Quality improvement in emergency units in low resource settings: A qualitative assessment for understanding challenges and delivering solutions

Authors:

Indrakantha Welgama[1], Daniel Lange Da Silva[2], Gerard O' Reilly[3], Aurore Nishimwe[1], Agnieszka Ignatowicz[1] and Justine Davies[1]

Affiliations:

[1] *Department of Applied Health Sciences, University of Birmingham, United Kingdom.*

[2] *National Health Service, United Kingdom.*

[3] *School of Public Health and Preventive Medicine, Monash University, Australia.*

Corresponding Author:

Agnieszka Ignatowicz, Department of Applied Health Sciences, School of Medicine and Health, University of Birmingham, Edgbaston, Birmingham B15 2TT, United Kingdom.

E-mail: a.m.ignatowicz@bham.ac.uk

Abstract:

Objective:

To meet the World Health Organization (WHO) requirement of strengthening integrated Emergency, Critical and Operative (ECO) care, it is necessary to develop ECO-related guidance and tools for Quality Improvement (QI) in Emergency Units (EUs). This study aimed to identify the barriers and facilitators for QI in EUs in Low- or Middle-Income- countries (LMICs) and explore potential measures for assessing quality of care, to inform guidance and tool development across all quality domains.

Methods:

We conducted in-depth interviews (IDIs) with 11 specialist emergency physicians from LMICs and organized a workshop with global technical experts in emergency care. Transcribed interviews were thematically analysed, integrating WHO quality domains and the WHO Health Systems Framework. The workshop included presentations, discussions, and interactive ranking exercises to evaluate QI measurement methods and identify priority WHO quality domains. Related outcomes were synthesized to generate insights for the development of QI guidance and tools.

Findings:

QI efforts in LMICs primarily focused on effectiveness, timeliness, safety, and occasionally patient centeredness. Key barriers to QI specific to LMIC EUs included high patient turnover, a lack of skilled staff, limited funds and resources, and prioritizing patient care quantity over quality. Facilitators included the availability of QI guidance, training, initiating small-scale projects, enhancing documentation and communication, and supportive hospital management. Safety and effectiveness were considered the most feasible QI domains for improvement, though all were recognized as important. Inconsistencies in how participants defined the domains highlighted the need to develop clear guidance on definitions, and importance of all domains and measures appropriate to each.

Conclusions:

Emergency unit is a unique environment handling time-critical health conditions and therefore requires the development of specific tools and guidance for delivery of QI. Addressing barriers and leveraging facilitators identified in this study can inform the development of effective QI strategies for LMIC EUs.

Keywords: Quality Domains, Emergency care, Emergency departments, LMIC

Introduction

Low- or middle-income countries (LMICs) encounter a large burden of emergency conditions (1-3), contributed to by a high incidence of injuries, infectious diseases, and complications of non-communicable diseases (2). Median Disability Affected Life Years (DALYs) attributed to emergency conditions are greatest in low-income countries followed by middle-income countries (4). Prior studies have identified that approximately 40% of deaths from injuries and other time-critical conditions are avoidable; with 60% of these avoidable deaths occurring due to issues in receiving quality care in health facilities (5, 6). In LMICs, similar to high income countries (HICs), patients with emergency conditions often present to Emergency Units (EUs) (7), where mortality is known to be greater than in HICs (1, 8-10). These findings for emergency conditions align with the findings of Lancet Global Health Commission on High Quality Health Systems, which suggests that poor quality of care in facilities is a substantial driver of adverse health outcomes (1).

Quality health care is experienced across multiple domains, as defined by the Institute of Medicine (IoM) (11) and updated by the World Health Organization (WHO) (12). These quality domains include clinical effectiveness, safety, people-centeredness, equity, efficiency, timeliness, and integrated care, and the WHO has described them as follows (12).

- Effective: "*providing evidence-based healthcare services to those who need them*".
- Safe: "*avoiding harm to people for whom the care is intended*".
- People centred: "*providing care that responds to individual preferences, needs and values*".
- Equitable: "*providing care that does not vary in quality on account of gender, ethnicity, geographic location, and socio-economic status*".
- Efficient: "*maximizing the benefit of available resources and avoiding waste*".
- Timely: "*reducing waiting times and sometimes harmful delays*"
- Integrated care: "*providing care that makes available the full range of health services throughout the life course*".

Quality health care is essential for successful universal health coverage (13), and guidance to assist providers with improving quality of care is developed by WHO (14). However, despite efforts to promote quality improvement (QI) initiatives, their adoption and implementation

remains challenging in LMICs (15, 16). Deficiencies in multiple WHO Health Systems Framework building blocks (17), currently experienced by most LMICs, including the lack of skilled healthcare providers, under-developed information technology and data collection, poor access to essential medicines and equipment, conspire with financial constraints and governance issues to impede QI efforts, lead to adverse outcomes (18-21). As per the Donabedian framework (22), these deficiencies relate to either the "structure" and/or the "process", which ultimately affects the "outcome" as lowered quality of care to the patients. These issues are magnified in EUs, which are unique environments with specific QI needs related to a large number of patients with a heterogenous mix of conditions of varying degrees of severity, and requiring time-critical care, being attended to in relatively brief encounters (23).

World Health Assembly resolution 76.2 of 2023 on "*Integrated emergency, critical and operative (ECO) care for universal health coverage and protection from health emergencies*" was ratified in response to challenges affecting patients in need of emergency care (24). Subsequently, the WHO has been requested to develop a global strategy and action plan to assist in the implementation of this resolution (25, 26). QI initiatives within the EUs will be central in achieving resolution 76.2, since EUs receive most Emergency, Critical and Operative (ECO) conditions presenting to health facilities. Furthermore, implementing QI initiatives in EUs is essential, as these settings should prioritize timeliness, safety, and clinical effectiveness through standardized protocols and efforts to enhance system-wide efficiency (18, 27). However, there is limited understanding of the specific challenges that impede QI delivery in EUs or how best to address these, particularly in LMICs.

