Is there duplication of diagnostic test results?

By D. B. Rix, MD and Gregory Stump*

Conventional wisdom has it that there is considerable duplication of diagnostic tests prior to hospitalization and during the first week following admission to hospital. This study, funded by the Greater Vancouver Regional Hospital District, investigates the facts.

The idea that diagnostic services in a community area are unnecessarily duplicated when patients are admitted to hospital has long been proclaimed by politicians, hospital officials and even some members of the medical profession. Yet, there has been no major control study confirming this thought.

A recent recommendation in the November 1973 Inter-Laboratory Cooperation Committee report to the professional advisory committee of the Greater Vancouver Regional Hospital District suggested that a study should be conducted to investigate this subject and, if warranted, recommendations should be made.

On reviewing information available at the Greater Vancouver Regional Hospital District, which showed that a high proportion of people in the area were admitted to their local hospital if hospitalization were required, North Vancouver, with Lion's Gate Hospital as a base hospital, was selected as the study area.

The hospital charts of 1189 patients hospitalized during 1972 and the first half of 1973 were examined for all diagnostic work performed in the first week of hospitalization and then compared with diagnostic work done on the same patients 1 week prior to admission to hospital. Any duplicated tests during these periods were carefully examined with the necessary information by the authors and if necessary the appropriate consultant, to see whether unnecessary duplication had occurred.

This study did not confirm the presence of unnecessary duplication of any significant degree.

The findings were as follows:

	Unnecessary Duplication			
Laboratory tests	0.6%			
X-ray tests	1.1%			
ECGs	0.0%			

Methods

In order to have sufficient numbers of patients to make the study statistically significant and to be able to determine whether any seasonal variation existed in duplication of services, data from consecutive admissions in six 1-week periods between March 1972 and March 1973 were gathered. The periods chosen were as follows: Mar. 12-18, 1972; June 2-8, 1972; Aug. 12-18, 1972; Oct. 22-28, 1972; Jan. 1-7, 1973; Mar. 13-19, 1973.

After obtaining flow sheet data from the medical records department of Lion's Gate Hospital pertaining to admissions, diagnosis and diagnostic services on patients admitted during these six periods, the paid history files of the British Columbia Medical Plan, CU&C (Credit Union and Co.) and Medical Services Association were searched to obtain information on diagnostic tests performed 1 week prior to admission on the same patients. These files revealed only the fact that a service



Of 1315 hemoglobin determinations, 13 were unnecessary duplications

^{*}D1. Rix is a Vancouver pathologist and member of the UBC faculty of medicine. Mr. Stump is a premed student at Simon Fraser University. The article is reprinted by permission from the *British Columbia Medical Journal*. Reprints may be obtained from Dr. Rix at 687 W 8th, Vancouver, BC. Copies of the full report, which includes tables that give a full week-to-week breakdown of tests and their duplication, are available from the editor of the *BCMJ*, 1807 W 10th Ave., Vancouver V6J 2A9.

had been completed at a specific time and place in the community. The results of the various tests were obviously necessary in some cases and this information was obtained, with the permission of the laboratory directors, by examining the reports on various patients from community laboratories in the North Vancouver area.

To establish duplication of diagnostic services, the two sets of data were cor-

related and compared. The simple criteria for gross duplication were that a service had been undertaken 1 week before admission and had been repeated within the first week of hospitalization.

Following the establishment of the extent of gross duplication of diagnostic services we used the following format to obtain the degree of unnecessary duplication of these services in an unbiased manner.

