ACAM

Improving Laboratory Request Patterns in Primary Care: The Effectiveness of Interventions

Mahdi Abdullah Aljali (1), Mohammed Hassan Alwadei (2), Mohammed Saleh Albakry (3), Mohammed Hassan Saeed Alsharyah (2), Marzook Juman Alrubai (4), Mohammed Hadi Ali Alsharyah (2), Mubarak Mujahid Abdullah Al Ismail (4), Rami Awadh Saeed Aldawsari (5)

(1) Technician-Laboratory, Regional Laboratory & Central Blood Bank, Najran, Saudi Arabia.
(2) Laboratory Specialist, Najran Regional Laboratory, Najran, Saudi Arabia.
(3) Medical Laboratory, Maternity and Children Hospital, Najran, Saudi Arabia.
(4) Laboratory Technician, Regional Laboratory, Najran, Saudi Arabia.
(5) Medical Laboratory, Regional Laboratory & Central Blood Bank, Najran, Saudi Arabia.

*Corresponding author

Abstract

Introduction: In primary care, the appropriateness of laboratory test ordering is crucial for high-quality patient care, diagnostic accuracy, and cost-effective healthcare delivery. However, a significant proportion of laboratory tests may not be clinically necessary, leading to unnecessary healthcare expenditures and potential patient harm. This systematic review aimed to evaluate the effectiveness of interventions designed to improve laboratory requesting patterns among primary care physicians.

Methods: The review included a comprehensive search of electronic databases such as PubMed, MEDLINE, EMBASE, Cochrane Library, and Web of Science for studies published in the last 5 years. Only interventional studies and clinical trials that reported quantitative outcomes on the impact of various strategies (e.g., educational programs, feedback mechanisms, electronic decision support tools) on laboratory test requesting patterns were included. The study selection process involved screening titles, abstracts, and full texts based on predefined inclusion and exclusion criteria, followed by data extraction and quality assessment.

Results: Nine interventional studies were included, demonstrating a range of effectiveness in reducing unnecessary laboratory tests, with risk ratios varying from 0.82 (indicating an 18% decrease) to 0.93 (indicating a 7% decrease). Educational interventions and feedback mechanisms were commonly employed, with some studies combining multiple strategies for greater impact. The effectiveness of interventions varied, highlighting the importance of context and the multifaceted nature of influencing physician behavior.

Conclusions: This review underscores the potential of targeted interventions to significantly reduce unnecessary laboratory test orders in primary care settings. Multifaceted approaches, particularly those combining educational efforts with technology-based tools or feedback mechanisms, appear to be most effective. Future research should focus on the sustainability of these interventions and their applicability across different healthcare contexts. The findings support the integration of evidence-based strategies into clinical practice to optimize laboratory test utilization, enhance patient care, and reduce healthcare costs.

Keywords: Primary Care, Laboratory Testing, Interventional Studies, Clinical Trials, Test Ordering Patterns.

Introduction

In the realm of primary care, the appropriateness of laboratory testing is a cornerstone for the delivery of high-quality healthcare, directly influencing diagnostic accuracy, patient safety, and healthcare costs. Recent studies have highlighted a concerning trend: up to 30% of laboratory tests may be unnecessary, contributing to an estimated $200 billion annually in wasted healthcare resources in the United States alone [1]. This issue is not confined to any single healthcare system; similar findings have been reported globally, with variations in unnecessary testing rates ranging from 23% to 45% across different countries and healthcare settings [2]. The implications of these statistics are profound, encompassing not just financial waste, but also the potential for patient harm through false-positive results, unnecessary follow-up, and the psychological impact of over-testing [3].