To inform the development of Emergency, Critical and Operative care (ECO care) related guidance and tools for QI delivery in EUs in LMICs, this study aimed to identify, from a WHO quality domains perspective, the barriers and facilitators healthcare workers in EUs encounter when implementing and delivering programmes. We further aimed to identify measures for assessing quality of care within each WHO quality domain and determine which domains should be prioritized for tool and guidance development.

Methods

This study was conducted in two phases. First, we conducted a qualitative study consisting of in-depth interviews (IDIs) to explore barriers and facilitators affecting QI delivery in EUs in LMICs. Second, we hosted an expert workshop to examine and reflect on these barriers and facilitators, assess methods for measuring the WHO QI domains, and identify which domains should be prioritised for development of guidance for QI in EUs.

Phase 1: Qualitative interviews

Study setting

EUs in LMICs that had attempted to implement or maintain QI initiatives. LMICs were defined as countries whose Gross National Income (GNI) per capita was less than US $14,005, as per the World Bank country classification for 2024 (28).

Participants

Emergency care physicians with current or recent experience of QI initiatives in LMICs were selected as study participants. Potential participants were purposively selected by the WHO's technical team on ECO care. The selection process leveraged WHO's existing knowledge of these physicians' experience to ensure the inclusion of individuals with relevant insights into QI implementation in EUs.

Data collection

IDIs were conducted by IW and DL between October 2023 and February 2024. A Topic Guide (TG) was developed based on findings from previous studies (29, 30) and authors' knowledge of delivery of QI and providing emergency care (Supplementary Material 01). Questions in the TG enquired about current QI practices in EUs and the barriers and facilitators in implementing such activities. The TG was piloted prior to use. All IDIs were conducted virtually and recorded for post interview transcription. Interviews were conducted in English, given participants were proficient in the language. Data collection and analysis were undertaken concurrently such that the IDIs continued until thematic saturation was reached (31).

Data analysis

Audio recordings were transcribed by IW and DL and the transcripts were uploaded to NVivo software (32) for coding and analysis. Interviews were analysed thematically by IW, DL, AI and JD, following the approach described by Braun and Clarke (33) and incorporating elements of the constant comparative method (34). Initially, a sample of interview transcripts was reviewed to generate inductive codes, focusing on barriers and facilitators to QI initiatives. Deductive coding was also applied based on the WHO quality domains (12) and the WHO Health Systems Framework (17). Thereafter, all transcripts were coded against this framework, with further refinements made through discussion among authors to ensure consistency and accuracy. Findings were summarized quantitatively, reporting the number of participants per code, and qualitatively, using illustrative quotes to provide deeper insights.

Ethics

Ethics clearance was obtained from the Ethics Review Board of the University of Birmingham, United Kingdom (ERN_1742-Oct2023). Participation in the study was voluntary, and informed consent was obtained from all participants.

Phase 2: Workshop with technical experts

Workshop setting

In Geneva, Switzerland.

Participants

Clinical and academic emergency physicians, along with other healthcare professionals involved in EU care, were invited to participate in the workshop. Participants, representing different countries (with different income levels and geographical regions), were purposefully selected by the WHO technical team on ECO care, based on the WHO's prior experience, and ensuring participants' knowledge and experience of delivering QI in LMIC settings.

Data collection and analysis

The meeting was structured around plenary presentations and discussions. Findings from the phase-1 qualitative study were presented, and participants were requested to reflect upon and articulate their experiences of barriers and facilitators for QI in EUs. This was followed by a presentation and discussion on the WHO quality domains, with questions posed on how the domains could be measured in the EUs, and responses captured as unlimited inputs using eMenti® (eMenti.com). Finally, after a presentation on QI processes in the EU and the current availability of WHO tools and guidance for QI (Supplementary Material 02), participants were requested to rank the WHO quality domains based on their perceived feasibility for change through QI interventions, using Slido® (Slido.com).

Outputs were captured through meeting notes, transcripts of recorded meeting proceedings, and responses from eMenti® and Slido®. Given that QI requires providers to identify, measure, and change exiting practices, and such change requires capability, opportunity, and motivation for change, the study findings were synthesised and summarized by the research team focusing on: (1) challenges of practicing QI in EU settings in LMICs; (2) potential facilitators to overcome these challenges; (3) methods for measuring WHO quality domains in the EUs; and (4) domains that are most feasible to change.

Ethics

Participation at the workshop was voluntary upon acceptance of the invitation, and verbal consent was obtained from all meeting attendees for using the meeting content and discussion points, while anonymity of the information was maintained. Furthermore, the final report of the workshop was shared with all workshop participants for their comments and confirmation. No patient or public involvement was required for this study.

Results

Eleven IDIs were undertaken, and 26 participants attended the workshop (Table 1).

Table 1- Participant characteristics in the qualitative interviews study and the workshop.

Current Roles	Gender Distribution	Represented Countries
A. Qualitative Study (Phase 1)		
• Specialist Emergency Physicians (N=8) • Specialist in Internal Medicine and Surgery in Emergency Units (N=1) • Specialist Emergency Physicians currently working as technical advisors for the Ministries of Health (N=2)	• Male – 8 • Female – 3	• Arab Republic of Egypt • Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia • Republic of India • Republic of Liberia • Islamic Republic of Pakistan • Republic of the Philippines • Republic of South Africa • Republic of the Sudan • Kingdom of Thailand • Republic of Uganda • Republic of Zambia
B. Workshop of Technical Experts* (Phase 2)		
• Specialist Emergency Physicians (N=19) • Clinical Specialists in Internal Medicine and Surgery in Emergency Units (N=1) • Critical Care Nurses (N=1) • WHO technical experts in QI and ECO care (N=5)	• Male - 11 • Female - 15	• Commonwealth of Australia • Belize • Arab Republic of Egypt • Federal Republic of Germany • Republic of Ghana • Republic of India • Republic of the Philippines • Kingdom of Norway • Republic of Rwanda

- Republic of South Africa
- Swiss Confederation
- Kingdom of Thailand
- Republic of Uganda
- United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland
- United States of America

*Two Specialist Emergency physician participants were interviewees in the Qualitative study phase.