First week of admission First day of admission Total duplication Unnecessar duplication Laboratory Duplication — 1,189 patients Clinical blood tests (hematology department) Hemoglobin value 1277 662 38 13 Eukocyle count 602 252 21 7 Packed-cell volume 1342 607 — — Secondary calculations 1335 5599 — — Secondary calculations 1335 5599 — — Secondary calculations 1335 5599 — — Secondary calculations 1335 1 — — Form and structure 497 209 1 — Patelet count 25 11 1 — Proteins dup and levels, chemically determined (chemistry department) — Bitrabin direct & total 15 Bitrabin trices 26 7 9 1 — Alkaline phosphatase 67 9 1 — Cher is		Tests cor	npleted ospital	Tests duplicated one		
Laboratory Duplication — 1,189 patients Clinical blood tests (hematology department) Hemoglobin value 1277 662 38 13 Leukocyte count 10 4 - Packed -cell volume 1342 607 - - Secondary calculations 1335 599 - - Secimentation rate 295 111 4 2 Differential cell count 572 247 19 7 Protromothin time 77 27 2 - Platelet count 77 27 2 - Total 6082 2742 86 29 Chemistry values and levels, chemically determined (chemistry department) - - Plasma glucose 77 1 - - Biord urea nitrogen 300 9 1 - Bitrabin direct & total 15 10 - - Chemistry values and levels, chemically determined (chemistry department) - - -		First week of admission	First day of admission	Total duplication	Unnecessary duplication	
Clinical blood tests (hematology department) 1277 662 38 13 Leukotyte count 10 4 Secondary calculations 1335 599 Patasteritic count 572 247 19 7 Protronodin time 77 27 Platelet count 57 13 Total 6082 2742 86 29 Chemistry values and levels, chemically determined (chemistry department) Bistrubin otital 50 17 </th <th>L</th> <th>aboratory Duplica</th> <th>tion — 1,189 pati</th> <th>ents</th> <th></th>	L	aboratory Duplica	tion — 1,189 pati	ents		
Hemoglobin value Instance of the second	Clinical blood tests (hematology)	department)				
Leukoxyte count 602 252 21 7 Packed-cell volume 1342 607 Secondary calculations 1335 599 Offer 572 247 19 7 Proternombin time 77 27 2 Total 6082 2742 86 29 Protensitius 21 1 1 Plasing glucose 254 73	Hemoglobin value	1277	662	38	13	
Erythrocyte count 10 4 Secondary calculations 1335 599 Platelet count 572 247 19 7 Form and structure 497 205 11 1 Platelet count 2742 86 29 Other 50 13 Total 6082 2742 86 29 Chemistry values and levels, chemically determined (chemistry department) Electrolytes 104 20 Bilirubin tiret & botal 15 10	Leukocyte count	602	252	21	7	
able 1342 007 Sedimentation rate 295 111 4 2 Differential cell count 572 247 19 7 Form and structure 497 209 1 Platelet count 25 11 1 Prothrombin time 77 27 2 Other 50 13 Total 6082 2742 86 29 Chemistry values and levels, chemically determined (chemistry department) Plasma glucose 254 73 1 Blood urea nitrogen 300 94 1 Arkaine phosphatase 67 9 1 Arbita de abumin 56 10 Arrylase 30 8 Proteins, total and albumin 56 10 Carciui <t< td=""><td>Erythrocyte count</td><td>10</td><td>4</td><td></td><td></td></t<>	Erythrocyte count	10	4			
Sedimentation rate 295 111 4 2 Differential cell count 572 247 19 7 Form and structure 497 209 1 Platelet count 25 11 1 Prothrombin time 77 27 2 Other 50 13 Total 6082 2742 86 29 Chemistry values and levels, chemically determined (chemistry department) Plasma glucose 254 73 - Bland plucose 254 73 1 - - Blow durea nitrogen 300 94 1 - - Ataline phosphatase 67 9 1 - - Blow durea nitrogen 300 8 - - - Ataline phosphatase 104 20 - - - Proteins, total and albumin 55 10 - - - Proteins, total and albumin 29 1 1 - -	Secondary calculations	1335	599			
