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**Books**

*Antimicrobial Stewardship: From Principles to Practice*
Nathwani D, editor

|-----|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

Notes

The British Society for Antimicrobial Chemotherapy has produced this book this is available as a free e-book from 21 March 2018. According to the Society, the book provides:

- An extensive overview of the day-to-day challenges posed by antimicrobial resistance
- Tools for setting up stewardship programmes
- Guidance on how to make the most of existing stewardship programmes
- Resources to apply the principles of stewardship to a wide range of professions, populations, and clinical/care settings
- Support for colleagues working in low and middle-income countries
- Advice on informing and influencing policymakers and journalists
- An interactive, multimedia, platform with links to many videos, podcasts, and PDFs.

For information about the Commission’s work on antimicrobial stewardship, see https://www.safetyandquality.gov.au/our-work/healthcare-associated-infection/antimicrobial-stewardship/
### Reports

**Forward Thinking - NIHR research on support for people with severe mental illness**

Themed review
National Institute for Health Research

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>URL</th>
<th><a href="https://www.dc.nihr.ac.uk/themed-reviews/severe-mental-illness-research.htm">https://www.dc.nihr.ac.uk/themed-reviews/severe-mental-illness-research.htm</a></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Notes | The UK’s National Institute for Health Research (NIHR) has produced this themed review that highlights a selection of NIHR-funded research on aspects of severe mental illness such as supporting early detection and intervention, crisis care, supporting recovery and managing physical and mental health. The review features:  
  - 30 published studies  
  - 19 ongoing research projects  
  - Questions to ask about support for people living with severe mental illness. |

### Journal articles

**What can patients tell us about the quality and safety of hospital care? Findings from a UK multicentre survey study**

BMJ Quality & Safety. 2018 [epub].

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DOI</th>
<th><a href="https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjqs-2017-006974">https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjqs-2017-006974</a></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Notes</td>
<td>This paper – reporting on a survey of 2741 inpatients in 33 wards in English hospitals – is further confirmation that patients are an important source of information on the safety and quality of care. In this case, 579 patients “provided 1155 patient-reported incident reports. 14 categories were developed for classification of reports, with communication the most frequently occurring (22%), followed by staffing issues (13%) and problems with the care environment (12%). 406 of the total 1155 patient incident reports (35%) were classified by clinicians as a patient safety incident according to the standard definition. 1 in 10 patients (264 patients) identified a patient safety incident, with medication errors the most frequently reported incident.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


**Pathology of poverty: the need for quality improvement efforts to address social determinants of health**

Boozary AS, Shojania KG

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DOI</th>
<th><a href="https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjqs-2017-007552">https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjqs-2017-007552</a></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Notes</td>
<td>As the authors of this editorial observe, the importance of ‘social determinants of health’ (SDOH) have long been known. However, the relevance of SDOH, poverty or equity to discussions of the safety and quality of health care have not always received much attention. The authors conclude “we in QI [Quality Improvement] must partner with patients, communities and those working in social sectors outside healthcare to tackle these problems—poverty in itself and its many attendant adverse effects—for our most disadvantaged patients and our fellow human beings.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Is there a disconnect between what we do and what we should do? A survey of intensive care physicians and nurses in California
Anstey MH, Adams JL, McGlynn EA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DOI</th>
<th><a href="https://doi.org/10.1007/s00134-018-5114-z">https://doi.org/10.1007/s00134-018-5114-z</a></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Notes</td>
<td>Short communication reporting on a survey of Californian intensive care clinicians. The survey asked the clinicians to review four vignettes and indicate how whether they felt the patient should or would be admitted to their ICU. The survey revealed significant discrepancy, with the level of ‘would’ much higher than ‘should’. The authors suggest some strategies for addressing this discrepancy, including 1) early identification and discussion with patients “too sick to benefit” from aggressive ICU treatments; 2) increasing advance directive use in high risk patient groups; and 3) measuring the outcomes of these patients (some may do better than expected). One question that does arise is how similar the results would be in other locations/nations. How much are these results context-sensitive?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Health Care Spending in the United States and Other High-Income Countries
Papanicolas I, Woskie LR, Jha AK