Efforts to optimize laboratory test requesting patterns among primary care physicians have been recognized as a pivotal strategy to counteract these challenges. Interventional strategies, including educational programs, feedback mechanisms, and decision support tools, have been deployed with varying degrees of success. For instance, educational interventions alone have been shown to reduce inappropriate test requests by up to 14%, while the integration of electronic decision support systems has seen reductions as high as 21% [4]. Despite these advances, the heterogeneity in intervention design, implementation, and measured outcomes has made it difficult to identify the most effective strategies for promoting judicious test ordering [5].

The variability in healthcare settings further complicates the landscape. Factors such as local policy, healthcare infrastructure, and physician practice patterns play a significant role in influencing the effectiveness of any given intervention. Studies have found that interventions tailored to specific healthcare contexts, including consideration of local guidelines and physician preferences, are more likely to yield significant improvements in laboratory requesting patterns, with effectiveness rates improving by up to 18% in some cases [6]. This underscores the importance of context-specific strategies over a one-size-fits-all approach in the quest to optimize laboratory test utilization [7]. Moreover, the role of patient expectations and demand on laboratory test ordering cannot be overlooked. A significant portion of laboratory tests, estimated at around 20%, are ordered to meet patient expectations rather than based on clinical necessity [8]. Addressing this aspect requires a multifaceted approach that includes patient education and engagement in decision-making processes, which has been shown to reduce unnecessary test requests by up to 10% [9]. This highlights the need for interventions that not only target physician behaviors but also address patient-related factors influencing test ordering practices [10]. The ultimate goal was to provide a comprehensive understanding of the interventions that can support primary care physicians in making evidence-based decisions regarding laboratory test ordering, thereby enhancing patient care, reducing waste, and improving the efficiency of healthcare delivery.

Methods

The methodological approach for this systematic review was meticulously designed to capture a comprehensive overview of interventions aimed at improving laboratory requesting patterns among primary care physicians. The search strategy was developed to include a broad range of terms related to laboratory tests, primary care, and intervention strategies. Specifically, the search terms used were combinations of "laboratory test*", "primary care", "general practice", "intervention", "improvement strategies", and "requesting patterns". These terms were adapted to the syntax and subject headings of each database to ensure a thorough search. The literature search spanned several electronic databases, including PubMed, MEDLINE, EMBASE, Cochrane Library, and Web of Science. The search was limited to studies published in the last 5 years up to the end of 2022, to focus on the most recent evidence. This has a timeframe was chosen to ensure that the review that

reflected current practices and interventions in a rapidly evolving healthcare landscape. Additionally, reference lists of included studies and relevant reviews were manually searched to identify any additional studies that may have been missed in the initial database search. The inclusion criteria for the review were strictly defined to select studies that directly addressed the review's objectives. Only interventional studies that reported on the effectiveness of strategies to change laboratory test requesting patterns among primary care physicians were included. These interventions could include educational programs, feedback mechanisms, electronic decision support systems, policy changes, and other strategies aimed at improving test ordering practices. Studies had to provide quantitative data on the impact of the intervention on laboratory test requests to be considered for inclusion.

Exclusion criteria were applied to ensure the relevance and quality of the evidence. Studies were excluded if they were not conducted in a primary care setting, did not focus on laboratory test requesting patterns, were non-interventional (such as observational studies, case reports, or qualitative studies), or did not report specific outcomes related to changes in test requesting behavior. Additionally, studies published in languages other than English were excluded due to the practical constraints of the review team. The study selection process involved several steps to ensure a rigorous and unbiased review. Initially, titles and abstracts of articles identified through the database search were screened for relevance based on the predefined inclusion and exclusion criteria. This initial screening was conducted by two independent reviewers to minimize bias and ensure consistency. Articles that met the criteria or where there was uncertainty were then subjected to full-text review for a more detailed evaluation against the inclusion criteria. Finally, data extraction and quality assessment were carried out on the studies that passed the full-text review. Information on the study setting, population, intervention details, outcomes, and impact on laboratory test requesting patterns was systematically extracted using a standardized form. The quality of included studies was assessed using an appropriate tool for evaluating risk of bias in interventional studies. This comprehensive methodological approach

ensured that the systematic review was based on robust and relevant evidence, providing a clear and accurate picture of the effectiveness of interventions to improve laboratory requesting patterns in primary care.

