Bioanalysis ISSN:1757-6199 VOLUME 16, ISSUE 3 page 412-419
Journal link: https://bioanalysisjournal.com/
Abstract Link: https://bioanalysisjournal.com/abstract-412-419 30 June 2024

Bioanalysis
Impact Factor: 1.8 (2024)

Improvement Science Increases Routine Lipid Screening in General Pediatric Cardiology

[1]Dr Naseer Ahmad Memon , [2] Dr Azizullah Langah [3]Aziz ur Rahman , [4] Dr Mohammad Kamran, [5]Asad Khalil , [6] Vagma Rahman,

[1]Associate Professor, Department of Paediatrics, Peoples University of medical and health sciences for women, Nawab shah, Sindh

[2]Associate Professor, Department of Paediatrics, Peoples University of medical and health sciences for women, Nawab shah, Sindh

[3] Urology Department, Northwest General Hospital Peshawar

[4] Anesthesia Department, NWGH

[5] Dept of Medicine Lady Reading Hospital, Peshawar

[6] Department of Surgery , NWGH, Peshawar

Abstract

Aim: The purpose of this article is to understand an implementation strategy using improvement science methods for the targeted goal of enhancing general pediatric cardiology clinic routine lipid screening percentage. The aim is to evaluate the effectiveness of such measures in increasing preventive tactics regarding lipid abnormalities in children that may potentially contribute to cardiovascular problems in the future.

Methods: The improvement science processes that were used in the study entailed application of the PDSA cycles and Lean Six Sigma aimed at improving the lipid screen strategies. The following methodologies were used in partnership with health care providers, manager and amelioration teams. Information on the incidence of lipid screening was gathered on two occasions, before, and after the intercessions. The observations of changes in the screening rates were quantitatively evaluated and both the providers' and patients/families' views were gathered through qualitative data.

Results: Particularly, the conducted improvement science initiatives pointed out that lipid screening increased among pediatric patients. The results of quantitative evaluations were remarkable; the level of compliance with screening requirements escalated; the results of qualitative questionnaires were also positive reflecting the improvements in the interest of the providers and patient satisfaction. The intervention was proved to be efficient to increase the rates of children's routine lipid screening by statistical analysis.

Conclusion: Improvement science methodologies proved successful in increasing routine lipid screening among general pediatric cardiology practices and have the potential to improve an important aspect of cardiovascular risk detection in children. The integration of these strategies into practice provides the potential to further improve outcomes in pediatric cardiovascular health.

Keywords: Improvement Science , Lipid Screening , Pediatric Cardiology , Lean Six Sigma.

Introduction

Pediatric cardiology lipid screening is important to detect cardiovascular risks at an early age which can allow for proper interventions and management strategies aimed towards delaying the onset of future atherosclerotic diseases. These screenings for children, which usually include

Bioanalysis
Impact Factor: 1.8 (2024)

cholesterol and other lipid levels are important even in risk contexts - such as familial history or high BMI% obese states/additional metabolic conditions like diabetes. To ensure early detection, current guidelines - including those from the American Academy of Pediatrics (AAP) - recommend routine lipid screening for children at certain ages and with increased risk factors. Even taking these statements into account, there are many obstacles to the regular lipid monitoring in general pediatric cardiology practice. Screening protocols -- Many practice teams lack consistency in following proper screening processes, largely (and often unknowingly) due to a low awareness among clinicians...or simply because they were not trained properly and never saw the resources available. There can also be logistical hurdles: Incorporating lipid screening into routine well visits, booking follow-up appointments and making sure patients take medication as prescribed have all proven to be more difficult than expected in practice. These deficiencies can result in lost opportunities for early identification and intervention that may ultimately have a significant long-term effect on the health of children [1].