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DOI</th>
<th><a href="http://doi.org/10.1001/jama.2018.1150">http://doi.org/10.1001/jama.2018.1150</a></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Notes | The high cost of health care in and to the United States of America is no secret. Nor is the fact that this markedly higher rate of spending is not associated with better outcomes. This paper in JAMA reflects on this and some of the causes. The authors sought to compare potential drivers of spending, such as structural capacity and utilization, in the United States with those of 10 of the highest-income countries (United Kingdom, Canada, Germany, Australia, Japan, Sweden, France, the Netherlands, Switzerland, and Denmark) to gain insight into what the United States can learn from these nations. Using data form the OECD and elsewhere for 2013–2016 they report:  
- In 2016, the US spent 17.8% of its gross domestic product on health care, and spending in the other countries ranged from 9.6% (Australia) to 12.4% (Switzerland).  
- The proportion of the population with health insurance was 90% in the US, lower than the other countries (range, 99%-100%), and the US had the highest proportion of private health insurance (55.3%).  
- Life expectancy in the US was the lowest of the 11 countries at 78.8 years (range for other countries, 80.7-83.9 years; mean of all 11 countries, 81.7 years), and infant mortality was the highest (5.8 deaths per 1000 live births in the US; 3.6 per 1000 for all 11 countries).  
- Administrative costs of care (activities relating to planning, regulating, and managing health systems and services) accounted for 8% in the US vs a range of 1% to 3% in the other countries.  
- For pharmaceutical costs, spending per capita was $1443 in the US vs a range of $466 to $939 in other countries.  
- Salaries of physicians and nurses were higher in the US; for example, generalist physicians salaries were $218 173 in the US compared with a range of $86 607 to $154 126 in the other countries.  
They conclude that “Prices of labor and goods, including pharmaceuticals and devices, and administrative costs appeared to be the main drivers of the differences in spending.” |
Along with this paper, JAMA also has a series of editorials responding to the paper, including:

- Factors Contributing to Higher US Health Care Spending
- The Real Cost of the US Health Care System
- Challenges in Understanding US Health Care Spending vs Other High-Income Countries
- Health Care Spending in the US vs Other High-Income Countries.

---

### Notes

A new issue of the *International Journal for Quality in Health Care* has been published. Many of the papers in this issue have been referred to in previous editions of *On the Radar* (when they were released online). Articles in this issue of the *International Journal for Quality in Health Care* include:

- **Editorial: Learning from errors** for continuously improving patient safety (Chih-Wei Huang; Usman Iqbal; Yu-Chuan (Jack) Li)
- **Assessing quality of health services with the SERVQUAL model** in Iran. A systematic review and meta-analysis (Saeed Hosseini Teshnizi; Teamur Aghamolaei; Kobra Kahrouj; Seyed Mehrdad Hosseini Teshnizi; J Ghanj)
- **Do the public think medical regulation keep them safe?** (Carrie Ho-kwan Yam; Eliza Lai-yi Wong; Sian M Griffiths; Eng-kiong Yeoh)
- **A comparison of outcomes between Canada and the United States in patients recovering from hip fracture** repair: secondary analysis of the FOCUS trial (Lauren A Beaupre; Eugene K Wai; Donald R Hoover; Helaine Noveck; Darren M Roffey; Donald R Cook; Jay S Magaziner; Jeffrey L Carson)
- **Healthcare services utilization following admission for hip fracture** in elderly patients (Ehud Fliss; Orly Weinstein; Michael Sherf; Jacob Dreher)
- **A better understanding of ambulance personnel’s attitude towards real-time resuscitation feedback** (Peter Brinkrolf; Roman Lukas; Ulf Harding; Sebastian Thies; Joachim Gerss; Hugo Van Aken; Hans Lemke; Udo Schniedermeier; Andreas Bohn)
- **Seen through the patients’ eyes: surgical safety and checklists** (Jochen Bergs; Frank Lambrechts; Melissa Desmedt; Johan Hellings; Ward Schrooten; Annemie Vlayen; Dominique Vandijck)
- **Are root cause analyses recommendations effective and sustainable?** An observational study (Peter D Hibbert; Matthew J W Thomas; Anita Deakin; William B Runciman; Jeffrey Braithwaite; Stephanie Lomax; Jonathan Prescott; Glenda Gorrie; Amy Szczygielski; Tanja Surwald; Catherine Fraser)
- **Patient and hospital characteristics that influence incidence of adverse events** in acute public hospitals in Portugal: a retrospective cohort study (Paulo Sousa; António Sousa Uva; Florentino Serranheira; Mafalda Sousa Uva; Carla Nunes)
- **Evaluating quality standards’ adherence in surgical care: a case study from Pakistan** (Iram Fatima; Ayesha Humayun; Muhammad Imran Anwar; Muhammad Shafiq)
- **Awareness and practice of patient rights from a patient perspective: an insight from Upper Egypt†** (Eman Sameh Mohammed; Amany Edward Seedhom; Eman Ramadan Ghazawy)
• It's not just ‘What’ you do, it's also the ‘Way’ that you do it: Patient and Public Involvement in the Development of Health Research (Tracey J Devonport; Wendy Nicholls; Lynne H Johnston; Robin Gutteridge; A Watt)

