Methods An interventional study was done between October 2018 and February 2019. The intervention included training of 130 housekeeping staff; redefining cleaning and disinfection responsibilities between housekeeping and nursing; adding a checklist for surfaces to be cleaned or disinfected; and emphasizing the inspector’s auditing role. The intervention engaged relevant staff partners from infection control, housekeeping, nursing, and environmental services. The study outcome was the frequency of effective cleaning done by housekeepers. It was assessed by comparing the photos taken from specified room sites (pre-prepared by fluorescent gel) using black light before and after cleaning. Six highly touched areas in patient rooms were chosen. The study was divided into three phases: pre-intervention assessment (October 2018), intervention (November 2018 through January 2019), and post-intervention reassessment (February 2019).

Results A total of 27 rooms with 162 opportunities were assessed during the pre-intervention phase. The findings showed that only 39 (24.1%) of the 162 opportunities were effectively cleaned. The frequencies of effective cleaning in different sites were: light switches 11.1%, door knobs 25.9%, water faucets 37%, telephones 25.9%, bed rails 14.8%, and patient tables 29.6%. A total of 33 rooms with 198 opportunities were assessed during the post-intervention phase. The findings showed that 116 (58.6%) of the 198 opportunities were effectively cleaned. The frequencies of effective cleaning in different areas were: light switches 42.4%, door knobs 84.8%, water faucets 75.7%, telephones 60.6%, bed rails 54.5%, and patient tables 63.6%. The overall improvement in effective cleaning in different sites was 34.9% (p<0.001), being highest for door knobs (58.9%, p<0.001) and lowest for light switches (31.3%, p=0.014).

Conclusion A multidisciplinary intervention including training and auditing of housekeepers was successful in significantly improving cleaning and disinfection at different sites in the patients’ rooms. Frequent assessment and feedback may need to be continued until reaching an optimal level. Further studies are needed to evaluate the impact of improved cleaning on infection rates.

Methods This was a retrospective study of data collected over the past 5 years (2013–2017) at KAUH, Jeddah, in which the quality indicators for certain parameters were analyzed and benchmarks were set for blood donor adverse reactions, transfusion reactions, fresh frozen plasma (FFP) in-date wastage, and cross match to transfusion (CT) ratio. Data were forwarded to the Hospital Transfusion Committee (HTC) for review. Deviations were identified and corrective actions were taken. The outcomes were used to plan for improvement.

Results Among a total of 60,631 blood donors, 282 donor reactions were reported, resulting in a rate of 0.46%, mostly in the form of mild dizziness. 285 adverse transfusion reactions were reported among 99,564 total blood transfusions, resulting in a rate of 0.28%; most were allergic and febrile reactions. Monitoring of the adverse donor reactions showed a decreased incidence; however, the adverse transfusion reactions were under-reported. The FFP in-date wastage was 2205 among 22,590 requested FFP units, resulting in a high rate of 9.76%. The CT ratio was 1.24. Safety improvements were implemented by a multidisciplinary quality improvement team to determine the critical control points and to address the factors contributing to high FFP wastage.

Conclusion The use of quality indicators as a tool for implementing a hemovigilance system can provide a better understanding of areas for improvement in the quality of the work and safety of patients. Establishing guidelines for appropriate clinical use of blood and proper communication between clinical transfusion staff and practitioners is expected to enhance these features along the blood transfusion chain. The use of a similar model in other institutions will facilitate the local benchmarking between hospitals, which is a feasible method to lower transfusion risk and cost and to improve quality outcomes.