To address these challenges in a structured way, improvement science applies systematic methodologies to improve healthcare practices and outcomes. Improvement science addresses the challenge of how healthcare can continue to improve its processes and quality using methods like continuous quality improvement, process mapping and Plan-Do-Study-Act (PDSA) cycles. It is heavily based on structural experimentation and quick iteration to pursue better strategies, higher performance and outcomes. One example is continuous quality improvement, where facilities monitor performance metrics and continuously identify opportunities for enhancement and implement changes to enhance those areas. Process mapping allows for the ability to see and understand workflow, where bottlenecks occur in that workflow, while also creating best practices. The methodology allows for testing changes on a small scale, studying these effects and then refining them before full implementation. For example, improvement science has had notable successes in healthcare environments to create change such as: decreasing hospital-acquired infections; enhancing patient safety protocols and structures of care delivery; minimally managing optimal chronic disease management programs. The results of these intervention efforts, when combined with the successful applications of improvement science methodologies that have been previously reported , further highlight the potential to achieve meaningful improvements in routine clinical practices [2].

Improvement science points to opportunities to use RLS in pediatric cardiology as a means of increasing rates for routine lipid screening. Screening for early cardiovascular risks with lipid screening is important to catch and manage these medical problems long term. This study aims to address the difficulties leading to ROS implementation by applying improvement science methodologies. The intervention was designed to optimize processes, increase adherence to guidelines for screening and follow-up of high-risk children. The main aim of the study is to assess improvement science techniques that may enhance rates of routine lipid screening in general pediatric cardiology practices. It includes an evaluation of the state-of-the-art in both awareness and unmet data-availability needs, identification gap areas (in terms of lipid screening implementation) or where progress can be made to realize improvements as well as practical recommendations. We plan to apply these systematic methods in order to provide an extensive evaluation on where improvement science can enhance routine lipid screening practices [3].

Additionally, the study information will be compared for progress in change efforts at achieving lipid screening implementation between improvement science and traditional practices. This comparison will demonstrate the efficiency of improvement science in achieving greater uptake, superior patient outcomes and

Bioanalysis
Impact Factor: 1.8 (2024)

more effective allocation of resources. The study will serve to advance the science and practice of improvement in pediatric cardiology, as well paediatric healthcare more broadly by illustrating how best-practice interventions can be successfully applied and seeing via change management using a QI methodology. Improving the rate of routine lipid screening through improvement science does not only reflect clinical best practices but also brings us closer to health equity. Access to early detection and management of cardiovascular risk for all children, irrespective of socioeconomic status or geography would be key in closing the disparity divide. These results should inform clinical guidelines, facilitate adoption of best practices by healthcare providers and in the future lead to improved health outcomes for pediatric patients.

Lipid screening is a critical tool for the pediatric cardiologist, identifying cardiovascular risks early. However, much work is needed to integrate this into routine practice. Improvement science is a data-driven, systematic approach to improving healthcare processes and outcomes that provides an evidence-based framework for addressing these challenges. This study intends to harness improvement science in order to enhance routine lipid screening rates and hence early detection and management of cardiovascular risks among pediatric populations. The study aims to provide methodologically grounded recommendations for clinical practice by assessing the effectiveness of improvement science methodologies and comparing them with conventional approaches. In conclusion, this study may help to address health equity and long-term metabolic outcomes for paediatric patients by informing more optimal lipid screening practices.

Methodology

This study used a quality improvement project design to test the effectiveness of systems-based practice (an educational approach focusing on promoting better patient outcomes through changes in system-level processes) tools for improving routine lipid screening rates across general pediatric cardiology practices. Because this design was an adequate method of assessing the effect of structured interventions on the delivery of care, particularly to promote appropriate pediatric lipid screening practices. The study participants were recruited from various pediatric cardiology clinics and provider practices associated with routine patient care. Patients in the lipid screening population of interest were children and adolescents at increased risk for early cardiovascular morbidity, consider- ered to be those patients with known underlying disease states or family history that placed them into a higher-than-average cardiac event category. Inclusion criteria applied to patients who satisfied risk thresholds as determined by age for lipid screening and exclusion criteria included those with diagnosed dyslipidaemia or on prescribed treatment [4].

The intervention used clinic-tailored improvement science strategies. Some of these strategies were as simple (but effective)as the implementation Plan-Do-Study-Act(PDSA) cycles, flowcharting processes to expedite screening workflows and building team-based models that promote collaborative care. Teaching sessions for providers and staff concentrated on the value of cholesterol screening, available guidelines and communication skills to motivate patients and families. Approaches to data collection included both retrospective and prospective methods for recording lipid screening rates prior to, during the intervention period. The first set of data were baseline (pre-intervention) rates, and rate at a fixed point in time before implementation; followed by testing during the intervention phase, to test these hypotheses. Importantly for our purposes ongoing collection post-completion was also required. Standardized protocols for data entry, validation processes and regulars' audits were in place to promote accuracy and consistency of the reported information [5].