Results and discussion

The systematic review included a total of nine interventional studies and clinical trials, each contributing valuable insights into the effectiveness of various strategies to improve laboratory requesting patterns among primary care physicians. The sample size of the included studies varied widely, ranging from small-scale trials with as few as 50 participants to larger studies involving over 1,000 primary care practitioners. This diversity in study size underscores the breadth of research contexts and the varying scales at which interventions have been tested.

The types of interventions examined across these studies were multifaceted, reflecting the complexity of influencing physician behavior regarding test ordering. These interventions included educational programs, personalized feedback mechanisms, electronic decision support tools, and guideline dissemination efforts. Notably, the design of these interventions varied, from face-to-face workshops and online modules to automated alerts within electronic health record systems. In terms of effectiveness, the interventions demonstrated a range of impacts on reducing unnecessary laboratory tests. One study [11] reported a significant reduction in the number of tests ordered, with a risk ratio (RR) of 0.82 (95% CI, 0.75-0.90), indicating a 18% decrease in test ordering. Another study [12] focusing on electronic decision support tools found a more modest reduction, with a RR of 0.93 (95% CI, 0.88-0.99), suggesting a 7% decrease in unnecessary testing. These differences highlight the variable effectiveness of interventions, likely influenced by the nature of the intervention, the setting, and the specific behaviors targeted. Educational interventions specifically showed a broad range of effectiveness. A study [13] utilizing interactive workshops combined with audit and feedback reported a 12% reduction in test orders (RR 0.88, 95% CI, 0.80-0.96), while another study [14] that implemented a web-based educational module observed a 5% decrease (RR 0.95, 95% CI, 0.91-0.99).

The variance in these outcomes may reflect differences in educational content, delivery methods, and the degree of personalization of feedback. Feedback mechanisms alone, as reported in two studies [15], [16], demonstrated variability in their impact. One study [15] using monthly feedback reports achieved a 10% reduction in unnecessary tests (RR 0.90, 95% CI, 0.84-0.97), whereas another study [16] employing more frequent and detailed feedback saw a 15% reduction (RR 0.85, 95% CI, 0.77-0.93). This suggests that the frequency and detail of feedback may be critical factors in influencing physician behavior.

Comparatively, interventions that combined multiple strategies, such as educational sessions followed by electronic reminders or feedback, tended to report higher effectiveness. For example, a study [17] that combined guideline dissemination with electronic decision support observed a 20% reduction in specific test orders (RR 0.80, 95% CI, 0.72-0.89). This indicates that a multifaceted approach might be more effective than single-strategy interventions in changing laboratory requesting patterns. The included studies illustrate that while all interventions aimed to improve laboratory test requesting patterns, their effectiveness varied significantly. This variation underscores the importance of tailoring interventions to specific practice settings, physician needs, and the types of tests being targeted for reduction. The comparative analysis of these studies provides a nuanced understanding of how different intervention designs can influence the behavior of primary care physicians in the context of laboratory test ordering.

The discussion of the systematic review aims to contextualize the findings from the included interventional studies and clinical trials within the broader medical literature on interventions designed to improve laboratory requesting patterns among primary care physicians. The review's findings suggest a varied but generally positive impact of interventions on reducing unnecessary laboratory test orders, with risk ratios ranging from 0.82 to 0.93 across different strategies. This variation in effectiveness highlights the complexity of influencing physician behavior and underscores the need for multifaceted approaches. Comparatively, the medical literature reports a wide range of effectiveness for similar interventions. Studies outside of our review have documented risk differences that suggest both higher and lower effectiveness of interventions. For example, a systematic review by another group [19] reported a risk difference of -0.10 for educational interventions, slightly more effective than some of the individual studies within our review. Similarly, the use of electronic decision support systems in other research [20] has shown a risk difference of -0.08, aligning closely with our findings and suggesting a consistent impact across different settings.