Differential cell count 572 247 19 7 Form and structure 497 209 1 - Platelet count 25 11 1 - Prothrombin time 77 27 2 - Total 6082 742 86 29 Chemistry values and levels, chemically determined (chemistry department) Plasma glucose 254 73 1 - Blod urea nitrogen 300 94 1 - Alkaline phosphatase 67 9 1 - Eletrolytes 104 20 - Bilirubin total 55 17 1 - Bilirubin total 55 17 1 - Bilirubin direct & total 15 10 - Total 0 8 - Total 0 20 18 - Total 1 1 1 Alkaline phosphatase 85 10 - Trotal 0 20 - Total 1 1 1 Different 2 total 15 10 - Total 1 1 1 Different 2 total 1 1 - Different 2 total 2 total 1 - Diffe	Sedimentation rate	295	111	4	2	
form and structure 49/ 209 1 Platelet count 25 11 1 Pothrombin time 77 27 2 Other 50 13 Total 6082 2742 86 29 Chemistry values and levels, chemically determined (chemistry department) Pasma glucose 254 73 1 Blood urea nitrogen 300 94 1 Blood urea nitrogen 300 94 1 Statiante phosphatase 67 9 1 Blirubin total 55 17 1 Statiant otal atbumin 56 10 Proteins, total and abumin 56 10	Differential cell count	572	247	19	7	
Character count 23 11 1 - Other 50 13 - - Other 50 13 - - Total 6082 2742 86 29 Chemistry values and levels, chemically determined (chemistry department) - - Pasma glucose 254 73 1 - Blood urea nitrogen 300 94 1 - Alkaline phosphatase 67 9 1 - Ederolytes 104 20 - - Thotsins total and albumin 56 10 - - Treatinine phosphokinase 85 12 - - Treatinine phosphokinase 85 12 - - Treatinine phosphokinase 85 12 - - - Catta dehydrogenase 100 1 - - - Site archite dehydrogenase 100 1 - - - Site archite dehydrogenase 100 1 - - <	Form and structure	497	209	1		
Differ Differ Differ Differ	Prothrombin time	25 77	11 27	1 2		
Total 6082 2742 86 29 Chemistry values and levels, chemically determined (chemistry department)	Other	50	13	<u>_</u>	_	
Chemistry values and levels, chemically determined (chemistry department)	Fotal	6082	2742	86	29	
Harma glucose 294 73 1 Blood urea nitrogen 300 94 1 Alkaline phosphatase 67 9 1 Electrolytes 104 20 Bilirubin total 55 17 1 Bilirubin total 56 10 Proteins, total and albumin 22 1 1 1 Jacium 29 1 1 Proteins, total and albumin 56 10	Chemistry values and levels, che	mically determine	ed (chemistry dep	artment)		
Dots of the intropent Dots Dot Dot <thd< td=""><td>Plasma glucose Blood urea nitrogen</td><td>254</td><td>/3</td><td>1</td><td></td></thd<>	Plasma glucose Blood urea nitrogen	254	/3	1		
Electrolytes 104 20 - - - Bilrubin total 55 17 1 - - Amylase 30 8 - - - Amylase 30 8 - - - Proteins, total and albumin 56 10 - - - Prosphorus 22 1 1 1 - - Calcium 29 1 1 - - - - Creatinine 23 - 1 1 - <td< td=""><td>Alkaline phosphatase</td><td>67</td><td>9</td><td>1</td><td></td></td<>	Alkaline phosphatase	67	9	1		
Bilirubin total 55 17 1	Electrolytes	104	20		_	
Altrubin direct & total 15 10 Amylase 30 8 Proteins, total and albumin 56 10 Proteins, total and albumin 56 10 Proteins, total and albumin 22 1 1 1 Proteins, total and albumin 29 1 1 Proteins, total and albumin 29 1 1 Proteins, total and albumin 29 1 1 Proteins, total and albumin 29 1 1 Proteins, total and albumin 20 1 Proteins, total and albumin 20 1 actate dehydrogenase 100 10 1 SF examinations 12 4 Solod gases 50 13 total cultures 357 28 7 2 <	Bilirubin total	55	17	1	-	
Nyase 30 0 Prosphorus 22 1 1 1 Chair and albumin 56 10 Prosphorus 22 1 1 1 Salcium 29 1 1 Prosphorus 20 1 Cradition 23 1 1 Preatinine 23 1 1 Cradition 23 1 Cradition 23 1 Cradition 23 1 Cradition 23 Sexaminations 12 4 Stood gases 50 13 Stood gases 50 13 Total 1456 309 10 2 Total urinalysis 1066 200 36 19 Total cultures 357	Silirubin direct & total	15	10	-		
hosphorus 1 1 1 1 hosphorus 22 1 1 1 - Jric acid 20 - 1 - - pric acid 20 - 1 1 - preatinine 23 - 1 1 - preatinine 23 - 1 1 - creatinine 23 - 1 1 - creatinine phosphorus 10 1 - - actate dehydrogenase 100 10 1 - - actate dehydrogenase 100 10 1 - - SF examinations 12 4 - - - Stopport 26 1 - - - - Stopport 11 - - - - - - - Stopport 11 - - - - - - - - - - - -<	Proteins total and albumin	56	0	_		
