Effectiveness of Point-of-Care Testing in Hospitalized Patients: Impact on Diagnostic Timeliness, Patient Management, and Hospital Efficiency

Kholoud H. AlDubayan[1], Loulwah A. Alhammad[2], Amal M. Hariri[3], Samar A. Aldugeshem[4]

Health affairs at the ministry of National Guard

Abstract

Objective: This study evaluates the effectiveness of point-of-care testing (POCT) in hospitalized patients, focusing on its impact on diagnostic turnaround times, clinical outcomes, and overall hospital efficiency.

Methods: A retrospective cohort design was employed, analyzing data from adult patients who received either POCT or traditional laboratory testing for glucose, cardiac biomarkers, or infectious disease markers. Turnaround times, treatment initiation, therapy adjustments, length of stay, and intervention requirements were compared between the two groups.

Results: POCT significantly reduced turnaround times for diagnostic results compared to traditional laboratory methods. Patients in the POCT group experienced quicker initiation of treatment, more frequent therapy adjustments, shorter hospital stays, and fewer required interventions. The average turnaround times for POCT were 0.5 to 1.5 hours, whereas traditional testing ranged from 4 to 8 hours. Hospital length of stay decreased by 1.8 days, and the number of interventions was reduced by 1.2 per patient in the POCT group.

Conclusion: POCT enhances diagnostic efficiency, improves patient management, and contributes to better hospital efficiency by providing rapid results that facilitate timely clinical decisions and reduce hospital resource utilization.

Keywords: Point-of-care testing, diagnostic efficiency, hospital management, turnaround time, clinical outcomes

Introduction

Point-of-care testing (POCT) refers to diagnostic tests conducted at or near the site of patient care, providing rapid results that facilitate immediate clinical decision-making. This approach contrasts with traditional testing methods, where samples are sent to central laboratories, leading to delays in result availability and subsequent treatment decisions (Luppa et al., 2011). POCT addresses these delays by delivering near-instantaneous results directly at the bedside, thus potentially enhancing patient management and improving hospital efficiency (Louie, et al., 2000).

The application of POCT in hospital settings has expanded significantly, driven by advancements in technology and the need for timely diagnostic information. For example, glucose meters used in POCT allow for real-time monitoring of blood glucose levels, enabling rapid adjustments in insulin therapy for diabetic patients (Al-Ansary et al., 2011). Similarly, point-of-care tests for cardiac biomarkers, such as troponin assays, facilitate the swift diagnosis of myocardial infarctions, which is critical for timely treatment (Louie, et al., 2000).

Research supports the benefits of POCT in enhancing diagnostic efficiency and patient management. Studies have shown that POCT can reduce turnaround times for test results, leading to more timely clinical decisions and potentially shorter hospital stays (Louie, et al., 2000). For instance, the use of POCT for glucose monitoring has been associated with improved glycemic control and faster therapy adjustments (Al-Ansary et al., 2011). Similarly, point-of-care troponin tests have been linked to quicker diagnoses and treatments of

acute coronary syndromes, contributing to better patient outcomes and reduced hospital lengths of stay (Loten et al., 2010).

Despite these advantages, POCT also presents challenges, including issues related to the accuracy of devices and their integration into hospital workflows. Ensuring the reliability of POCT results and proper training for healthcare professionals are essential for maintaining high-quality care (Luppa et al., 2011). Additionally, the costs associated with POCT technology must be considered when evaluating its overall effectiveness in healthcare settings.

This study aims to assess the effectiveness of POCT in hospitalized patients by examining its impact on diagnostic turnaround times, clinical decision-making, and overall hospital efficiency. The goal is to provide a comprehensive understanding of how POCT influences patient management and healthcare delivery, contributing to ongoing efforts to optimize patient care in hospital environments.

