



Effect of a Quality of Care Improvement Initiative in Patients With Acute Coronary Syndrome

¹ Chindy, ¹ Diana

¹ Faculty of Medicine, Tarumanagara University, Special Region of Jakarta,
Indonesia

Correspondence : dokter.chindy1982@gmail.com

Article History :

Received date : 2024/04/12
Revised date : 2024/05/05
Accepted date : 2024/06/18
Published date : 2024/07/03



Copyright: © 2024 by the authors. Submitted for possible open access publication under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (BY NC) license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>).

E-ISSN :

ISSN 3048-1368



P-ISSN :

ISSN 3048-1376



ABSTRACT

Background: The literature surrounding quality improvement initiatives in healthcare, particularly in the context of acute coronary syndrome (ACS), has evolved significantly over the past few decades.

Literature Review: The literature review on quality improvement initiatives in acute coronary syndrome (ACS) reveals a complex landscape of interventions and outcomes that are influenced by various factors, including context, implementation fidelity, and the nature of the interventions themselves. The systematic review by (C Conry et al., 2012) highlights the evolution of hospital-based quality improvement efforts over a decade, pointing out the predominance of interpersonal interventions aimed at patient satisfaction, while technical interventions, which are more likely to yield measurable improvements in outcomes, are less common.

Conclusion: In conclusion, the literature underscores the multifaceted nature of quality improvement initiatives in ACS, revealing that while significant advancements have been made, challenges remain in terms of implementation, adherence, and contextual adaptation. The effectiveness of these initiatives is contingent upon robust leadership, standardized protocols, and ongoing evaluation of quality indicators. Future research should aim to develop tailored strategies that consider local contexts and address barriers to implementation, ultimately enhancing the quality of care for patients with acute coronary syndrome.

Keyword: Effect, Quality of Care, Improvement Initiative, Acute Coronary Syndrome

INTRODUCTION

The literature surrounding quality improvement initiatives in healthcare, particularly in the context of acute coronary syndrome (ACS), has evolved significantly over the past few decades. A systematic review conducted by (C Conry et al., 2012) highlights the advancements made in hospital-based quality improvement interventions from 2000 to 2010. The authors emphasize the disparity between the volume of literature available and the lack of theoretically grounded interventions, suggesting that while interpersonal interventions aimed at enhancing patient satisfaction are prevalent, technical interventions led by physicians yield more substantial improvements in medical outcomes. This review sets a foundation for understanding the complexities of implementing quality improvement initiatives in diverse healthcare settings, noting that administrative support is crucial for overcoming barriers to change.

Further exploring the landscape, (S. Lee et al., 2016)

conducted a systematic review focusing on cardiovascular disease (CVD) care in low- and middle-income countries (LMICs). Their findings reveal that while quality improvement interventions can be successfully implemented in these settings, the results remain inconclusive. The authors argue that adaptations to local contexts are essential for achieving optimal clinical outcomes, particularly given the constraints faced by LMICs, such as limited healthcare budgets and workforce capacity. This highlights the need for more targeted studies in CVD care quality improvement to better understand effective strategies.

(Singh et al., 2019) contribute to this discourse with their mixed methods analysis of the ACS QUIK trial in India, which examines the implementation and acceptability of a heart attack quality improvement toolkit. The study identifies significant variability in the responsiveness of hospitals' emergency cardiovascular care services, attributed to a lack of

standardization and funding. The authors underscore the importance of hospital leadership in the successful implementation of quality improvement initiatives, providing evidence that higher adherence to the toolkit correlates with improved care measures. This suggests that stakeholder perspectives are vital in the evaluation of such interventions.

The implementation of critical care pathways (CCPs) for ACS patients has also been shown to enhance clinical outcomes. (Hai et al., 2019) detail how these pathways promote adherence to evidence-based medical therapies, resulting in reduced mortality rates. Their research indicates that while compliance with guideline-directed therapies remains a challenge, the structured approach of a CCP can lead to significant improvements in both in-hospital and post-discharge care.

Lastly, (Leonardi et al., 2022) present a multicentre study aimed at assessing clinical governance in ACS patients. Their work seeks to quantify the impact of quality indicators on diagnosis and therapy, thereby providing a framework for continuous

improvement in patient care. This study further emphasizes the necessity of monitoring and evaluating quality improvement efforts to ensure that they translate into better health outcomes for patients with ACS.

Together, these articles illustrate the multifaceted nature of quality improvement initiatives in the context of ACS, revealing critical insights into the effectiveness, challenges, and necessary adaptations for successful implementation across various healthcare settings.

