

## **A comparison of hospital adverse events identified by three widely used detection methods.**

June 28, 2011

Naessens JM, Campbell CR, Huddleston JM, et al. A comparison of hospital adverse events identified by three widely used detection methods. *Int J Qual Health Care*. 2009;21(4):301-7.

doi:10.1093/intqhc/mzp027.

<https://psnet.ahrq.gov/issue/comparison-hospital-adverse-events-identified-three-widely-used-detection-methods>

---

Measuring [safety](#) in health care settings remains challenging despite efforts to develop [scorecards](#), focus on preventive [strategies](#), and invest in safety [infrastructure](#). This study compared the detection of adverse events in hospitals using the [AHRQ patient safety indicators](#) (PSIs), [provider-reported](#) events, and the [IHI Global Trigger Tool](#). Investigators discovered that each method yielded significantly different results. For instance, only 6.2% of hospitalizations with a PSI also had a provider-reported event, and only 10.5% of provider-reported events had a PSI. Based on their findings, the authors suggest that measuring safety requires a multifaceted approach, but they [caution](#) about using such indicators for public reporting and performance comparisons. An AHRQ WebM&M [commentary](#) discusses the limitations of using PSIs for public reporting and hospital comparison purposes.