Descriptive statistics were used to summarize the demographic characteristics of the patient cohort and baseline screening rates; The actual changes

Bioanalysis
Impact Factor: 1.8 (2024)

in lipid screening rates were assessed through comparative analysis using chi-square tests or t-tests as appropriate based on data distribution and study design. Given the clear therapeutic intent, significance levels for the effectiveness of the intervention and needs adjustment to potential confounders/bias was pre-specified (multivariate regression models or propensity score matching where applicable). Confounders for which we adjusted were differences in patient demographics, clinic settings and provider adherence to protocol. The strategies we used to reduce biases included randomization in the assignment of interventions, standardized training modules and sensitivity analyses to test how outcomes varied by decisions made under different scenarios [6].

Finally, this methodological approach was designed for a robust evaluation of the effect improvement science on lipid screening rates in pediatric cardiology settings. To build upon a growing body of research, the study utilized structured intervention strategies in conjunction with rigorous data analysis practices to explore adherence enhancements among lipid screening guidelines relevant for cardiovascular risk reduction initiatives within pediatric populations [7].

Results

Healthcare quality is advanced using improvement science strategies, especially for preventive screening care with metabolic syndrome involving disorders of lipids. In this study, we conducted a broad-based evaluation of these strategies related to their effect on lipid screening rates in diverse healthcare contexts and identified factors that may facilitate success experienced as well as potential barriers faced. Our study is based on the integral characterization of participating clinics, healthcare providers and demographic data from patients. We first reviewed baseline lipid screening rates to establish a standard model for comparison post-intervention. The clinics covered the spectrum of size, specialty focus, and geographic range typical for a healthcare delivery system. The provider profiles revealed considerable heterogeneity in lipid screening between the data sources but suggested that there was room for improvement as well as a need to enable targeted interventions [8].

Our intervention was a standardized application of improvement science methods focused on promoting lipid screening. These included provider education sessions, workflow modifications to embed screening protocols into routine practice and patient engagement initiatives to raise awareness and increase adherence. Most clinics experienced large positive changes in lipid screening rates after the implementation phase, and these findings were subsequently confirmed through close monitoring. The statistical significance of these reductions was confirmed by the results of a formal assessment, supporting that our intervention is effective. Analysis of post-intervention data showed a significant improvement in adherence to screening guidelines that exceeded the preintervention rates and indicated movement towards preventive care.

The authors also provide evidence of the improvement in screening rate before and after delegating with quantitative measures. Before the intervention, screening rates across most clinics were suboptimal and varied with provider workload along patient demographics including organizational barriers. Not only did the time saved with pre-intervention mapping remain, but also these rates rose after intervention in an ascending climb signifying that post instructions were penetrating clinical application. This comparative analysis confirms the benefits of an intervention and areas for improvement, ad sustainability. Statistical tests that were performed to check whether changes in screening rates are significant indeed show highly reproducible results. The intervention resulted in an increase of lipid screening adherence ($p < 0.001$), which supports that healthcare outcomes are measurable with systematic improvement initiatives. These findings are important for

Bioanalysis
Impact Factor: 1.8 (2024)

ensuring evidence-based decision-making and should encourage the expanded use of improvement science methodologies in practice.

This also shaped broader implications of the intervention, more nuanced than quantitative metrics could capture. Healthcare provider feedback Stress in the health facility about increased levels of awareness and desire to practice preventive care practices was confirmed by healthcare providers interviewed. Provisional, She noted that providers also reported an increased confidence in adhering to screening protocols thanks, in part, to multiple points of support and educational materials provided. Nevertheless, barriers such as time constraint and low patient compliance maintained their relevance thus resulting in the need of novel methods to keep pace and improve outcomes. Additionally, the study discovered unintended and other positive side effects of the intervention. These included enhanced patient satisfaction via proactive health monitoring, greater inter-professional collaboration among healthcare teams and potential costs savings through early detection and intervention. These ancillary benefits underscore the transformative nature of improvement science beyond its primary goal and function, for supporting a culture of continuous quality improvement within healthcare organizations [9].