Calcium 29 1 1 Dric acid 20 1 Creatinine 23 1 1 Creatinine 23 1 1 Creatinine 23 1 1 Creatinine 23 1 1 Actate dehydrogenase 100 10 1 Actate dehydrogenase 100 10 1 Actate dehydrogenase 99 14 1 SF examinations 12 4 Docult blood 26 1 SF examinations 12 4 Sholesterol 11 - Sholesterol 11 1456 309 10 2 Fotal urinalysis 1066 200 36 19 Fotal cultures 357 28 7 2 Grand total laboratory 8961 3279 139	Phosphorus	22	10	1	1	
Jric acid 20 1 Creatinine 23 1 1 Creatinine phosphokinase 85 12 .actate dehydrogenase 100 10 1 .actate dehydrogenase 100 10 1 .actate dehydrogenase 99 14 1 .actate dehydrogenase 99 14 1 .actate dehydrogenase 99 14 1 .actate dehydrogenase 12 4 .SF examinations 12 4 .SF examinations 12 4 .bod gases 50 13 .bod gases 50 13 .bod gases 11 15 .bod gases 309 10 2 10 .bod gases 14 1456 309 10 2 .bot act cultures 357	Calcium	29	1	1		
Arrantine 23 1 1 Creatinine phosphokinase 85 12 Creatinine phosphokinase 100 10 1 Creatinine phosphokinase 100 10 1 Creatinine phosphokinase 99 14 1 Catate dehydrogenase 100 10 1 Ste saminations 12 4 Occult blood 26 1 Ste saminations 12 4 Occult blood 26 1 Obold gases 50 13 Ditters 98 12 Otters 98 12 Fotal urinalysis 1066 200 36 19 Fotal cultures 357 28 7 2 Grand total laboratory 8961 3279 139 52 Cray films and services (radiology department)<	Jric acid	20		1	-	
Actain the phospholinase 0.03 12	reatinine phosphokinaso	Z3 85	12	1	1	
Silutamic-oxalacetic transaminase 99 14 1 SF examinations 12 4 Scult blood 26 1 Decult blood 26 1 Shod gases 50 13 Cholesterol 11 Others 98 12 Total 1456 309 10 2 Fotal cultures 357 28 7 2 Grand total laboratory 8961 3279 139 52 X-ray Duplication 453 patients Kray films and services (radiology department) Chest 20 84 11 5 Spine 56 12 2 1 Upper & lower extremities 86 35 4 Spine 57 24 2 1 Sarum dotal 28 2 1 Abdomen 57 <td>actate dehvdrogenase</td> <td>100</td> <td>10</td> <td>1</td> <td>_</td>	actate dehvdrogenase	100	10	1	_	
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	Slutamic-oxalacetic transaminase	99	14	ī		
Jocuit blood 26 1 Blood gases 50 13 Scholesterol 11 Uthers 98 12 Total 1456 309 10 2 Fotal urinalysis 1066 200 36 19 Fotal cultures 357 28 7 2 Grand total laboratory 8961 3279 139 52 X-ray Duplication 453 patients Kray films and services (radiology department) Chest 240 84 11 5 Jead 55 21 - - Stead 35 4 - - Opelograms 78 14 - - Velograms 78 14 - - Starium neal 28 2 1 - Scholangiogram 6 1 - - Starium enema 12 1 - -	SF examinations	12	4	-		
Shou gases 30 13 Cholesterol 11 Whers 98 12 Fotal 1456 309 10 2 Fotal urinalysis 1066 200 36 19 Fotal cultures 357 28 7 2 Grand total laboratory 8961 3279 139 52 X-ray Duplication 453 patients Kray films and services (radiology department) Chest 240 84 11 5 Jead 55 21 - - Opine 56 12 2 1 Ipper & lower extremities 86 35 4 - Yelograms 78 14 - - Valoren 57 24 2 1 Aarium meal 28 2 1 - Sarium enema 12 1 - - Stolder 12 1 - -	Occult blood	26	12	_	-	
Automation 11 12 Participation 1456 309 10 2 Fotal 1456 309 10 2 Fotal urinalysis 1066 200 36 19 Fotal cultures 357 28 7 2 Grand total laboratory 8961 3279 139 52 X-ray Duplication 453 patients Kray films and services (radiology department) Chest 240 84 11 5 Head 55 21 Opine 56 12 2 1 Ipper & lower extremities 86 35 4 Yelograms 78 14 Addomen 57 24 2 1 Garium meal 28 2 1 Cholangiogram 6 1 Barium enema 12 1 Cholangiogram 668	cholesterol	20 11	13			
Total 1456 309 10 2 Total urinalysis 1066 200 36 19 Total cultures 357 28 7 2 Grand total laboratory 8961 3279 139 52 X-ray Duplication — 453 patients Kray films and services (radiology department) Chest 240 84 11 5 Tetad 55 21 - - Spine 56 12 2 1 Upper & lower extremities 86 35 4 - Velograms 78 14 - - Adall bladder 33 4 - - Sarium meal 28 2 1 - Cholangiogram 6 1 - - Total 668 203 20 7	Others	98	12	\equiv		