LITERATURE REVIEW

The systematic review conducted by (C Conry et al., 2012) provides a comprehensive examination of hospital-based quality improvement initiatives over a decade, specifically from 2000 to 2010. The authors highlight a significant advancement in health research related to quality of care, yet they also underscore a notable deficiency in the theoretical design and implementation of many interventions. This critical observation suggests that while there

is an abundance of literature, the lack of a robust theoretical framework may limit the effectiveness and sustainability of quality improvement initiatives in hospital settings.

The review categorizes interventions into two main types: interpersonal and technical. Interpersonal interventions, primarily aimed at enhancing patient satisfaction, are typically executed by nursing staff. In contrast, technical interventions, which are generally led by physicians, focus on measurable medical outcomes for patients with specific conditions. This distinction is particularly relevant in the context of acute coronary syndrome, where technical interventions may lead to more substantial improvements in patient care due to their quantifiable nature. The review indicates that technical interventions tend to yield more significant advancements in quality of care, likely because they allow for clearer measurement and assessment compared to the more subjective interpersonal interventions.

Moreover, the authors suggest that the challenges associated with

achieving quality improvements in hospitals may be influenced by external factors, including administrative hurdles. This recognition of external influences is crucial, as it points to the complexity of implementing effective quality improvement initiatives. It raises questions about how administrative structures and policies can either facilitate or hinder the success of these interventions.

The article titled "Quality Improvement for Cardiovascular Disease Care in Low- and Middle-Income Countries: A Systematic Review" by (S. Lee et al., 2016) provides a comprehensive analysis of the effectiveness of quality improvement initiatives aimed at enhancing cardiovascular disease (CVD) care, particularly in low- and middle-income countries (LMICs). The authors highlight a critical gap in the literature concerning acute coronary syndrome (ACS) interventions, noting that the majority of existing studies have concentrated on chronic CVD conditions. This focus limits the understanding of how quality improvement initiatives can

be tailored to address the urgent needs of ACS patients, which is crucial given that CVD remains the leading cause of death globally.

One of the significant insights from this review is the inconclusiveness of the results from various studies on quality improvement interventions for ACS. The authors point out that many of these studies had a duration of less than 12 months, which may not be sufficient to observe meaningful changes in health outcomes. This raises important questions about the sustainability and long-term effectiveness of such initiatives. The lack of robust data on acute care interventions underscores the necessity for more targeted research in this area to establish evidence-based practices that can improve patient outcomes.

Moreover, (S. Lee et al., 2016) emphasize that quality care delivery in LMICs does not require the adoption of universal standards developed in high-income countries. Instead, they advocate for a contextualized approach where interventions are adapted to the

specific capacities and needs of local communities. This perspective is particularly relevant for ACS care, where rapid response and effective management are essential for improving survival rates. The authors argue that clinical quality improvement can be implemented in any setting without significant financial burden, suggesting that innovative and resource-efficient strategies can be developed to enhance care for ACS patients in LMICs.

The systematic review also highlights the importance of measuring health outcomes in evaluating the effectiveness of quality improvement interventions. By focusing on specific clinical care quality improvement initiatives compared to usual care, the authors provide a framework for assessing the impact of these interventions on patient health. This evidence-based approach is vital for informing policy and practice in the management of CVD, particularly in resource-limited settings.

The article titled "Implementation and acceptability of

a heart attack quality improvement intervention in India: a mixed methods analysis of the ACS QUIK trial" by (Singh et al., 2019) provides a comprehensive evaluation of a quality improvement initiative aimed at enhancing emergency cardiovascular care for patients with acute coronary syndrome (ACS) in India. The study's main focus is on the variability in responsiveness and capacity of hospitals' emergency services, which were found to differ significantly across the trial hospitals. This variability is attributed to a lack of standardization in emergency cardiovascular care and an insufficient number of qualified emergency staff.

One of the critical insights from the article is the identification of systemic issues that hinder the effective implementation of quality improvement initiatives. The authors highlight that the existing systems and resources to support such initiatives varied widely among participating hospitals. This included discrepancies in data capture systems and the presence of dedicated quality officers, which are essential for monitoring

and enhancing the quality of care. The mixed methods evaluation employed in this study is particularly noteworthy, as it allows for a nuanced understanding of both the adherence to the ACS QUIK toolkit intervention and its outcomes.

The findings suggest a correlation between the level of implementation of the intervention and improvements in process of care measures. Hospitals that demonstrated higher fidelity to the toolkit experienced greater enhancements in care delivery. This relationship underscores the importance of robust implementation strategies in achieving desired health outcomes, particularly in the context of ACS management.