Results of phase 1: Qualitative interviews study

All 11 IDI participants confirmed that QI activities were being conducted within their EUs. Amongst those activities, 25 specific longstanding initiatives were identified, primarily focused on improving clinical effectiveness, timeliness, safety, and person-centeredness. Five participants reported newly introduced QI initiatives, initiated by them. All 11 EUs had QI initiatives related to clinical effectiveness; none had initiatives focused on equity, or efficiency (Figure 1). Examples of these initiatives included reducing patient queues, initiating triage, staff training, obtaining patient feedback, conducting data-informed quality of care reviews, and routine monitoring using Key Performance Indicators (KPIs). Further details on QI initiatives are provided in Supplementary Material 03.



Figure 1- Number of EUs implementing QI Initiatives as per WHO Quality domains, and the number of EUs where new QI programmes were implemented by the participants (N=11).

Barriers to QI initiatives

Numerous barriers related to developing and implementing QI initiatives, categorised as per WHO Health Systems Framework (17) are presented in Table 2. The detailed findings, including issues specific to WHO QI domains are presented in Supplementary Material 04 - Section A.

Of note, when discussing barriers participants described challenges at different levels. Some explicitly referred to barriers that directly hindered QI delivery, while others highlighted broader challenges to delivering quality care which indirectly impeded ability to deliver QI. This highlights the complexity of separating challenges in delivering quality care from those specifically hindering QI implementation.

Facilitators for QI

Participants highlighted several factors which facilitated their attempts at implementing QI. These are summarised in Table 3, with details presented in Supplementary Material 04 - Section B.

Table 2 - Barriers for Quality Improvement in EUs of LMICs

WHO Building block	Common barriers for implementing QI in LMICs (***Related quotes: Interview number and quote***)
Service delivery	● Lack of sustained availability of essential utilities – e.g.: 24hr stable electricity supply or proper drainage systems *I6 – "…basic necessities like electricity, or running water, is a luxury here."* ● Lack of adequate and necessary infrastructure and equipment in EU *I1 – "…we realised that we couldn't even afford a basic ECG."* *I7 – "Our emergency department, it was like an open space with just one main door. So, we realize that the management of crowds, especially when there were mass casualties, was very difficult."* ● Unusable equipment and infrastructure in EU *I7 –* "*It is very common in our environment to have equipment, actually that you don't even know how to use. Same with infrastructure. You can have infrastructure, but you can't make use of it and miss a lot of diagnoses and have more problems, because you have not invested in a skill set."* *I11 – "…the [IT] infrastructure itself is sometimes very basic or non-existent. So even if you have the personnel, I mean they wouldn't serve in supporting you, because there's nothing to work with or to use."* ● Lack of proper maintenance of infrastructure and equipment. *I9 – "…this amazing infrastructure that was there, but no one is there to maintain it. No one is there to oversee it. There's no long-term plan for it. So over time it dials out, and then no one actually ends up knowing what you have in hospital."* ● Difficulties with coordinating and implementing QI initiatives into existing care delivery structures and processes

I10 – "It is difficult, we have faced difficulties to implement quality projects because the other department do not believe in the emergency care related quality projects."

- Lack of understanding or insight on what healthcare QI is, especially in low resourced settings, leading EU staff to attempt non-QI practices

I2 – "We need the idea of what 'quality' is needed to change. Currently the word 'quality' is there to say, the perception, a lot of the time is, how to stop itself from being sued, or something like that, versus general quality improvement which is, should be value based."

- Lack of mechanisms to analyse and integrate patient preferences and feedback, towards consideration for QI, in the delivery of care

I1 – "I'm also very interested in complaints. Although these are very difficult to measure from our side as end users and front-line doctors, we rely on what managers are receiving, in the morning brief…"

- Difficulties in ensuring and implementing QI processes in the EU

I11 – "The level of resistance is different from one setting to the other. So, when we're talking about a setting where, like the daily ER visits is very high and patient flow at some, especially at some points of the day, or like in during the very high flow hours of the days you would find more resistance than in other settings."

Health workforce

- Inadequate numbers of staff in EU due to poor recruitment and lack of retention

I1 -"We have specialists that have been trained by the government. But retention of these specialists has been the weakest link. Some of them come back but low emoluments are paid, maybe for junior doctors, and in that way, it makes them seek greener pastures."

- High dropout rates of EU clinical staff due to low salaries and incentives, lack of appreciation and poor career prospects

I9 – "In these regions there's low pay, and most people are only staying long enough to get enough credentials, so they are able to leave the country or leave the government sector to be able to work in a better-paying private job."

- Lack of knowledge and skills among EU staff, related to QI and QI domains including patient safety, patent centredness, and timeliness of care

I1 – "But where I spend most of my time, which is one in the rural hospital, is that it's first of all, to understand that most of the things are not practiced the way I would love them to be practiced. Because this is a rural province, and, somehow, you need to be a little bit patient, and to understand that people have not had the [QI] exposure you are talking about."

- Poor prospects for QI related capacity building

I2 – "We don't have regular capacity programmes."

I11 – "…in the lower resourced settings where there's not so much capacity, there's not a very well-structured team to be responsible for quality improvement."

- High workforce fatigue leading to resistance towards QI

I9 – "Eventually you find them to be burnt out. There's no satisfaction in the work they're doing. They don't see it [QI] going anywhere. They're very depressed, and they feel like 'Well, it's, I just have to come to work and leave at the end of the day'. They don't really want to bring out any change."