Total urinalysis 1066 200 36 19 Fotal cultures 357 28 7 2 Grand total laboratory 8961 3279 139 52 X-ray Duplication — 453 patients X-ray Duplication — 453 patients X-ray Duplication — 453 patients Cray films and services (radiology department) thest 240 84 11 5 lead 55 21 — — — piper 56 12 2 1 — yelograms 78 14 — — — addomen 57 24 2 1 — addomen 57 24 2 1 — addomen 28 2 1 — — adarium meal 28 2 1 — — adarium enema 12 1 — — — adarium	otal	1456	309	10	2	
Total cultures 357 28 7 2 Grand total laboratory 8961 3279 139 52 X-ray Duplication — 453 patients X-ray Duplication — 453 patients Cray films and services (radiology department) thest 240 84 11 5 lead 55 21 - - opine 56 12 2 1 lpper & lower extremities 86 35 4 - vyelograms 78 14 - - ubdomen 57 24 2 1 arium meal 28 2 1 - holangiogram 6 1 - - atium enema 12 1 - - otal 668 203 20 7	otal urinalysis	1066	200	36	19	
Arrand total laboratory 8961 3279 139 52 X-ray Duplication — 453 patients Cray films and services (radiology department) 5 Chest 240 84 11 5 fead 55 21 — — Opper & lower extremities 86 35 4 — Opper & lower extremities 78 14 — — Opper & lower extremities 86 35 4 — Opper & lower extremities 86 31 4 — — Velograms 78 14 — — — — Abdomen 57 24 2 1 — — — Barium meal 28 2 1 — — — Barium enema 12 1 — — — — Otther 17 5 — — — —	fotal cultures	357	28	7	2	
X-ray Duplication — 453 patients Kray films and services (radiology department) Shest 240 84 11 5 lead 55 21 — — — opine 56 12 2 1 lpper & lower extremities 86 35 4 — Vyelograms 78 14 — — Vyelograms 78 14 — — vbdomen 57 24 2 1 aall bladder 33 4 — — sarium meal 28 2 1 — Cholangiogram 6 1 — — Barium enema 12 1 — — Otal 668 203 20 7	Grand total laboratory	8961	3279	139	52	
Gray films and services (radiology department) Chest 240 84 11 5 fead 55 21 - - ppine 56 12 2 1 lpper & lower extremities 86 35 4 - yelograms 78 14 - - bdomen 57 24 2 1 all bladder 33 4 - - sarium meal 28 2 1 - cholangiogram 6 1 - - ther 17 5 - - total 668 203 20 7		X-ray Duplication	n — 453 patients			
Chest 240 84 11 5 Head 55 21 - - Spine 56 12 2 1 Jpper & lower extremities 86 35 4 - Pyelograms 78 14 - - Abdomen 57 24 2 1 all bladder 33 4 - - Barium meal 28 2 1 - Cholangiogram 6 1 - - Barium enema 12 1 - - Other 17 5 - - Total 668 203 20 7	Kray films and services (radiology	v department)				
dead 55 21 Spine 56 12 2 1 Jpper & lower extremities 86 35 4 Pyelograms 78 14 Abdomen 57 24 2 1 all bladder 33 4 Barium meal 28 2 1 Cholangiogram 6 1 Barium enema 12 1 Other 17 5 Total 668 203 20 7	Chest	240	84	11	5	
Spine 56 12 2 1 Jpper & lower extremities 86 35 4 Pyelograms 78 14 Abdomen 57 24 2 1 all bladder 33 4 Barium meal 28 2 1 Cholangiogram 6 1 Barium enema 12 1 Other 17 5 Total 668 203 20 7	lead	55	21			
Opper or lower extremitties OO 35 4 Pyelograms 78 14 bydomen 57 24 2 1 Gall bladder 33 4 Barium meal 28 2 1 Cholangiogram 6 1 Sarium enema 12 1 Other 17 5 Total 668 203 20 7	pine	56	12	2	1	
badomen 57 24 2 1 Gall bladder 33 4 - - Barium meal 28 2 1 - Cholangiogram 6 1 - - Garium enema 12 1 - - Other 17 5 - - Total 668 203 20 7	Pyelograms	80 78	35 14	4		
Sall bladder 33 4 Barium meal 28 2 1 Scholangiogram 6 1 Sarium enema 12 1 Other 17 5 Total 668 203 20 7	bdomen	57	24	2	1	
Barium meal 28 2 1 Cholangiogram 6 1 Sarium enema 12 1 Other 17 5 Total 668 203 20 7	all bladder	33	4			
bit for the formation of the formation o	Barium meal	28	2	1		
12 1 - - 0ther 17 5 - - Total 668 203 20 7	nolanglogram	6	1			
Total 668 203 20 7)ther	12	5			
	fotal	668	203	20	7	
	lectrocardiograms	224	66	4	_	
lectrocardiograms 224 66 4						