Moreover, the article discusses the role of hospital administrators and leadership in facilitating the adoption of quality improvement interventions. The authors argue that strong leadership support is crucial for overcoming barriers to implementation and ensuring sustainability. This perspective is aligned with broader literature on quality improvement,

which emphasizes the need for organizational commitment and resources to foster effective change.

While the study presents valuable data, it also acknowledges limitations, such as the lack of evaluation of the acceptability of the intervention in some contexts. This gap indicates an area for future research, as understanding the perspectives of healthcare providers and patients could further enhance the effectiveness of quality improvement initiatives.

The article "Guideline-Based Critical Care Pathway Improves Long-Term Clinical Outcomes in Patients with Acute Coronary Syndrome" by (Hai et al., 2019) presents an insightful examination of the effectiveness of a critical care pathway (CCP) in enhancing the management of acute coronary syndrome (ACS). The authors articulate the rapid evolution of ACS management, emphasizing that timely revascularization and optimal medical therapy—encompassing dual antiplatelet therapy, statins, beta-blockers, and ACE inhibitors/angiotensin receptor

blockers (ACEI/ARB)—are crucial for improving clinical outcomes. Notably, the article highlights a persistent issue: compliance with evidence-based medical therapy remains suboptimal, particularly within Asian populations.

The study underscores the implementation of a CCP as a pivotal strategy to enhance both in-hospital and post-discharge care for ACS patients. The authors present compelling evidence that improved adherence to guideline-directed therapies correlates with significant reductions in 30-day and one-year mortality rates. This finding is particularly relevant given the critical nature of timely intervention in ACS cases, where delays can lead to worsened outcomes.

A key strength of the article is its focus on long-term compliance with guideline-directed medical therapy post-discharge, an area that is often overlooked in existing literature. The authors demonstrate that the CCP not only improves adherence during hospitalization but also fosters ongoing compliance with prescribed therapies after patients

leave the hospital. This aspect is vital, as it addresses the continuity of care, which is essential for sustaining the benefits of initial treatment interventions.

The methodology employed in the study is robust, utilizing a comprehensive approach to assess the impact of the CCP on long-term cardiovascular outcomes. The authors provide a thorough analysis of data collected from patients admitted with ACS, offering a clear depiction of how the CCP influenced both adherence to medication and subsequent health outcomes.

However, while the findings are promising, the article could benefit from a more in-depth discussion of potential barriers to implementation of the CCP in diverse healthcare settings. Factors such as resource availability, staff training, and institutional support may significantly affect the feasibility and sustainability of such initiatives. Additionally, the study primarily focuses on an Asian population, which raises questions about the generalizability of the results to other

demographic groups and healthcare systems.

The article "Clinical governance of patients with acute coronary syndromes" by (Leonardi et al., 2022) presents a comprehensive examination of the implementation of clinical governance principles in the management of patients with acute coronary syndrome (ACS). The authors articulate a patient-centered approach aimed at enhancing holistic quality improvement, which is particularly relevant in the context of ACS, where timely and effective care is crucial for patient outcomes.

The study is designed as a prospective, multicentre investigation that seeks to verify and quantify the inclusion of patients while simultaneously describing the relative and absolute effects of various quality indicators related to diagnosis and therapy. This methodological approach is commendable as it allows for a robust analysis of the quality of care provided to ACS patients across different healthcare settings.

One of the key insights from this article is the emphasis on the systematic application of clinical

governance to ensure that care delivery is not only effective but also adheres to established standards of quality. The authors highlight the importance of monitoring quality indicators, which can serve as benchmarks for assessing the efficacy of interventions and the overall management of ACS. This focus on quality metrics is crucial, as it provides a framework for continuous improvement in clinical practice.

Moreover, the article discusses the implications of a patient-centered approach, which is essential in the context of ACS, where individual patient needs and preferences can significantly influence treatment outcomes. By prioritizing patient engagement and satisfaction, the authors argue that healthcare providers can foster better adherence to treatment plans and improve overall health outcomes.

However, while the study presents a thorough evaluation of quality indicators, it would benefit from a more detailed exploration of the specific interventions employed within the clinical governance framework. Understanding the

particular strategies that led to improvements in quality of care would provide valuable insights for practitioners aiming to replicate these results in their own settings.