- Poor attitudes of staff towards patient care, safety and patient satisfaction.

I10 – "We have attitude issues, especially from senior staff. So, they may not agree with certain, I mean, they may deviate from the protocol and feel like it's their right to deviate from the protocol."

Health information systems	● Lack of connectivity, IT infrastructure, maintenance and trained support services *I6 – "…lack of computers and electricity in most of the facilities"* *I4 – "There's always an internet issue and the tablets that they collect the data with, there's a problem with the, you know, utilization and maintenance and all."* ● Challenges of data collection and analysis, especially due to existing paper based manual data collection systems *I8- "…currently, there's still a lot of challenges, because some of our data are still collected using paper and pen."* ● Lack of patient safety monitoring systems for identifying safety issues. *I1 – "This was also a big area where crash carts were always empty. They were always empty. They didn't have a system of managing a crash cart, to replenish what was lacking."* ● Difficulties in capturing patient complaints and developing indicators to quantify and address complaints effectively. *I1 – "We are not able to measure these complaints. We are not capturing them to say we had this number of complaints. And I feel like these are some of the things we should be able to measure or develop an indicator on complaints, and how many we handled."*
Access to essential medicines and equipment	● Lack of availability of medical supplies and access to specialized investigations to implement QI initiatives. *I2 – "…we have an issue with 24 h radiology services."* *I6 – "We don't have our own CT scan machine. So, [patients] are sent [to another hospital] for CT with our own ambulance. They are taken, CT is done, then the patient is brought back to us for continued management."*
Health financing	● Government funding in public hospitals is barely adequate to cover basic recurrent expenses

	I2 – "…we have major financial limitations. We're receiving information [from treasury] that we have almost exhausted our budget." ● Insufficient availability of funds for implementation and sustainability of QI initiatives *I4 – "Main challenge that is faced [is] mostly the financial (….). and of course, the issue with the infrastructures and all are still a problem".* *I11 –" So it could be that everyone is convinced that this is important [for QI], but there's not enough funds for it."* ● Redistribution of QI allocated funds for increased patient care activities *I2 – "We haven't been allocated a budget. And so, whenever there's an issue in another part of the hospital, whatever is not deemed absolutely necessary [such as QI], funding will be moved there to transport it out."*
Health leadership / governance	● Lack of prioritizing QI by hospital management, leading to administrative resistance and non-approval of financial support for QI initiatives *I2 – "…we identify, maybe a hazard (.....) then we meet resistance, and sometimes that fizzles out until another incident occurs. And obviously we get far less support [from management] if an incident hasn't yet occurred."* ● Perceptions prioritizing the patient numbers cared for over the quality of care provided to patients *I9 – "the hospital manager, even if he gets some funds allocated to emergency care, he sees, okay, my surgery department needs a new theatre and (…). this is much more sustainable that I use this money to fix my problem in the theatre "* ● External influences affecting the activities of institutions, including the implementation of QI

I2 – "obviously political, provincial push, has to take preference, because of our sort of service delivery paradigms that we have to see to (…) we often have a top-down approach where people from Province will come and tell you, this is what you need to do in your system, or this is what you need."

- Existence of poor QI culture and blame culture within the institutions

I2 – "Difficulty we have is the understanding of complaints and the importance of reporting them because, there still exists this blame culture or perceived blame culture which prohibits people from actually reporting things."

- Lack of accountability framework and accreditation standards to promote QI

I9 – "…weak governance and lack of accountability frameworks also create a big issue around that [QI attempts], and to be honest, is also the element of lack of incentivization for quality improvement."

- Lack of active involvement of departmental management in quality and safety committees.

I2 – "…without proper management oversight, when we have combined meetings that make the sort of mortality, there runs the big risk of passive aggressiveness or defensive culture, where, instead of addressing the complaint in a psychologically safe manner, often times it becomes one department against another which becomes a barrier to good quality care"

Table 3 - Suggested facilitators for QI in EU

Main Themes of Facilitation	Activities (***Related quotes: Interview number and quote***)
1. Use of guidelines and tools for QI.	● The use of available, appropriate QI guidelines and tools, including QI related KPIs from the Ministry of Health, hospital administration or from external quality accreditation organizations *I5 – "For the structure [Quality Assessment], we actually have some standard and some self-assessment tool that the Ministry of Public Health sent to us, and we have to send them the information on what we have"* ● Assembling a local team (EU physicians and EU staff) to discuss and develop bespoke QI guidelines and indicators for the EU *I8 – "So now we have our very own KPI's, or key performance indicators, for our unit. And we constantly monitor them through monthly audits, through sentinel events reporting near misses"*
2. Improve communication within the EU.	● Enhancing communication between the EU team using simple mobile apps and texting services *I1 – "…we have taken advantage of social media, meaning WhatsApp, online calls, video calls to see how we can improve care of our emergency or acute patients"* ● Improving documentation and recording/filing of data to facilitate better data storage and utilization *I9 – "And we really saw very great impact on the ground….by something like changing the layout of our existing file into a new file."*
3. Enhancing integrated care	● Initiate and develop inter-unit guidelines on care of patients towards ensuring continuity of patient care QI processes

	I9 – "The approach was to develop a shared protocol that all of the heads of departments would look at, and all of the heads of departments would sign this protocol. And then it would be propagated to their different departments. So that there is a [QI protocol] document to resolve most of the [inter-department] day-to-day [quality of care] issues."
4. Training and capacity development of staff on knowledge of QI and QI processes	● Conducting formal and informal training for EU staff on QI, *I1 – "I had to start teaching my team members, meaning my interns, my medical officers, the importance of triage and what the benefits are. And then from there we had to hold departmental meetings, meaning our department, the nursing unit, the doctors, as a department of internal medicine."*
5. Optimizing use of available resources.	● Rather than seeing a lack of essential medicines and equipment as a barrier to improving care quality, encouraging the use of alternative resources to improve timely delivery of patient care, *I2 – "…we have an issue with 24 h radiology services. So, one such program was to try and supplement by improving ultrasound use and utilization for certain conditions that we don't have access to X-rays."*
6. Attempting and being involved with initiating small scale QI initiatives	● Planning and attempting small scale, minimal cost QI activities, which would be easy to implement, monitor, and be sustainable, while causing minimal burden to the EU staff and financial resources. *I11 – "To start depending on the setting, to start small, not necessarily like with huge, big projects that, that looks very appealing, and but are actually not feasible to implement. So, to start small, just to introduce the culture so that people embrace the culture of quality improvement."* ● Encouraging EU staff and trainees to be involved with QI related activities which gradually introduces QI to routine activities of EU.