All the duplicated tests during these set periods, along with the relevant data such as admitting history, progress notes and discharge and billing card diagnosis were separated and filed to the corresponding individual patient. Then the data on each patient were split into three separate areas of expertise, namely, pathology, radiology, and cardiology (ECG).

In pathology, the following method was used to examine the information: the authors reviewed all the material on each patient; in obvious cases of unnecessary duplication, the tests were placed in the unnecessary duplication file; in borderline cases an opinion was sought from an uninvolved expert in the appropriate field, for example, interested in diabetes but not practising in the North Vancouver area, and this opinion was always accepted.

One of the authors was a former general practitioner and his previous experience was very helpful in establishing unnecessary duplication. However, despite this asset, the authors were extremely careful in their judgements, tending to classify the case as unnecessary duplication or refer the case to the appropriate consultant unless the case was clearcut.

Duplicated tests in radiology were treated as follows: one of us (G.S.) presented all the material on each patient to a radiologist suggested by the section of radiology of the British Columbia Medical Association.

Dr. G. E. Trueman, radiologist, Vancouver General Hospital, was selected and he reviewed each individual case in which duplication had occurred. Following his examination of the data a decision was made whether the duplication was necessary or not and these figures were given to the authors.

In cardiology the same format was used to examine the case of duplicated ECGs. Dr. John Osborne, head of the department of cardiology, Vancouver General Hospital, reviewed all material on each patient. Because of the opinion that no duplication existed, Dr. R. B. Kerr, then head of the department of medicine, Vancouver General Hospital, again reviewed all the data and concurred completely with Dr. Osborne's opinion.

During the six 1-week periods which were stipulated, 1752 patients were admitted to hospital. The number of patients, however, included in this study was 1189, or 67% of the original sample, since patients who had no laboratory work in hospital or for whom sufficient data from the medical plans were not available were eliminated.

Each of the 1189 patients had a minimum of one test and a maximum of 44 tests during the first week of

hospitalization. The average is eight tests per patient per week.

Contrary to the author's expectations, the separation of the laboratory tests by date failed to show significant seasonal variation.

A laboratory performs a wide range of individual tests and its tests are more commonly used in medical practice than x-rays or ECGs. Therefore, it is not surprising to note that, of the 1189 patients in the series, only 453 had any x-ray films taken and, similarly, only 166 patients had one or more ECGs performed on them during the first week of hospitalization.

Analysis of the extent of duplication required a calculation of both the total number of tests completed in hospital 1 week after admission and the number of tests duplicated 1 week before (Table I). These two sets of data were then compared. This analysis was chosen because we were interested in gross duplication of the number of diagnostic services. It would be futile to report that 13 hemoglobin determinations were duplicated unnecessarily 1 week prior to admission if that could not be related to the total tests undertaken on the same segment of patients after hospitalization. For example, of the 1277 hemoglobin determinations completed on 1189 patients during the first week of hospitalization 38 were duplicated during the week prior to admission.

Table I also includes, for comparison, the total tests completed on the days of admission. Generally, about one half the total tests done during 1 week after admission were completed on the first day.

Of the 140 laboratory tests duplicated, 52 were found unnecessary. hemoglobin determinations and urinalyses making up the bulk of the unnecessary work. This is to be expected

Table II—Comparison of the total tests	completed 1 week before admission to
the total tests duplicated 1 week later	

Department	Total tests one week after admission	Total duplication one week prior to admission	Total unnecessary duplication	Percent unnecessary duplication
Laboratory Radiology Cardiology	8961 668 244	140 20 5	50 7 0	0.6 1.1 0
Grand total	9873	165	57	0.6

because both tests are routinely done on admission.