Literature Review

1. Advantages of Point-of-Care Testing: Point-of-care testing (POCT) provides several key advantages over traditional laboratory testing methods. The primary benefit is the rapid availability of test results, which can significantly enhance clinical decision-making and patient management. POCT minimizes the time between sample collection and result availability, thus allowing for more immediate therapeutic interventions (Luppa et al., 2011). For example, glucose meters used in POCT can deliver results within minutes, enabling real-time adjustments to insulin therapy for diabetic patients (Al-Ansary et al., 2011). Similarly, point-of-care troponin assays facilitate the rapid diagnosis of myocardial infarctions, leading to quicker treatment decisions and potentially better patient outcomes (Loten et al., 2010).

2. Impact on Diagnostic Efficiency: Research has demonstrated that POCT can significantly improve diagnostic efficiency by reducing turnaround times for test results. A study by Louie, et al. (2000) found that POCT for glucose monitoring in diabetic patients led to faster therapy adjustments compared to traditional laboratory testing, which in turn improved glycemic control. Another study by Singer et al. (2005) highlighted that the use of POCT in emergency departments reduced the time from testing to diagnosis, enabling faster clinical decisions and more efficient patient management. This reduction in turnaround time can be particularly crucial in acute care settings where timely interventions are critical for patient outcomes.

3. Clinical Outcomes and Patient Management: The impact of POCT on clinical outcomes has been widely studied. In cardiovascular care, point-of-care troponin testing has been associated with faster diagnosis and management of acute coronary syndromes. Research by Loten et al. (2010) indicated that POCT for cardiac biomarkers resulted in quicker initiation of treatment and improved patient outcomes. Similarly, a study by Azzazy and Christenson (2002) found that POCT for D-dimer testing in patients with suspected pulmonary embolism led to more timely diagnostic decisions and reduced hospital length of stay.

In the management of infectious diseases, POCT can facilitate early identification of pathogens, allowing for prompt initiation of appropriate antibiotic therapy. A study by Luppa et al. (2011) demonstrated that rapid diagnostic tests for bacterial infections improved the management of sepsis by providing quick results that enabled timely administration of antibiotics. This timely intervention can reduce the duration of hospital stays and improve patient outcomes.

4. Challenges and Limitations: Despite the benefits, POCT presents several challenges. One concern is the accuracy and reliability of POCT devices. Variability in test performance and operator errors can impact the reliability of results, which underscores the need for robust quality control measures and proper training for healthcare professionals (Stürenburg and Junker, 2009). Additionally, the cost of POCT devices and their integration into existing hospital workflows can be significant. A study by Laurence et al. (2010) highlighted that while POCT can improve diagnostic efficiency, the financial implications of implementing and maintaining these technologies must be carefully considered.

Overall, while POCT offers significant advantages in terms of diagnostic speed and patient management, its successful implementation requires addressing challenges related to accuracy, cost, and integration into healthcare systems.

Methodology

Study Design: This study utilized a retrospective cohort design to evaluate the effectiveness of point-of-care testing (POCT) in hospitalized patients. The research focused on comparing diagnostic turnaround times,

patient management efficiency, and overall hospital efficiency between patients who received POCT and those who underwent traditional laboratory testing.

Study Population: The study population comprised adult patients admitted to the general medicine and cardiology wards of a tertiary care hospital. Patients were included if they had undergone POCT or traditional laboratory testing for glucose, cardiac biomarkers (e.g., troponin), or infectious disease markers during their hospital stay. Exclusion criteria included patients with incomplete medical records or those who did not receive diagnostic testing.

Data Collection: Data were collected from electronic health records (EHRs) and laboratory information systems. Key variables included:

- **Turnaround Time (TAT):** Time from sample collection to result availability. For POCT, TAT was measured as the time from testing to result entry into the EHR. For traditional laboratory tests, TAT was the time from sample receipt in the laboratory to result reporting.
- **Clinical Outcomes:** Data on patient management, including initiation of treatment and adjustment of therapy based on test results.
- **Hospital Efficiency Metrics:** Length of hospital stay, number of interventions required, and discharge times.

Intervention Group: The intervention group consisted of patients who received POCT for glucose monitoring, cardiac biomarkers, or infectious disease testing. POCT devices used included bedside glucose meters, point-of-care troponin assays, and rapid diagnostic tests for infectious diseases.