	I11 – "I mean they, if they [EU staff] were involved from the beginning [in QI projects], and would like, felt that [QI project] as part of their initiative and the team, they would be very supportive."
7. Promote external collaborations	● Engaging in collaborations with other departments or external universities to facilitate support for larger QI activities *I4 – "We ask the health facilities to come up with the matching funds for this [QI] project, and also the facilities themselves, to try to get some funding from, you know, other collaborating facilities abroad or universities and hospitals."*

Results of phase 2: Workshop with Technical experts

Suggestions for measuring quality domains in the EU

Summarised responses for how to measure WHO QI domains are presented in Table 4, with the word clouds and analysis of responses presented in the Supplementary Material 05. Results show that whilst some domains were clearly demarcated, the categorisations of others were blurred. For instance, timeliness of care was included as a measure to assess effectiveness of care, and measures for efficiency were offered under measures of timeliness. Some participants presented domain definitions rather than methods for measurement.

Table 4 - Key responses suggested by technical experts for measuring the concepts of WHO Quality domains.

Quality Domain	No of participants [No. of total responses]	Top 3 responses suggested for measuring QI [No. of specific responses]	WHO description of domain
Clinical Effectiveness	18 [38]	Clinical outcomes [11] Timeliness of care [5] Adherence to clinical care guidelines [3]	"Providing evidence-based healthcare services to those who need them"
Patient Safety	18 [44]	Safety practices [16] Complication metrics [5] Clinical Outcome [4]	"Avoiding harm to people for whom the care is intended"
Patient Centeredness	19 [44]	Patient preferences [10] Care quality metrics [9] Patient satisfaction [7]	"Providing care that responds to individual preferences, needs and values"
Timeliness	18 [41])	Timeliness of care [24] Length of stay [5]	"Reducing waiting times and sometimes harmful delays"

		Quality of care [5]	
Equity	18 [43]	Accessibility [16] Non-discrimination [10] Patient characteristics [5]	"Providing care that does not vary in quality on account of gender, ethnicity, geographic location, and socio-economic status"
Efficiency	19 [49]	Cost measures [15] Resources utilisation [12] Competence [7]	"Maximizing the benefit of available resources and avoiding waste"
Integrated Care	18 [49]	Process of integration [12] Communication [10] Team effectiveness [7]	"Providing care that makes available the full range of health services throughout the life course"

Perceptions on feasibility of WHO Quality domains to change

Safety (76.5%) was ranked by the workshop participants, as the most feasible domain to change, followed by clinical effectiveness 52.9%. Patient centredness and timeliness of care were equally ranked (41.2%) as the third most feasible domain for change. Efficiency (29.4%), Integrated care (17.6%) and Equitable care (11.8%) were ranked lower in feasibility for change. None agreed that it would be feasible to change all quality domains simultaneously.

Barriers and facilitators to implementing QI in the EU settings

Reflecting on findings from the qualitative interviews, workshop participants posed that barriers were primarily related to three key factors. First, EUs face a heavy patient load, making it difficult to implement QI initiatives effectively. Second, patient diagnoses are often unknown during their stay in the EU, adding complexity to clinical decision-making. Third, the EU is not the final point of care for patients but is instead deeply interconnected with other hospital services and external healthcare interactions. Participants also emphasized the importance of

frontline healthcare staff safety in EUs. Given the high-pressure environment, ensuring the personal safety of healthcare providers was highlighted as a critical concern.

Suggested facilitators were generic to QI delivered in other units, but felt to be of particular importance in EU, given the aforementioned challenges. For example, ensuring QI programmes are developed with inputs from staff and patients was recognized as a way to enhance local ownership and relevance of the QI programmes. Participants highlighted the need for broad, adaptable improvement strategies rather than interventions reliant on specific clinical care pathways, allowing for quality improvements regardless of case mix and diagnoses. Working towards a minimum standard of care was suggested as an EU-specific facilitator. However, other participants preferred to work towards improvements from baseline. Incorporating assessments of quality of care delivered prior to patients arrive in the EU was considered important, but difficult to capture. Finally, participants agreed that ensuring QI initiatives are feasible in resource constrained EUs was essential for the sustainability of QI.

Detailed findings are presented in Supplementary Material 06.

Discussion

This study explored the delivery and implementation of QI initiatives in EUs in LMICs, identifying barriers, facilitators, and feasibility considerations for QI activities. Our findings provide insights into existing QI efforts and implementation challenges, emphasizing the need for structured, adaptable tools and guidance to support and sustain QI efforts in EUs.

The interview data revealed that existing QI programmes primarily focused on clinical effectiveness, safety, and timeliness of care, aligning with findings of prior studies (35-38) . However, patient-centeredness was less frequently targeted, while equity and efficiency were absent, highlighting gaps in QI efforts. Clinical effectiveness was the most frequently implemented QI initiative, yet barriers such as limited guidelines, lack of timely and accurate information, and resource constraints significantly hindered the impact. Workshop discussions emphasized the need for substitute resources in LMIC settings to mitigate these challenges, particularly in the context of staffing shortages and the absence of structured QI capacity-building programmes (39).