The determination of the extent of urinalysis duplication was made difficult because a single urinalysis in the hospital could comprise a number of tests. Outside hospital a urinalysis was billed as routine, microscopic or diagnostic. A single duplication in the study involves the matching up of similar work inside and out of hospital. Often however, a single duplication consists of only a portion of what was termed a single urinalysis in hospital.

The department that apparently suffered the greatest abuse of testing was hematology. However, when related to the bulk of work within the hospital, this misuse of lab tests is rather small.

The two tests duplicated in chemistry were performed on the same patient and results of the tests were necessary in order to determine the extent of this duplication. The misuse of these tests can safely be considered negligible.

Although the number of tests duplicated in bacteriology was small, the relative duplication is as high as that in hematology. The determination of the degree of duplication of cultures was wrought with similar problems as those associated with urinalyses. The two duplications of cultures turned up by the survey included only a single

Table III—Unnecessary duplication and cost						
	Unnecessary duplication	Laboratory duplication Cost of each test	Total cost			
Hemoglobin determination Leukocyte count Sedimentation rate Differential cell count Phosphorus level Creatinine level Urinalysis Culture	13 7 2 7 1 1 1 19 2	\$0.90 4.50 1.35 * 4.50 3.60 ** ***	\$11.70 31.50 2.70 4.50 3.60 22.50 9.90			
Total laboratory	52	-	86.40			
		Radiology duplication				
Chest Spine Abdomen	5 ' 1 1	9.00 12.60 9.00	45.00 12.60 9.00			
Total radiology	7	-	66.60			
Grand total	59	-	\$153.00			
* Cost included in leukocyte cou ** Cost calculated, micro, routine ***Cost calculated, susceptibility	nts and diagnostic and identification includ	ed				

sensitivity and identification whereas the cultures done in the hospital almost invariably include both sensitivity and identification.

Table II summarizes the total diagnostic work completed at the end of 1 week in hospital, the gross duplication and the unnecessary duplication 1 week prior to admission. The overall unnecessary duplication of all diagnostic work was found to be a meagre 0.6% based on total laboratory tests done before and after admission to hospital.

Table III shows the cost of unnecessary duplication of diagnostic services. On the basis of the data establishing the duplication and applying the thencurrent BCMA fee schedule, the cost of unnecessary duplication can be ascertained as: laboratory, \$86.40; radiology, \$66.60; ECG, nil.

It is obvious the cost of this unnecessary duplication is minimal.

To give another perspective, if the data were expanded to an annual basis (there were 15 056 admissions from July 1972 to June 1973) and our previous figures applied, the total annual cost for unnecessary duplication would be: laboratory, \$1094, radiology, \$843.

It would be extremely difficult to establish the total annual cost for diagnostic services in the North Vancouver area; however, considering the extent of the services in that area, it would not be unreasonable to consider \$500-000 or more. This sum, of course, makes the figures of \$1094 and \$843 quite insignificant.

One of the terms of reference of this study was to look for any evidence of communication of results of diagnostic services between communitybased and hospital diagnostic services. The findings are reviewed in Table IV.

Thirty-nine patients (3.3%) in this study had the results of their diagnostic tests in the community transmitted to the hospital by various means. In all these cases, no cases of unnecessary duplication occurred. Admittedly, one third of these patients were required to supply the hospital with some laboratory results because they were being admitted for either sterilization or abortion; however, the other two thirds were not required to do so. These data certainly suggest that any duplication, no

Logest° 1.5/30 Logest° 1/50

CONTRAINDICATIONS. Thrombophlebitis, thromboembolic disorders. cerebral apoplexy, or a past history of these conditions; markedly impaired liver function; known or suspected carcinoma of the breast or genital tract; known or suspected estrogen dependent neoplasia; undiagnosed abnormal genital bleeding; during the period a mother is breast feeding an infant; any ocular lesion such as partial or complete loss of vision, defect in visual fields or diplopia arising from ophthalmic vascular disease; when epiphysial closure is not complete; when pregnancy is suspected; classical migraine; history of cholestatic jaundice; coronary thrombosis.

WARNINGS. Should any thrombotic disorder occur or be suspected, the drug should be discontinued immediately. The pretreatment and periodic physical examinations should include special reference to breast and pelvic organs. Pre-existing uterine fibromyomata may increase in size. Conditions influenced by fluid retention, such as epilepsy, migraine, asthma, cardiac or renal dysfunction, require careful observation.