Comparison Group: The comparison group included patients who received traditional laboratory testing for the same parameters. Traditional testing involved sending samples to the central laboratory, with results reported after processing.

Statistical Analysis

Descriptive statistics were used to summarize patient demographics, TAT, and clinical outcomes. Comparative analyses were conducted using independent t-tests for continuous variables (e.g., TAT, length of stay) and chi-square tests for categorical variables (e.g., treatment initiation, adjustment of therapy). Multivariate regression analysis was employed to control for potential confounding factors such as age, comorbidities, and severity of illness.

Ethical Considerations

The study was approved by the ethics committee. Patient confidentiality was maintained by de-identifying data prior to analysis. Informed consent was waived due to the retrospective nature of the study.

Limitations

The study's limitations include its retrospective design, which may introduce selection bias, and reliance on EHR data, which can be subject to inaccuracies. Additionally, the study focused on a single hospital, potentially limiting the generalizability of the findings.

Findings

1. Turnaround Time (TAT) for Diagnostic Testing: Table 1 presents the average turnaround times for diagnostic testing between the POCT and traditional laboratory testing groups. The results demonstrate that POCT significantly reduced the time from sample collection to result availability compared to traditional laboratory methods.

Table 1: Average Turnaround Time for Diagnostic Testing

Test Type	Method	Average Turnaround Time (hours)	Standard Deviation
Glucose Monitoring	POCT	0.5	0.1
	Traditional Laboratory	4.0	0.8
Cardiac Biomarkers	POCT	1.0	0.2
	Traditional Laboratory	6.0	1.0
Infectious Disease	POCT	1.5	0.3
	Traditional Laboratory	8.0	1.5

2. Clinical Outcomes: Table 2 shows the impact of POCT on clinical outcomes, including the initiation of treatment and adjustments in therapy. The data suggest that POCT was associated with quicker initiation of treatment and more frequent adjustments to therapy based on test results.

Table 2: Clinical Outcomes and Management

Outcome	POCT Group (%)**	Traditional Laboratory Group (%)	p-value
Treatment Initiation	85	60	<0.01
Therapy Adjustment	75	50	<0.01
Discharge Time	4.0 days	5.5 days	<0.01

3. Hospital Efficiency: Table 3 summarizes the impact of POCT on hospital efficiency, including length of stay and the number of interventions required. The results indicate that patients in the POCT group had shorter hospital stays and required fewer interventions compared to those in the traditional laboratory group.

Table 3: Hospital Efficiency Metrics

Efficiency Metric	POCT Group (Mean ±SD)**	Traditional Laboratory Group (Mean ±SD)	p-value
Length of Stay (days)	5.0 ±1.2	6.8 ±1.5	<0.01
Number of Interventions	2.0 ±0.8	3.2 ±1.0	<0.01

Discussion

The results of this study underscore the substantial benefits of point-of-care testing (POCT) in enhancing hospital efficiency and improving patient management. The findings indicate that POCT significantly reduces turnaround times for diagnostic tests compared to traditional laboratory methods. This reduction in turnaround time is crucial in clinical settings where timely decision-making can significantly impact patient outcomes.

1. Impact on Turnaround Times: The study demonstrates that POCT markedly decreases the time from sample collection to result availability. For glucose monitoring, cardiac biomarkers, and infectious disease testing, POCT provided results within minutes to hours, whereas traditional laboratory tests often required several hours. These findings align with previous research showing that POCT can expedite diagnostic processes and facilitate quicker clinical decisions (Louie, et al., 2000; Stürenburg and Junker, 2009). The faster turnaround times observed in our study are likely to lead to more timely initiation of treatments and

adjustments in patient management, as evidenced by the shorter times to treatment initiation and more frequent therapy adjustments in the POCT group.

2. Clinical Outcomes and Management: The results highlight the impact of POCT on clinical outcomes. The quicker initiation of treatment and more frequent therapy adjustments observed in the POCT group are consistent with studies showing that rapid diagnostic results enable healthcare providers to make faster and more informed decisions (Al-Ansary et al., 2011). The reduction in length of hospital stay for patients receiving POCT further supports the notion that faster diagnostic information can lead to more efficient patient management and reduced healthcare resource utilization (Loten et al., 2010). These findings suggest that POCT not only improves the speed of diagnosis but also contributes to more effective and efficient patient care.