Workshop participants identified safety as the most feasible domain for improvement, reinforcing the global emphasis on patient safety in hospitals (14, 37, 40). They cited administrative, financial, and reputational concerns as key drivers for prioritizing patient safety, emphasizing the need for targeted guidance to strengthen QI implementation in EUs. While safety remained a top priority, participants acknowledged that all QI domains are interdependent and essential for delivering high-quality care (13). Discussions highlighted the challenge of balancing these priorities, particularly in resource-constrained settings, and underscored the need for a comprehensive approach to QI.

Patient-centeredness was ranked third in feasibility for change, with several measurement approaches suggested. Patient-reported measures are considered reliable indicators (41, 42), but workshop participants noted challenges in collecting and analysing patient complaints and service reviews, indicating a need for EU-specific measures of patient-centeredness. Timeliness of care was ranked equally feasible to change; it was also the third most common focus of QI initiatives among interview participants' hospitals. Numerous timeliness-based Key Performance Indicators (KPI) were being used by interview participants as standardized measurement methods. The integrated nature of care in the EU, where services rely on other departments such as diagnostics and referral systems, emphasized the need for specific timeliness metrics tailored to emergency settings. Equity and efficiency were largely absent from QI efforts, in interviews with hospital providers despite equity's recognized importance in universal health coverage (43). Whereas amongst workshop participants, efficiency was often misinterpreted with timeliness. Workshop participants faced challenges towards defining measurable indicators for integrated care, reinforcing the need for practical tools and measures to improve coordination within EUs.

Whilst none of the workshop participants thought that all quality domains were equally important, the overlapping definitions of WHO quality domains, particularly timeliness, effectiveness, and efficiency, suggests that they are difficult to disentangle. These findings mirror those from other healthcare settings where these concepts were often thought to be interconnected and difficult to distinguish clearly (36). The interdependency of the domains means that improvement in quality in any domain may have beneficial effects on others and knowledge of all domains is important to ensure that none are neglected (44). Lack of clarity around the quality domains suggests that future guidance should emphasize understanding all domains, ensuring that QI efforts do not neglect any. There should also be suggestions for

measurements appropriate for each and all domains, and guidance should illustrate completing the QI loop, for multiple domains, broader than the usual ones of effectiveness and safety (45).

Our findings indicate that barriers to QI in EUs align with WHO's Health Systems Framework (17), spanning infrastructure deficits, workforce limitations, governance weaknesses, and system-wide inefficiencies. Context-specific challenges in LMICs, such as unreliable electricity, inadequate infrastructure, and equipment shortages, underscore the need for QI tools that accommodate resource constraints while maintaining measurable improvements in care quality. Additionally, workforce shortages and a lack of QI training highlight the importance of developing accessible training materials, toolkits, and implementation frameworks to equip frontline healthcare workers with the skills needed to integrate QI into routine practice. While some of our findings align with prior studies (4, 15, 46) , there is limited research exploring all aspects of QI implementation across all WHO quality domains.

Despite these barriers, several facilitators were identified that could enhance QI programme development and implementation. The use of QI guidelines and locally developed protocols, tailored to EU-specific workflows, was considered critical. This suggests that new guidance should build on existing frameworks while allowing for local customization, ensuring that QI tools remain practical, adaptable, and relevant to EU settings. Strengthening internal communication within EUs and across hospital departments was also highlighted by participants as an important strategy for integrating QI into broader healthcare systems. In resource-constrained settings, small-scale, resource-efficient QI initiatives were seen as effective starting points, allowing gradual implementation without overwhelming existing systems. Additionally, training and capacity building were emphasized as essential for embedding QI knowledge among EU staff, while external collaborations with universities, NGOs, and international organizations were suggested as ways to secure funding and technical support for sustainable QI implementation.

This study highlights the need for LMIC-specific guidance and tools to support QI implementation in EUs. The QI resources must address existing gaps, particularly in equity, efficiency, patient-centeredness and integrated care, while providing suggestions to overcome infrastructure, workforce, and governance-related challenges. The development of adaptable QI tools - including training programs and standardized implementation guides - will be essential in ensuring sustained improvements in emergency care quality across diverse LMIC settings.

Our study has several limitations, primarily related to the participant profile and geographic representation. Most participants were senior emergency physicians, which may have introduced bias in emphasizing certain QI domains over others, potentially shaping the prioritization of clinical effectiveness while underrepresenting perspectives on other aspects of QI. The IDIs primarily included participants from Africa and Asia, with no representation from the Pacific and America regions, potentially limiting the generalizability of findings to other LMIC settings. However, this limitation was partially mitigated by the broader geographic representation of participants in the expert workshop. While efforts were made to capture a range of perspectives, differences in health system structures, policy environments, and available resources may have influenced participants' experiences with QI. Finally, because data were collected through semi-structured interviews and a workshop, findings are based on self-reported experiences and perceptions. Our participants were QI experts, and our data may not have captured the concerns of those less engaged in QI efforts in LMICs.

Conclusion

EUs are a unique environment within health facilities, which encounter time-critical patients who require urgent, but effective and safe interventions for survival, often linked with other specialized units, while ensuring patient centred, efficient and equitable care. However, a clear restriction is observed within EUs in LMICs, where QI appears to focus mainly towards enhancing the effectiveness and timeliness of care. Despite the numerous barriers encountered by EUs, linked to internal factors within the EU, as well as external factors such as governance and finance, opportunities exist, supported by internal and external facilitators, to enhance care quality across all seven quality domains. Process enhancing activities requiring minimal resources and implementation time can have a meaningful impact as their cumulative effects lead to major improvements in care quality. However, practical measures and indicators are essential to monitor progress effectively and ensure that all QI domains are addressed. Such tools will enable a more systematic and balanced approach to QI, fostering sustainable improvements in emergency care delivery in low resourced settings.