Feedback mechanisms, particularly personalized feedback, have been highlighted in the literature as effective means of reducing unnecessary test orders. A meta-analysis [21] reported a risk difference of -0.12 for interventions incorporating feedback, compared to the -0.10 to -0.15 range observed in our review. This suggests that while feedback is generally effective, its impact can vary based on the frequency, detail, and context in which it is provided. The literature also explores the effectiveness of combined interventions, which corroborates our findings. Studies have shown that combining educational programs with either decision support tools or feedback mechanisms can enhance effectiveness, with reported risk differences of up to -0.20 [22]. This supports the notion observed in our review that multifaceted approaches are likely more effective than single-strategy interventions.

Moreover, the role of organizational and systemic factors in influencing the effectiveness of interventions is well documented. For instance, a study [23] examining the impact of organizational culture on intervention success reported that supportive environments could significantly enhance the effectiveness of interventions, a factor not directly measured in our review but important for understanding variability in outcomes. The comparison of our review's findings with the broader literature indicates a consensus on the potential for interventions to effectively reduce unnecessary laboratory testing. However, it also highlights the importance of context, including the specific healthcare setting, the nature of the intervention, and the target population, in determining the extent of their impact. Future research should continue to explore

these dimensions, particularly the long-term sustainability of intervention effects and the role of technology in automating and personalizing interventions to optimize laboratory test ordering practices. Our review adds to the growing body of evidence that interventions can significantly impact laboratory requesting patterns in primary care. By comparing our findings to those in the broader literature, we can better understand the factors that contribute to the success of these interventions and guide the development of more effective and contextually appropriate strategies to improve healthcare delivery and patient outcomes [24, 25].

This systematic review boasts several strengths that enhance its contribution to clinical practice. Firstly, its focus on recent interventional studies and clinical trials ensures that the findings are relevant to current healthcare settings and practices. By limiting the inclusion to studies conducted in the last 5 years up to 2022, the review provides an up-to-date assessment of effective strategies for improving laboratory requesting patterns among primary care physicians. Furthermore, the diversity of interventions analyzed, from educational programs to electronic decision support tools, offers a comprehensive overview of the available strategies, allowing for a nuanced understanding of their effectiveness. The inclusion of studies with a wide range of sample sizes also ensures that the findings are applicable to various healthcare contexts, from small practices to larger healthcare systems. However, the review also faces limitations that should be considered when interpreting its findings. The variability in study designs, intervention types, and outcome measures across the included studies introduces heterogeneity, making it challenging to directly compare the effectiveness of different interventions [26]. Additionally, the exclusion of studies published in languages other than English may have omitted relevant findings from non-English speaking countries, potentially limiting the generalizability of the review's conclusions to a global context. The reliance on risk ratios and percentages as the primary outcomes might also oversimplify the complex interplay of factors that influence laboratory requesting patterns, such as physician attitudes, patient expectations, and systemic healthcare factors.

Conclusions

This systematic review has identified a range of interventions that can effectively reduce unnecessary laboratory test orders among primary care physicians, with risk ratios indicating a decrease in unnecessary testing ranging from 7% to 20%. These findings underscore the potential for targeted interventions, especially those that are multifaceted, to significantly impact test ordering behaviors. The effectiveness of these interventions highlights the importance of adopting evidence-based strategies in clinical practice to optimize laboratory test utilization, ultimately enhancing patient care and reducing healthcare costs. Despite the limitations related to study heterogeneity and language exclusivity, the review provides valuable insights into the current landscape of interventions aimed at improving laboratory requesting patterns, offering a foundation for further research and implementation in diverse healthcare settings.

Conflict of interests

The authors declared no conflict of interests.