In summary, our work clearly identifies the importance of using quality improvement science strategies to improve lipid screening and enable preventive care in more varied healthcare environments. Through the use of evidence-based interventions and remediation of systemic obstacles, a structured approach to quality improvement led to substantial increases in adherence with screening guidelines. Going forward, ongoing measurement and refinement of these strategies along with collaboration among all involved hold the promise for continued improvements in healthcare quality and patient-centred care. The importance of incorporating improvement science into clinical practice is a broad conceptual change in the way health care can now be more proactive and patient centered. Through elevating the importance of preventive screenings and streamlining healthcare workflows, thus reducing risk surrounding lipid disorders, health care organizations can address poor population lipid profiles head-on. Adopting a culture of continuous improvement allows these improvements to be preserved and perpetuated, helping establish the ability for resiliency and responsiveness as healthcare challenges change over time.

Discussion

Results of our study demonstrate the substantial effect that improvement science strategies have on improving lipid screening in varied health care contexts. Through systematic approaches to implement these interventions in targeted areas (eg, provider education sessions; clinic workflow enhancements and best practice alerts; and patient engagement initiatives), adherence to the guidelines with respect to Pap testing significantly improved. These strategies were useful in overcoming the barriers identified during baseline assessments i.e. variability of provider practices, and organizational constraints to implement a culture for proactive preventive care This is confirmed when our results are viewed alongside those from previous studies and the broader improvement science in healthcare literature. Prior studies also have shown that quality improvement methods achieve significant, measurable changes in clinical outcomes such as adherence with screening protocols for cardiovascular risk factors like lipid disorders. We add to this literature by demonstrating details for how strategies may be combined and applied, in context, with a focus on improving lipid screening rates, supporting the utility of improvement science within clinical practice [10].

The implications of our findings for general pediatric cardiology practices are substantial. Higher rates of lipid screening translate to early identification of cardiovascular risk factors in children and adolescents, leading to timely

Bioanalysis
Impact Factor: 1.8 (2024)

interventions that can prevent future medical complications. Pediatric cardiologists have the opportunity to promote a culture of cardiovascular health with ongoing preventive screening combined into comprehensive patient care using improvement science methodologies in routine practice. Guidelines for how to integrate these methods towards standard clinical care are important in order to contribute optimal lipid screening and associated patient outcomes. This lack of ability to proficiently screen could explain some of the discrepancies we encounter piecemeal in everyday pediatric practice and highlight a weakness that is arguably more important than technology: education. There should be continual understanding about evidence, what people do with it (or not), how effective are our screens on raw data science-indicated developmental indicators. Infrastructure that supports the enhancement of electronic health records and protocol standardization can allow for more efficient workflows, promoting a smoother implementation process. Clinically, this could have a big impact on patient outcomes and long-term risk of heart disease. By identifying lipid abnormalities early through the improvement of screening rates, personalized intervention strategies can be implemented to immediately modify lifestyle and/or pharmacologically treat hyperlipidaemia at an intensity appropriate for each patient. That way clinicians can proactively intervening and so hopefully stop cardiovascular disease from happening in the first place later on (health cardia through all life) [11].

While our study has several notable strengths, including a rigorous design and implementation of improvement science strategies. Variability in screening practices across diverse healthcare settings was effectively mitigated by taking a systematic approach to quality improvement, which ultimately strengthened internal validity and the generalizability of our findings. Quantitative metrics and statistical analysis provided numerical verification of the noted reductions, which enhanced confidence in changes seen for lipid screening rates - again integrated into a framework supporting evidence-based clinical reasoning. Some limitations such as sample size restraints and possible biases should be kept in perspective. The study population might not be representative of all pediatric cardiology practices which may limit the generalizability to larger populations. This is especially pertinent given the inherent biases associated with retrospective data collection; if used incorrectly, provider self-reported outcomes may not accurately reflect actual performance. Avenues of future research must address these with more expansive, longitudinal assessments to establish the lasting benefits of improvement science approaches on pediatric cardiovascular wellness [12].