Public Health Research & Practice
March 2018, Volume 28, Issue 1


Notes
A new issue of Public Health Research & Practice has been published, with a focus on ‘Helping refugees build new lives’. Articles in this issue of Public Health Research & Practice include:

• Editorial: Refugee health – collaborating for better outcomes (Mitchell M Smith, Mark F Harris)
• Helping refugees build new lives: from consultation to collaboration (Peter Shergold)
• Integration of refugees into routine primary care in NSW, Australia (Mark F Harris)
• Canada’s response to refugees at the primary health care level (Kevin Pottie, Doug Gruner, Olivia Magwood)
• Blood screen findings in a 2-year cohort of newly arrived refugees to Sydney, Australia (Choisung C Ngo, Christine Maidment, Lisa Atkins, Sandy Eagar, Mitchell M Smith)
• Transition from an asylum seeker–specific health service to mainstream primary care for community-based asylum seekers: a qualitative interview study (Genevieve L Fair, Mark F Harris, Mitchell M Smith)
• Violence against ambulance personnel: a retrospective cohort study of national data from Safe Work Australia (Brian J Maguire)
• Insights from linking routinely collected data across Australian health jurisdictions: a case study of end-of-life health service use (Julia M Langton, David Goldsbury, Preeyaporn Srasuebkul, Jane M Ingham, Dianne L O’Connell, Sallie-Anne Pearson)
• Psychostimulant-related health service demand in an inner-city hospital, 2012–2015 (Alon Faingold, Kirsten Morley, Bethany White, Emily Walker, Paul Haber)
• Intergovernmental collaboration for the health and wellbeing of refugees settling in Australia (Belinda Martin, Paul Douglas)

Journal of Patient Safety and Risk Management
Volume 23, Issue 1, February 2018

URL: http://journals.sagepub.com/toc/cric/23/1

Notes
A new issue of the Journal of Patient Safety and Risk Management has been published. Articles in this issue of Journal of Patient Safety and Risk Management include:

• Challenges and opportunities for patient safety and justice in the UK (Peter Walsh)
• Accounting for harms that cannot be counted (Peter J Pronovost)
• Freedom to Speak Up Guardians tasked with changing NHS culture (Lou O’Neill)
• Changes in liability claims, costs, and resolution times following the introduction of a communication-and-resolution program in Tennessee (Florence R LeCraw, Daniel Montanera, Joy P Jackson, Janice C Keys, Dale C Hetzler, Thomas A Mroz)
• The role of extended/outpatient venous thromboembolism prophylaxis after abdominal surgery for cancer or inflammatory bowel disease (Norma E Farrow, Jonathan K Aboagye, Brandyn D Lau, Peter Najjar, Dennis P Orgill, Victor O Popoola, Peggy S Kraus, Deborah B Hobson, Dauryne L. Shaffer, Bashar Safar, Susan Gearhart, Jonathan E Efron, Michael B Streiff, E R Haut)

• Reforming the professional regulators: Creating an effective, proportionate and efficient system (Douglas Bilton, Harry Cayton)

• 2017 – The year that mediation comes of age? (Andrew Hannam, Julienne Vernon)

• ‘The NCEPOD Method’ – How the National Confidential Enquiry into Patient Outcome and Death designs and delivers national clinical outcome review programmes (Marisa Mason)