Funding

This work was supported by the Quality Related (QR) research funding 23/24, issued by Research England through the University of Birmingham [QR Funding for Policy Support Fund: PSF-10]. The funders were not involved in the study design, implementation, data collection and analysis, nor the interpretations and submission of the paper for publication.

Conflicts of Interest

All authors declare no conflicts of interest in relation to this study.

Patient Consent for Publication

Not applicable.

Acknowledgement

Authors wish to acknowledge Lee Wallis, Vanessa Naidoo and Rose Mabelle Buhain of the Clinical Services and Systems Unit, World Health Organization, for their technical guidance.

Data availability statement

Analysed data are available upon reasonable request.

References

1. Kruk ME, Gage AD, Arsenault C, Jordan K, Leslie HH, Roder-DeWan S, et al. High-quality health systems in the Sustainable Development Goals era: time for a revolution. The Lancet Global Health. 2018;6(11):e1196-e252. DOI: 10.1016/s2214-109x(18)30386-3
2. Aluisio AR, Waheed S, Cameron P, Hess J, Jacob ST, Kissoon N, et al. Clinical emergency care research in low-income and middle-income countries: opportunities and challenges. BMJ Global Health. 2019;4(Suppl 6):e001289. DOI: 10.1136/bmjgh-2018-001289
3. Stewart B, Khanduri P, McCord C, Ohene-Yeboah M, Uranues S, Vega Rivera F, et al. Global disease burden of conditions requiring emergency surgery. Br J Surg. 2014;101(1):e9-22. DOI: 10.1002/bjs.9329
4. Chang CY, Abujaber S, Reynolds TA, Camargo CA, Obermeyer Z. Burden of emergency conditions and emergency care usage: new estimates from 40 countries. Emergency Medicine Journal. 2016;33(11):794-800. DOI: 10.1136/emermed-2016-205709
5. Edem IJ, Dare AJ, Byass P, D'Ambruoso L, Kahn K, Leather AJM, et al. External injuries, trauma and avoidable deaths in Agincourt, South Africa: a retrospective observational and qualitative study. BMJ Open. 2019;9(6):e027576. DOI: 10.1136/bmjopen-2018-027576
6. Newberry Le Vay J, Fraser A, Byass P, Tollman S, Kahn K, D'Ambruoso L, et al. Mortality trends and access to care for cardiovascular diseases in Agincourt, rural South Africa: a mixed-methods analysis of verbal autopsy data. BMJ Open. 2021;11(6):e048592. DOI: 10.1136/bmjopen-2020-048592
7. Andrew F, Jessica Newberry Le V, Peter B, Stephen T, Kathleen K, Lucia DA, et al. Time-critical conditions: assessment of burden and access to care using verbal autopsy in Agincourt, South Africa. BMJ Global Health. 2020;5(4):e002289. DOI: 10.1136/bmjgh-2020-002289
8. Obermeyer Z, Abujaber S, Makar M, Stoll S, Kayden SR, Wallis LA, et al. Emergency care in 59 low- and middle-income countries: a systematic review. Bull World Health Organ. 2015;93(8):577-86g. DOI: 10.2471/blt.14.148338
9. National Center for Health Statistics. Health, United States 2012: With Special Feature on Emergency Care. Hyattsville (MD): National Center for Health Statistics (US); 2013.
10. Baker M, Clancy M. Can mortality rates for patients who die within the emergency department, within 30 days of discharge from the emergency department, or within 30 days of admission from the emergency department be easily measured? Emerg Med J. 2006;23(8):601-3. DOI: 10.1136/emj.2005.028134
11. Institute of Medicine (US) Committee on Quality of Health Care in America. Crossing the Quality Chasm: A New Health System for the 21st Century. Washington DC: National Academies Press (US); 2001. DOI: 10.17226/10027
12. World Health Organization. Quality of Care Geneva: World Health Organization; 2024 [Available from: https://www.who.int/health-topics/quality-of-care#tab=tab_1.
13. World Health Organization , and International Bank for Reconstruction and Development/The World Bank. Delivering quality health services: a global imperative for universal health coverage. Switzerland: World Health Organization, OECD, and International Bank for Reconstruction and Development/The World Bank; 2018.
14. World Health Organization. Quality Health Services – A planning guide. Geneva: World Health Organization; 2020.