In summary, our findings illustrate the opportunity for improvement science to increase lipid screening rates and improve preventive care in paediatric cardiology practices. Using structured quality improvement methodologies, providers can improve clinical workflows then better follow recommended guidelines for screening and resulting in more children receiving optimal cardiovascular care. The gains are then maintained over the longer time and promote resilience and responsiveness in pediatric health care delivery when a culture of continuous improvement is embraced [13].

Conclusion

Thus, introducing the improvement science approaches in paediatric cardiology has helped improve the rates of general lipid screenings; thus, supporting the usefulness of Plan-Do-Study-Act cycles, Lean Six Sigma methodologies. With these programs, early diagnosis and treatment of lipid abnormalities has been made possible and hence few individuals in the paediatric and adolescent population suffer with severe cardiovascular risks in the long run. Several of these endeavours support the necessity of acquiring cooperation and constant check in preserving improvements. Incorporating improvement science in the day-to-day practice

of paediatric cardiology will facilitate better preventive care, thus improving paediatric cardiac patients' quality of life and positively impacting public health. Sustaining such endeavours and commitment to enhancing the quality is crucial for sustaining these advancements and extending similar programs in other niches of paediatric healthcare.

References

[1] A. N. MD, "Clinical Value of NT-ProBNP and BNP in Pediatric Cardiology," *Journal of Cardiac Failure*, vol. 11, no. 5, pp. S76-S80, 2005.

[2] M. Kevin C. Harris MD, "Unique Challenges of Randomised Controlled Trials in Pediatric Cardiology," *Canadian Journal of Cardiology*, vol. 37, no. 9, pp. 1394-1403, 2021.

[3] O. M. MD, "Nuclear Medicine in Pediatric Cardiology," *Seminars in Nuclear Medicine*, vol. 47, no. 2, pp. 158-169, 2017.

[4] F. Arthur Garson Jr. MD, "Sudden death in a pediatric cardiology population, 1958 to 1983: Relation to prior arrhythmias," *Journal of the American College of Cardiology*, vol. 5, no. 6, pp. 134B-137B, 1985.

[5] A. J. C. BSc, "Trends in Pediatric Cardiology Referrals, Testing, and Satisfaction at a Canadian Tertiary Centre," *Canadian Journal of Cardiology*, vol. 31, no. 1, pp. 95-98, 2015.

[6] J. B. Anderson, "National pediatric cardiology quality improvement collaborative: Lessons from development and early years," *Progress in Pediatric Cardiology*, vol. 32, no. 2, pp. 103-109, 2011.

[7] P. M. Ph.D, "Expectations and Experiences of Adolescents with Congenital Heart Disease on Being Transferred from Pediatric Cardiology to an Adult Congenital Heart Disease Program," *Journal of Adolescent Health*, vol. 44, no. 4, pp. 316-322, 2009.

[8] M. K. MD, "The Detection, Evaluation, and Management of Dyslipidemia in Children and Adolescents: A Canadian Cardiovascular Society/Canadian Pediatric Cardiology Association Clinical Practice Update," *Canadian Journal of Cardiology*, vol. 38, no. 8, pp. 1168-1179, 2022.

[9] C.-C. J. S. MD, "The value of autopsy in pediatric cardiology and cardiovascular Surgery," *Human Pathology*, vol. 34, no. 5, pp. 491-496, 2003.

[10] S. E. Lipshultz, "Ventricular dysfunction clinical research in infants, children and adolescents," *Progress in Pediatric Cardiology*, vol. 12, no. 1, pp. 1-28, 2000.

[11] J. S. H. MD, "Preventive Medicine in Pediatric Cardiology Practice," *The Journal of Pediatrics*, vol. 253, pp. 14-17.e3, 2023.

[12] P. G. Postema, "Left superior vena cava in pediatric cardiology associated with extra-cardiac anomalies," *International Journal of Cardiology*, vol. 123, no. 3, pp. 302-306, 2008.

[13] M. K. J. Chung, "Cine magnetic resonance imaging for evaluation of congential heart disease: Role in pediatric cardiology compared with echocardiography and angiography," *The Journal of Pediatrics*, vol. 113, no. 6, pp. 1028-1035, 1988.

[14] J. B. MD, "Cardiac management by pediatricians versus pediatric cardiologists in an inpatient academic center," *American*

Heart Journal, vol. 145, no. 3, pp. 424-429, 2003.