ACH Med J
(2025) 3: 108-109
ISSN:2822-5872
Doi : 10.5505/achmedj.2025.18480

LETTER TO THE EDITOR

Evaluation of Accreditation Processes from the Perspective of Medical Biochemistry Laboratory: The Ankara Bilkent City Hospital Example

Gamze Gok[1], Mehmet Fatih Alpdemir[1], Ali Cınar[2],Ozcan Erel[3]

[1]Ankara Bilkent City Hospital, Department of Medical Biochemistry, Ankara, Türkiye

[2]Ankara Bilkent City Hospital, Deputy Head Physician, Ankara, Türkiye

[3]Ankara Yıldırım Beyazıt University, Faculty of Medicine, Department of Medical Biochemistry, Ankara, Türkiye

Article Info

Received Date: 09.02.2025
Revision Date : 30.03.2025
Accepted Date: 04.04.2025

Keywords:

Accreditation,
Medical Biochemistry Laboratory,
Panic Value.

ORCIDs of the authors:

GG :0000-0002-2804-5548
MFA :0000-0003-3015-1478
AC :0009-0005-4006-0184
OE :0000-0002-2996-3236

Dear Editor,

Accreditation can be defined as the evaluation of a health institution's achievement of accreditation standards by an independent health accreditation institution, taking into account the relevant performance levels, and sharing it with the public.[1] In many countries, accreditation plays a role in the evaluation of the health system and is indispensable for the health system.[2]

The mission of Ankara Bilkent City Hospital is to deliver high-quality healthcare services that are timely, efficient, and sustainable. Our commitment is built on principles of equity, ensuring trust and satisfaction for both patients and employees. Additionally, we aim to be a leader in medical education, offering continuous opportunities for the advancement of healthcare. The vision of Ankara Bilkent City Hospital is to be the premier healthcare institution recognized globally for providing exceptional healthcare services to everyone. We prioritize patient care, scientific research, the development of skilled human resources, success in medical education, and the effective use of healthcare technology.[3]

The accreditation process in our hospital started in 2022. Until today, the accreditation surveys of the physical therapy hospital, gynecology hospital, general hospital, cardiovascular hospital, children's hospital, neurology orthopedic hospital, and oncology hospital located in different towers within our hospital have been completed.

Our laboratory serves all hospital units and has undergone numerous surveys during the accreditation process. We would like to share our experiences regarding the accreditation journey with our valued readers.

Accreditation and quality groups were established in our clinic, and chairmen and officers were determined for each group. Meetings were usually held regularly and urgently when necessary, and information flow was ensured. Ideas were exchanged at each meeting, and these meetings positively affected the accreditation process.

The test guide, forms, instructions, and other documents related to our laboratory were reviewed.

Correspondence Address: Üniversiteler Mahallesi 1604. Cadde No: 9 Çankaya Ankara - Türkiye
Phone: +90 505 378 67 03 / **e-mail:** gamze_gok@outlook.com

During the accreditation survey process, the most frequently evaluated situations by the inspectors are as follows:

Education;

Information was requested regarding our clinic's annual education plan, including the training conducted and its content.

Indicators;

The performance of our laboratory is indicator-based. The indicators followed within our laboratory were evaluated. In particular, internal quality and external quality indicators were evaluated in detail in each survey. Information was requested about the activities carried out in case the target values were not reached.

Risk Management;

The reasons that may cause risk and their solutions have been questioned. The risk analysis performed in our hospital is located on the desktop of each employee's computer.

Tracing;

The patient determined via the laboratory information system was traced by specifying a spontaneous date and time range. In tracing, the patient's sample collection, laboratory admission times, analysis and result reporting stages, calibration of the day the sample was analyzed, and internal quality control results were evaluated. In our hospital, panic value notification is made by the panic value notification instructions. During the surveys, while tracking patients with panic values, information such as the laboratory specialist who made the panic value, the method and time of the notification, and which clinician the panic value notification was sent to were evaluated in detail.

Documents;

The test guide, forms, procedures, and instructions related to our laboratory on our hospital's intra-hospital communication portal were examined. Information was requested about the revisions of the revised documents and the reasons for the revision.

Point of Care Tests;

During the accreditation survey, point-of-care test devices, device guides, and training certificates of the users were evaluated.

Environmental Conditions;

During the survey, our laboratory's temperature and humidity values were checked, and old records of temperature and humidity were evaluated.

Information about devices and device users;

The training certificates of device users, maintenance files of devices, and technical service fault record documents were questioned.

We aim to contribute to the literature with our experience.

Best regards…

References

1. Mansour W, Boyd A, Walshe K. The development of hospital accreditation in low and middle-income countries: a literature review. Health policy and planning. 2020;35(6):684-700.

2. KAVAK, Demet Gökmen. Türkiye Sağlik Hizmetleri Kalite Ve Akreditasyon Enstitüsü (Tüska) Sağlikta Akreditasyon Standartlari. Sağlıkta Kalite ve Akreditasyon Dergisi, 2018, 1.1: 14-20.

3.https://ankarasehir.saglik.gov.tr/EN-388236/our-mission-and-vision.html(Access date:15.01.2025)