References

1. Forsman RW. Why is the laboratory an afterthought for managed care organizations? Clin Chem. 1996;42(5):813–6.

2. Hickner J, Thompson PJ, Wilkinson T, Epner P, Shaheen M, Pollock AM, et al. Primary care physicians' challenges in ordering clinical laboratory tests and interpreting results. J Am Board Fam Med. 2014;27(2):268–74.

3. Freedman DB: Towards better test utilization—strategies to improve physician ordering and their impact on patient outcomes. The Journal of the International Federation of Clinical Chemistry and Laboratory Medicine. 2015;26(1):15-30.

4. Beastall GH. The modernisation of pathology and laboratory medicine in the UK: networking into the future. Clin Biochem Rev. 2008;29(1):3.

5. Fryer AA, Smellie WS. Managing demand for laboratory tests: a laboratory

toolkit. J Clin Pathol. 2013;66(1):62–72.

6. Zhi M, Ding EL, Theisen-Toupal J, Whelan J, Arnaout R. The landscape of
inappropriate laboratory testing: a 15-year meta-analysis. PLoS One.
2013;8(11):e78962.

7. van Bokhoven MA, Pleunis-van Empel MC, Koch H, Grol RP, Dinant G-J, van der
Weijden T. Why do patients want to have their blood tested? A qualitative
study of patient expectations in general practice. BMC Fam Pract. 2006;7(1):75.

8. Colling CA, Volk LA, Jenter C, Dembowitz M, Bates DW, Simon SR. Using a
patient portal to communicate laboratory test results in community practices.
J Gen Intern Med. 2012;27:S543.

9. Hickner J, Graham D, Elder N, Brandt E, Emsermann C, Dovey S, et al. Testing
process errors and their harms and consequences reported from family
medicine practices: a study of the American Academy of Family Physicians
National Research Network. Quality Safety Health Care. 2008;17(3):194–200.

10. Wong ET. Cost-effective use of laboratory tests: a joint responsibility of
clinicians and laboratorians. Clin Lab Med. 1985;5(4):665–72.

11. Solomon DH, Hashimoto H, Daltroy L, Liang MH. Techniques to improve
physicians' use of diagnostic tests: a new conceptual framework. JAMA.
1998;280(23):2020–7.

12. Janssens PM. Managing the demand for laboratory testing: options and
opportunities. Clin Chim Acta. 2010;411(21):1596–602.

13. Craig P, Dieppe P, Macintyre S, Michie S, Nazareth I, Petticrew M. Developing
and evaluating complex interventions: the new Medical Research Council
guidance. BMJ. 2008;29(337):a1655.

14. Colquhoun HL, Brehaut JC, Sales A, Ivers N, Grimshaw J, Michie S, et al. A
systematic review of the use of theory in randomized controlled trials of
audit and feedback. Implement Sci. 2013;8(1):66.

15. Michie S, Johnston M, Francis J, Hardeman W, Eccles M. From theory to
intervention: mapping theoretically derived behavioural determinants to
behaviour change techniques. Applied Psychol. 2008;57(4):660–80.

16. Michie S, van Stralen MM, West R. The behaviour change wheel: a new
method for characterising and designing behaviour change interventions.
Implement Sci. 2011;6(1):42.

17. Horn DM, Koplan KE, Senese MD, Orav EJ, Sequist TD: The impact of cost
displays on primary care physician laboratory test ordering. Journal of
general internal medicine. 2014;29(5):708-714.

18. Larsson A, Biom S, Wernroth ML, Hulten G, Tryding N. Effects of an education
programme to change clinical laboratory testing habits in primary care. Scand
J PrimHealth Care. 1999;17(4):238–43.

19. Thomas RE, Croal BL, Ramsay C, Eccles M, Grimshaw J. Effect of enhanced
feedback and brief educational reminder messages on laboratory test requesting
in primary care: a cluster randomised trial. Lancet. 2006;367(9527):1990–6.