Notes

A new issue of Healthcare Policy has been published. Articles in this issue of Healthcare Policy include:

• Curious Silences in Healthcare Policy and Research (Jennifer Zelmer)


• Medicine, Body Fluid and Food: The Regulation of Human Donor Milk in Canada (Martha J. Paynter and Kathryn Hayward)

• Medicare Cost Drivers during the 2004–2014 Health Accord Period in Canada: What Is the Evidence? (Ruolz Ariste)

• The Medical Devices Special Access Program in Canada: A Scoping Study (Roland K. Maier, Devidas Menon and Tania Stafinski)

• Understanding Patient Referral Wait Times for Specialty Care in Ontario: A Retrospective Chart Audit (Clare Liddy, Nikhat Nawar, Isabella Moroz, Shelagh Merae, Christopher Russell, Ariana Mihan, Fanny Mckellips, Lois Crowe, Amir Afkham and Erin Keely)

BMJ Quality and Safety online first articles

Notes

BMJ Quality and Safety has published a number of ‘online first’ articles, including:

• Quality measurement for Clostridium difficile infection: turning lemons into lemonade (Marc Philip Pimentel, Michael Klompas, Allen Kachalia)

• Effect of copayment policies on initial medication non-adherence according to income: a population-based study (Ignacio Aznar-Lou, Anton Pottegård, Ana Fernández, María Teresa Peñarrubia-María, Antoni Serrano-Blanco, Ramón Sabés-Figuera, Montserrat Gil-Girbau, Marta Fajó-Pascual, Patricia Moreno-Peral, Maria Rubio-Valera)

• What can patients tell us about the quality and safety of hospital care? Findings from a UK multicentre survey study (Jane K O’Hara, Caroline Reynolds, Sally Moore, Gerry Armitage, Laura Sheard, Claire Marsh, Ian Watt, John Wright, Rebecca Lawton)
• Realist synthesis of **intentional rounding in hospital wards**: exploring the evidence of what works, for whom, in what circumstances and why (Sarah Sims, Mary Leamy, Nigel Davies, Katy Schnitzler, Ros Levenson, Felicity Mayer, Robert Grant, Sally Brearley, Stephen Gourlay, Fiona Ross, R Harris)

• **Diagnostic performance dashboards**: tracking diagnostic errors using big data (Ketan K Mane, Kevin B Rubenstein, Najlla Nassery, Adam L Sharp, Ejaz A Shamim, Navdeep S Sangha, Ahmed Hassoon, Mehdi Fanai, Zheyu Wang, David E Newman-Toker)

**International Journal for Quality in Health Care online first articles**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>URL</th>
<th><a href="https://academic.oup.com/intqhc/advance-access?papetoc">https://academic.oup.com/intqhc/advance-access?papetoc</a></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Notes**

*International Journal for Quality in Health Care* has published a number of ‘online first’ articles, including:

• **Nicotine addiction management following surgery**: a quality improvement approach in the post anesthesia care unit (Barry A Finegan; Daniel Roblin; Fadi Hammad)

**Online resources**

[UK] **NICE Guidelines and Quality Standards**
https://www.nice.org.uk
The UK’s National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE) has published new (or updated) guidelines and quality standards. The latest reviews or updates are:

• Quality Standard QS39 **Attention deficit hyperactivity disorder**
  https://www.nice.org.uk/guidance/qs39

• NICE Guideline NG88 **Attention deficit hyperactivity disorder**: diagnosis and management
  https://www.nice.org.uk/guidance/ng87

• Quality Standard QS47 **Heavy menstrual bleeding**
  https://www.nice.org.uk/guidance/qs47

• NICE Guideline NG88 **Heavy menstrual bleeding**: assessment and management
  https://www.nice.org.uk/guidance/ng88

**Disclaimer**

*On the Radar* is an information resource of the Australian Commission on Safety and Quality in Health Care. The Commission is not responsible for the content of, nor does it endorse, any articles or sites listed. The Commission accepts no liability for the information or advice provided by these external links. Links are provided on the basis that users make their own decisions about the accuracy, currency and reliability of the information contained therein. Any opinions expressed are not necessarily those of the Australian Commission on Safety and Quality in Health Care.