18 [16.7]	7/26 [26.9]	0.068	0.489	0.036*↓
Is anti-pain medication applied?	34/34 [100]	17/18 [94.4]	26/26 [100]	0.346	0.409	n.a.
Does the patient have an (open) iv line?	27/34 [79.4]	18/18 [100]	26/26 [100]	0.081	1	0.081
Are notes and observation charts checked by Dr and documented once a day?	16/34 [47.1]	3/18 [16.7]	13/26 [50]	0.038*↓	<0.001*↓	<0.001*↓
overall immediate outcome [%]	123/176 [69.9]	55/110 [50]	99/150 [66]	0.001*↓	0.011	0.476
difference				0.1989	-0.1600	0.0389
95% CI of differences				0.0825–0.3102	-0.2961 – -0.0389	-0.0618–0.1398

Immediate outcome indicators for Preoperative Care in the control group 2009–2011. Significance was tested 2010 (t₂) against 2009 (t₁), 2011 (t₃) against 2010 (t₂), and 2011(t₃) against 2009 (t₁). Significant improvement was marked with *↑, significant decline is marked with *↓. Confidence interval was given for the differences of overall immediate outcome of the key procedure in 2009, 2010, 2011. Resulting from the correction of Table 7, the following significant changes in immediate outcome indicators are new: significant decline between t₁ and t₂ in “Are notes and observation charts checked by Dr and documented once a day?”.

doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0156206.t002

The following information is missing from the Funding section: GIZ Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit GmbH provided support in the form of grants to Dr. Mtatifikolo.

The following information is missing from the Competing Interests section: Dr. Mtatifikolo received grants from GIZ Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit GmbH, a commercial company, during the conduct of this study.

Reference

1. Bosse G, Abels W, Mtatifikolo F, Ngoli B, Neuner B, Wernecke K, et al. (2015) Perioperative Care and the Importance of Continuous Quality Improvement—A Controlled Intervention Study in Three Tanzanian Hospitals. PLoS ONE 10(9): e0136156. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0136156 PMID: 26327392

Curriculum vitae **Wiltrud Abels**

Mein Lebenslauf wird aus datenschutzrechtlichen Gründen in der elektronischen Version meiner Arbeit nicht veröffentlicht.

Geteilte Erstautorenschaft

Perioperative Care and the Importance of Continuous Quality Improvement – A Controlled Intervention Study in Three Tanzanian Hospitals

Bosse G, Abels W, Mtatifikolo F, Ngoli B, Neuner B, Wernecke KD, Spies C.
PLoS One. 2015, Sep 1 DOI: 10.1371/journal.pone.0136156

Correction: Perioperative Care and the Importance of Continuous Quality Improvement - A Controlled Intervention Study in Three Tanzanian Hospitals

Bosse G, Abels W, Mtatifikolo F, Ngoli B, Neuner B, Wernecke KD, Spies C.
PLoS One. 2016, May 19 DOI: 10.1371/journal.pone.0156206

Co-Autorenschaften

Immediate outcome indicators in perioperative care: a controlled intervention study on quality improvement in hospitals in Tanzania

Bosse G, Mtatifikolo F, Abels W, Strosing C, Breuer JP, Spies C.
PLoS One. 2013, Jun 12 DOI: 10.1371/journal.pone.0065428

Quality of health care and the need for assessment

Bosse G, Ngoli B, Leshabari MT, Külker R, Dämmrich T, Abels W, Breuer JP, Kersten R, Spies C.
East Afr J Public Health. 2011, Sep 8 <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/23120956>

Postervorträge

Continuous Quality Improvement in the perioperative care in a Tanzanian referral hospital – what interventions do work?

Abels W, Bosse G, Spies C
International Forum on Quality and Safety in Healthcare 08.-11. April, 2014, Paris

An Action Plan to improve the quality of preoperative care in a referral hospital in Tanzania

Bosse G, Abels W, Spies C
International Forum on Quality and Safety in Healthcare 16.-19. April, 2013, London

***“It is the ethical dimensions of individuals
that are essential to a system’s success.”***

Avedis Donabedian,
shortly before his death in 2000

***“If real development is to take place,
the people have to be involved.”***

Julius Kambarage Nyerere,
from his book Uhuru na Maendeleo (“Freedom and Development”), 1973

“The room for improvement can never be filled.”

Joseph Nzige,
Bombo Hospital in Tanga, Tanzania, 2013

Mein sehr besonderer Dank gilt zuerst meiner Doktormutter Frau Professor Claudia Spies, die das Thema formulierte und gemeinsam mit mir und Dr. Götz Bosse die formalen und inhaltlichen Kriterien erarbeitete; die das Forschungsvorhaben im Rahmen der durch die Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (giz) geförderten deutsch-tansanischen Krankenhauspartnerschaft als Kopf der deutschen Seite konsentiert; die durch unschätzbar wichtige Diskussionen und Beiträge diese Arbeit immer weiter verbessern half; die die Rahmenbedingungen für die vorliegende wissenschaftliche Arbeit schuf und die Arbeit final korrigierte; deren Geduld ich nötig hatte und dankbar zu schätzen weiß.

Desweiteren danke ich herzlich Dr. Götz Bosse, Mentor, Supervisor und Oberarzt, der in seiner eigenen Promotionsarbeit in 1996 den Prototyp des Messinstruments aus der Taufe hob, das heute die Grundlage dieser Arbeit darstellt; der schon in 2008 meine Begeisterung für sein Projekt erkannte und mich mit den Ideen von Avedis Donabedian und Essob G. bekannt machte; der mich vor Ort in Tansania gefördert und gefordert hat, der mich in das Messinstrument einführte und es mich selbständig benutzen ließ; der mit mir zusammen den vorliegenden Artikel geschrieben hat. Ich danke für alles gemeinschaftliche Denken und Diskutieren, bei dem ich sehr viel gelernt habe.

Ich danke sehr herzlich auch Herrn Professor Klaus-Dieter Wernecke, der schon die vorhergehenden Publikationen im Rahmen dieses Projektes durchweg unterstützt hat; der mich bereits vorher, aber im Rahmen der vorliegenden Arbeit mehr als nur einige Male empfing um geduldig alle Fragen durchzusprechen; der nie gesagt hat: „Das geht nicht“; der immer ansprechbar war und Sicherheit zu vermitteln wusste.

Ich danke auch Herrn PD Dr. Bruno Neuner, der uns überaus wichtigen Input gab, und in mehrfachen Diskussionen durch sein umfassendes Wissen neue Anregungen gab.

Ich danke Frau Cornelia Becker, die meine Erfahrungen in Tansania sehr positiv und nachhaltig beeinflusst hat und durch ihre langjährige Erfahrung im Land wichtige Hinweise und Hilfestellung zu geben wusste.

Nicht zuletzt gilt mein ganz besonders herzlicher Dank allen Mitarbeitern der tansanischen Krankenhäuser in dieser Studie, die über die letzten Jahre gegen viele Widrigkeiten ihre Begeisterung und Zeit hergegeben haben, um die Qualität der Gesundheitsversorgung für ihre Patienten in den Fokus zu rücken. Ich danke stellvertretend für alle anderen, aber auch in besonderem Maße unseren Co-Autoren Dr. Baltazar Ngoli und Dr. Ferdinand Mtatifikolo, der im Januar 2016 nach kurzer Krankheit überraschend verstorben ist. Ich danke Dr. Rehema Maggid, Herr Adam Lyatuu, Herr Joseph Nzige, Djema und Happy für all die Unterstützung und alles, was ich von ihnen habe lernen dürfen.