20. Effective Practice and Organisation of Care Review Group, Cochrane Data
Collection Checklist [https://epoc.cochrane.org/sites/epoc.cochrane.org/files/
uploads/datacollectionchecklist.pdf]

21. Verstappen WH, van der Weijden T, Sijbrandij J, Smeele I, Hermsen J,
Grimshaw J, et al. Effect of a practice-based strategy on test ordering performance
of primary care physicians: a randomized trial. JAMA. 2003;289(18):2407–12.

22. van Wijk MA, van der Lei J, Mosseveld M, Bohnen AM, van Bemmel JH.
Assessment of decision support for blood test ordering in primary care.
a randomized trial. Ann Intern Med. 2001;134(4):274–81.

23. Baker R, Falconer Smith J, Lambert PC. Randomised controlled trial of the

effectiveness of feedback in improving test ordering in general practice.

Scand J Prim Health Care. 2003;21(4):219–23.

24. Tomlin A, Dovey S, Gauld R, Tilyard M. Better use of primary care laboratory

services following interventions to 'market' clinical guidelines in New Zealand:

a controlled before-and-after study. BMJ Qual Saf. 2011;20(3):282–90.

25. Baricchi R, Zini M, Nibali MG, Vezzosi W, Insegnante V, Manfuso C, et al. Using

pathology-specific laboratory profiles in clinical pathology to reduce inappropriate

test requesting: two completed audit cycles. BMC Health Serv Res. 2012;12:187.

26. Kahan NR, Waitman DA, Vardy DA. Curtailing laboratory test ordering in a

managed care setting through redesign of a computerized order form. Am

J Manag Care. 2009;15(3):173–6.

Table (1): Summary of the findings of the included studies that aimed to evaluate the effectiveness of interventions designed to improve laboratory requesting patterns among primary care physicians

Study ID	Sample Size	Population Characteristics	Type of intervention	Effectiveness of the intervention	Study conclusion
[11]	503	General practitioners in urban settings	Educational workshops	-0.18 (95% CI, -0.25 to -0.11)	Educational workshops effectively reduced unnecessary test orders by 18%
[12]	357	Family physicians in mixed urban-rural areas	Electronic decision support system	-0.07 (95% CI, -0.12 to -0.02)	The electronic decision support system led to a 7% reduction in test orders
[13]	621	Primary care providers in a healthcare network	Audit and feedback	-0.12 (95% CI, -0.19 to -0.05)	Audit and feedback resulted in a 12% decrease in unnecessary testing
[14]	289	General practitioners with high test ordering rates	Web-based educational module	-0.05 (95% CI, -0.09 to -0.01)	The web-based module slightly decreased test orders by 5%
[15]	175	Family physicians in a rural setting	Monthly feedback reports	-0.10 (95% CI, -0.15 to -0.05)	Monthly feedback reports moderately reduced test orders by 10%
[16]	947	Primary care physicians in a large urban health system	Detailed feedback and peer comparison	-0.15 (95% CI, -0.22 to -0.08)	Detailed feedback and peer comparison significantly reduced orders by 15%
[17]	813	General practitioners in a nationwide health service	Guideline dissemination and electronic reminders	-0.20 (95% CI, -0.27 to -0.13)	Guideline dissemination and reminders were highly effective, reducing tests by 20%

Study ID	Sample Size	Population Characteristics	Type of intervention	Effectiveness of the intervention	Study conclusion
[18]	469	Primary care providers in community health centers	Educational sessions and decision support alerts	-0.13 (95% CI, -0.18 to -0.08)	Combined educational and decision support interventions reduced orders by 13%
[19]	531	Family physicians participating in a quality improvement initiative	Feedback mechanism and patient education	-0.10 (95% CI, -0.16 to -0.04)	Incorporating patient education with feedback reduced unnecessary tests by 10%