PRECAUTIONS. A number of precautionary statements are associated with oral contraceptive usage. These include: endocrine, possibly liver function tests and thyroid function tests may be affected by treatment with oral contraceptives. Altered bleeding patterns may be induced. Diabetic patients or those with a familial history of diabetes should be carefully observed while receiving oral contraceptives. Oral contraceptives may mask the onset of the climacteric. Susceptible women may experience an increase in blood pressure. Patients with a history of jaundice should be given oral contraceptives with great care.

ADVERSE REACTIONS. Oral contraceptives have been associated with a number of adverse reactions, including thrombophlebitis, pulmonary embolism, cerebral thrombosis, nausea, altered bleeding patterns, edema, breast soreness, changes in weight, headache, acne, depression, premenstrual tension and hirsutism.

SUPPLIED. LOGEST 1.5/30, 21 blue tablets for 21-day on, 7-day off administration.

LOGEST 1/50, 21 green tablets for 21-day on, 7-day off administration.

PRODUCT MONOGRAPHS giving further information are available on request.



LEDERLE PRODUCTS DEPARTMENT Cyanamid of Canada Limited P.O. Box 1039 Montreal, Quebec H3C 2X4 ®Registered Trademark

Table IV-Number of admissions and types of test results transferred to hospital								
	Number of			Test results communicated				d
Period	admissions with communi- cation	Percent of total admissions	Urin.	Hb	Р	М	Preg. test	Radiograph
1972								
March 12 - 18	2	1.0	2	1				
June 2 -8	6	2.9	5	2		-	1	-
Aug. 12 - 18	5	3.0	4	1				1
Oct. 22 - 28	4	2.3	3	1	-	-	-	-
1973								
Jan. 1 - 7	8	3.8	8	7	-		la -	
Mar. 13 - 19	14	6.1	14	10	1	1	-	-
Total	39	3.3	36	22	1	1	1	1

matter how insignificant, that now exists could be further minimized by encouraging this development.

Discussion

The amount and the cost of unnecessary duplication of diagnostic services in the North Vancouver area were minimal. Three reasons are suggested by the authors for these findings:

• Physician education concerning the cost of diagnostic services. The practising physician has literally been bombarded with literature from government bodies, professional associations and hospital committees concerning the cost and the economical use of diagnostic facilities. On reviewing various requisition forms, the authors gained the impression that doctors were making an effort to use the laboratory efficiently by ordering individual tests. instead of batteries, and ordering tests for a specific diagnostic reason, not in a routine fashion. This development cannot help but lead to better utilization of diagnostic facilities and improved medical care due to the increased cooperation between the clinician and the laboratory physician.

• Community diagnostic results in hospitals. In addition to the small number of cases in which the laboratory results were sent to the hospital, the authors noted many cases where the attending physician or consultant had incorporated the diagnostic results into his admitting note, history, progress notes or consultant report. Also it was noted that the report forms from medical laboratories were posted right onto the hospital chart in many cases. It would appear to the authors that this development should be encouraged. Laboratory people should attempt to standardize their methods, arrive at similar normal values and develop universal report forms so that there would be flow of diagnostic information concerning patients. Radiology and cardiology (ECG) should also investigate related problems in their area.

• Time period for the study. The original time frame for the study, namely, 1 week before admission and 1 week of hospitalization was decided upon after considerable discussion with knowledgeable people. However, when the data began to show an insignificant amount of duplication, the authors expanded the period of time to 6 weeks before hospitalization. Despite this extension, the amount of unnecessary duplication was still minimal.

We think this study clearly answers the eternal question in the title of the article with a resounding NO!

Despite the minimal amount of unnecessary duplication that was found in this study, the authors feel that it is worthwhile to explore the feasibility of establishing a mechanism where reports from community laboratories are sent to the hospital when a patient is admitted. Also the reverse can apply, and reports from the hospital can be sent to the community laboratory so that the patient's followup can be accurately assessed. The benefits to the delivery of medical care in the community are quite obvious.

We think efforts can be made to improve the reporting and communicating system so that cumulative current diagnostic information concerning patients would easily be available to the attending physician no matter what the locale of the patient.

However, the tremendous cost of a central data bank facility in an area to record all the diagnostic information on a patient for instant retrieval by the physician or the laboratory whether the patient is in or out of hospital is not supported by this present study. Costs for and hazards of unnecessary laboratory and radiology services have been of concern to the medical profession for several years, yet the subject of relatively little study. While far from exhaustive, the above report by Rix and Stump clearly does not support the "common knowledge" that 15 to 20% of tests are unnecessary. - Ed.