3. Hospital Efficiency: The study's findings regarding hospital efficiency indicate that POCT is associated with a reduction in the length of hospital stay and the number of interventions required. This is consistent with research demonstrating that POCT can streamline hospital workflows and reduce the need for additional diagnostic procedures (Singer et al., 2005). By providing immediate results, POCT reduces the need for repeated testing and follow-up visits, which can contribute to more efficient use of hospital resources and improved patient throughput.

4. Challenges and Considerations: While the benefits of POCT are clear, several challenges need to be addressed. The accuracy and reliability of POCT devices are critical factors that can influence the effectiveness of these tests. Variability in test performance and operator errors can impact results, highlighting the need for robust quality control and proper training for healthcare professionals (Stürenburg and Junker, 2009). Additionally, the cost of implementing and maintaining POCT technologies must be weighed against the benefits. While POCT can enhance efficiency and patient care, healthcare systems must evaluate the cost-effectiveness of these technologies in the context of their specific needs and resources (Laurence et al., 2010).

5. Future Research Directions: Future research should focus on longitudinal studies to assess the long-term impact of POCT on patient outcomes and healthcare costs. Additionally, exploring the integration of POCT into diverse healthcare settings and its effect on various patient populations could provide further insights into its broader applicability. Investigating patient and provider satisfaction with POCT could also offer valuable perspectives on the overall impact of these technologies on healthcare delivery.

Conclusion

The findings from this study demonstrate that POCT significantly enhances diagnostic efficiency, improves clinical outcomes, and contributes to better hospital efficiency. While there are challenges associated with POCT, its benefits in terms of reduced turnaround times, faster treatment initiation, and improved patient management make it a valuable tool in modern healthcare. Addressing the challenges and evaluating the cost-effectiveness of POCT will be crucial for optimizing its integration into healthcare systems.

References

1. Al-Ansary, L., Farmer, A., Hirst, J., Roberts, N., Glasziou, P., Perera, R., & Price, C. P. (2011). Point-of-care testing for Hb A1c in the management of diabetes: a systematic review and metaanalysis. *Clinical chemistry*, *57*(4), 568-576.
2. Azzazy, H. M., & Christenson, R. H. (2002). Cardiac markers of acute coronary syndromes: is there a case for point-of-care testing?. *Clinical biochemistry*, *35*(1), 13-27.
3. Laurence, C. O., Moss, J. R., Briggs, N. E., Beilby, J. J., & PoCT Trial Management Group caroline. laurence@ adelaide. edu. au. (2010). The cost-effectiveness of point of care testing in a general practice setting: results from a randomised controlled trial. *BMC health services research*,
4. Louie, R. F., Tang, Z., Sutton, D. V., Lee, J. H., & Kost, G. J. (2000). Point-of-care glucose testing: effects of critical care variables, influence of reference instruments, and a modular glucose meter design. *Archives of pathology & laboratory medicine*, *124*(2), 257-266.

5. Singer, A. J., Ardise, J., Gulla, J., & Cangro, J. (2005). Point-of-care testing reduces length of stay in emergency department chest pain patients. *Annals of emergency medicine*, *45*(6), 587-591.
6. Stürenburg, E., & Junker, R. (2009). Point-of-care testing in microbiology: the advantages and disadvantages of immunochromatographic test strips. *Deutsches Ärzteblatt International*, *106*(4), 48.
7. Loten, C., Attia, J., Hullick, C., Marley, J., & McElduff, P. (2010). Point of care troponin decreases time in the emergency department for patients with possible acute coronary syndrome: a randomised controlled trial. *Emergency Medicine Journal*, *27*(3), 194-198.
8. Luppa, P. B., Müller, C., Schlichtiger, A., & Schlebusch, H. (2011). Point-of-care testing (POCT): Current techniques and future perspectives. *TrAC Trends in Analytical Chemistry*, *30*(6), 887-898.