CONCLUSION

The literature review on quality improvement initiatives in acute coronary syndrome (ACS) reveals a complex landscape of interventions and outcomes that are influenced by various factors, including context, implementation fidelity, and the nature of the interventions themselves. The systematic review by (C Conry et al., 2012) highlights the evolution of hospital-based quality improvement efforts over a decade, pointing out the predominance of interpersonal interventions aimed at patient satisfaction, while technical interventions, which are more likely to yield measurable improvements in outcomes, are less common. This distinction is critical, as it suggests that technical interventions may be more effective in enhancing care for ACS patients.

Furthermore, the review by (S. Lee et al., 2016) emphasizes the necessity of contextualizing quality improvement strategies in low- and middle-income countries (LMICs). The authors argue that the effectiveness of these interventions is often inconclusive and that adaptations to local needs are essential. This underscores the importance of developing targeted research that addresses the unique challenges faced by ACS patients in these settings, particularly given the high mortality rates associated with cardiovascular diseases.

The mixed methods analysis of the ACS QUIK trial by (Singh et al., 2019) provides valuable insights into the variability of hospital responses to quality improvement initiatives. The study highlights the lack of standardization and the critical role of hospital leadership in facilitating successful implementation. The correlation found between adherence to the quality improvement toolkit and improvements in care measures reinforces the idea that stakeholder

engagement is vital for achieving desired health outcomes.

The article discussing critical care pathways (CCPs) by (Hai et al., 2019) further supports the notion that structured approaches can significantly enhance clinical outcomes. The findings indicate that adherence to evidence-based therapies through CCPs correlates with reduced mortality rates, emphasizing the importance of continuity of care post-discharge. However, the article also notes challenges in achieving compliance, particularly in certain populations, which suggests that barriers to implementation need to be addressed to sustain improvements.

Lastly, the multicentre study on clinical governance by (Leonardi et al., 2022) highlights the importance of monitoring quality indicators to ensure effective care delivery for ACS patients. The focus on a patient-centered approach aligns with the broader goal of improving health outcomes through enhanced engagement and adherence to treatment plans.

In conclusion, the literature underscores the multifaceted nature of quality improvement initiatives in ACS, revealing that while significant advancements have been made, challenges remain in terms of implementation, adherence, and contextual adaptation. The effectiveness of these initiatives is contingent upon robust leadership, standardized protocols, and ongoing evaluation of quality indicators. Future research should aim to develop tailored strategies that consider local contexts and address barriers to implementation, ultimately enhancing the quality of care for patients with acute coronary syndrome.

REFERENCES

1. C Conry, M., Humphries, N., Morgan, K., McGowan, Y., Montgomery, A., Vedhara, K., Panagopoulou, E., & McGee, H., 2012. A 10 year (2000–2010) systematic review of interventions to improve quality of care in hospitals. ncbi.nlm.nih.gov
2. S. Lee, E., Vedanthan, R., Jeemon, P., H. Kamano, J., Kudesia, P., Rajan, V., Engelgau, M., & E. Moran, A., 2016. Quality Improvement for Cardiovascular Disease Care in Low- and Middle-Income Countries: A Systematic Review. ncbi.nlm.nih.gov
3. Singh, K., Devarajan, R., P Mohanan, P., S Baldrige, A., Kondal, D., E Victorson, D., N Karmali, K., Zhao, L., M Lloyd-Jones, D., Prabhakaran, D., Goenka, S., D Huffman, M., & QUIK Investigators, A. C. S., 2019. Implementation and acceptability of a heart attack quality improvement intervention in India: a mixed methods analysis of the ACS QUIK trial.. [PDF]
4. Hai, J. J., Wong, C. K., Un, K. C., Wong, K. L., Zhang, Z. Y., Chan, P. H., Lam, Y. M., Chan, W. S., Lam, C. C., Tam, C. C., Wong, Y. T., Yung, S. Y., Chan, K. W., Siu, C. W., Lau, C. P., & Tse, H. F., 2019. Guideline-Based Critical Care

- | | |
|---|--|
| <p>Pathway Improves Long-Term Clinical Outcomes in Patients with Acute Coronary Syndrome. ncbi.nlm.nih.gov</p> <p>5. Leonardi, S., Montalto, C., Carrara, G., Casella, G., Grosseto, D., Galazzi, M., Repetto, A., Tua, L., Portolan,</p> | <p>M., Ottani, F., Galvani, M., Gentile, L., Sofia Cardelli, L., De Servi, S., Antonelli, A., Maria De Ferrari, G., Oltrona Visconti, L., & Campo, G., 2022. Clinical governance of patients with acute coronary syndromes. ncbi.nlm.nih.gov</p> |
|---|--|