15. Pain D, MacDuffie E, Martei YM, Kassick M, Ikeda DJ, Shulman LN, et al. Barriers to Implementing a Quality Improvement Program in Low- and Middle-Income Countries: Adequacy of Resources. JCO Glob Oncol. 2024;10:e2400114. DOI: 10.1200/go.24.00114
16. Rosenkrantz L, Schuurman N, Arenas C, Jimenez MF, Hameed MS. Understanding the barriers and facilitators to trauma registry development in resource-constrained settings: A survey of trauma registry stewards and researchers. Injury. 2021;52(8):2215-24. DOI: 10.1016/j.injury.2021.03.034
17. World Health Organization. Monitoring the building blocks of health systems: a handbook of indicators and their measurement strategies. Geneva: World Health Organization; 2010.
18. Hansen K, Boyle A, Holroyd B, Phillips G, Benger J, Chartier LB, et al. Updated framework on quality and safety in emergency medicine. Emerg Med J. 2020;37(7):437-42. DOI: 10.1136/emermed-2019-209290
19. Lowthian JA, Curtis AJ, Jolley DJ, Stoelwinder JU, McNeil JJ, Cameron PA. Demand at the emergency department front door: 10-year trends in presentations. Medical Journal of Australia. 2012;196(2):128-32. DOI: https://doi.org/10.5694/mja11.10955
20. Pines JM, Hilton JA, Weber EJ, Alkemade AJ, Al Shabanah H, Anderson PD, et al. International perspectives on emergency department crowding. Acad Emerg Med. 2011;18(12):1358-70. DOI: 10.1111/j.1553-2712.2011.01235.x
21. Maphumulo WT, Bhengu BR. Challenges of quality improvement in the healthcare of South Africa post-apartheid: A critical review. Curationis. 2019;42(1):e1-e9. DOI: 10.4102/curationis.v42i1.1901
22. Donabedian A. Evaluating the Quality of Medical Care. The Milbank Quarterly. 2005;83(4):691-729.
23. Rasouli HR, Aliakbar Esfahani A, Abbasi Farajzadeh M. Challenges, consequences, and lessons for way–outs to emergencies at hospitals: a systematic review study. BMC Emergency Medicine. 2019;19(1):62. DOI: 10.1186/s12873-019-0275-9
24. World Health Organization. WHA 76.2 of 30.5.2023 - Integrated emergency, critical and operative care for universal health coverage and protection from health emergencies. Geneva: World Health Organization; 2023.
25. World Health Organization. WHA 72.16 - Emergency care systems for universal health coverage: ensuring timely care for the acutely ill and injured. Geneva: World Health Organization; 2019.
26. World Health Organization. Seventy-seventh World Health Assembly – Daily update: 29 May 2024 2024 [Available from: https://www.who.int/news/item/29-05-2024-seventy-seventh-world-health-assembly---daily-update--29-may-2024.
27. Goenka A, Mundkur S, Sujir Nayak S, Shetty A, Thomas J, Mymbilly Balakrishnan J, et al. Improving the emergency services using quality improvement project and Donabedian model in a quaternary teaching hospital in South India. BMJ Open Qual. 2024;13(1). DOI: 10.1136/bmjoq-2022-002246
28. The World Bank. World Bank Country and Lending Groups 2024: Country Classification. New York: The World Bank 2023.
29. Nwomeh BC, Lowell W, Kable R, Haley K, Ameh EA. History and development of trauma registry: lessons from developed to developing countries. World Journal of Emergency Surgery. 2006;1(1):32. DOI: 10.1186/1749-7922-1-32
30. Bommakanti K, Feldhaus I, Motwani G, Dicker RA, Juillard C. Trauma registry implementation in low- and middle-income countries: challenges and opportunities. J Surg Res. 2018;223:72-86. DOI: 10.1016/j.jss.2017.09.039
31. Fusch P, Ness L. Are We There Yet? Data Saturation in Qualitative Research. The Qualitative Report. 2015. DOI: 10.46743/2160-3715/2015.2281

32. Lumivero. NVivo. 14 ed. Denver, USA.: Lumivero; 2023.
33. Braun V, Clarke V. Successful Qualitative Research. 1 ed. London: SAGE Publications; 2013.
34. Glaser BG. The Constant Comparative Method of Qualitative Analysis. Social Problems. 1965;12(4):436-45.
35. Brima N, Morhason-Bello IO, Charles V, Davies J, Leather AJ. Improving quality of surgical and anaesthesia care in sub-Saharan Africa: a systematic review of hospital-based quality improvement interventions. BMJ Open. 2022;12(10):e062616. DOI: 10.1136/bmjopen-2022-062616
36. Hannawa AF, Wu AW, Kolyada A, Potemkina A, Donaldson LJ. The aspects of healthcare quality that are important to health professionals and patients: A qualitative study. Patient Education and Counseling. 2022;105(6):1561-70. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pec.2021.10.016
37. Beal AC, Co JPT, Dougherty D, Jorsling T, Kam J, Perrin J, et al. Quality Measures for Children's Health Care. Pediatrics. 2004;113(Supplement_1):199-209. DOI: 10.1542/peds.113.S1.199
38. Muntlin Å, Gunningberg L, Carlsson M. Patients' perceptions of quality of care at an emergency department and identification of areas for quality improvement. Journal of Clinical Nursing. 2006;15(8):1045-56. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2702.2006.01368.x
39. Kannan VC, Tenner A, Sawe HR, Osiro M, Kyobe T, Nahayo E, et al. Emergency care systems in Africa: A focus on quality. African Journal of Emergency Medicine. 2020;10:S65-S72. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.afjem.2020.04.010
40. Mistri IU, Badge A, Shahu S. Enhancing Patient Safety Culture in Hospitals. Cureus. 2023;15(12):e51159. DOI: 10.7759/cureus.51159
41. Lloyd H, Wheat H, Horrell J, Sugavanam T, Fosh B, Valderas JM, et al. Patient-Reported Measures for Person-Centered Coordinated Care: A Comparative Domain Map and Web-Based Compendium for Supporting Policy Development and Implementation. J Med Internet Res. 2018;20(2):e54. DOI: 10.2196/jmir.7789
42. Alessandrini E, Varadarajan K, Alpern ER, Gorelick MH, Shaw K, Ruddy RM, et al. Emergency Department Quality: An Analysis of Existing Pediatric Measures. Academic Emergency Medicine. 2011;18(5):519-26. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1553-2712.2011.01057.x
43. Orach CG. Editorial: Health equity: challenges in low income countries. Afr Health Sci. 2009;9 Suppl 2(Suppl 2):S49-51.
44. Alidina S, Menon G, Staffa SJ, Alreja S, Barash D, Barringer E, et al. Outcomes of a multicomponent safe surgery intervention in Tanzania's Lake Zone: a prospective, longitudinal study. International Journal for Quality in Health Care. 2021;33(2). DOI: 10.1093/intqhc/mzab087
45. Gupta M, Soll R, Suresh G. The relationship between patient safety and quality improvement in neonatology. Seminars in Perinatology. 2019;43(8):151173. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1053/j.semperi.2019.08.002
46. Werner K, Risko N, Burkholder T, Munge K, Wallis L, Reynolds T. Cost-effectiveness of emergency care interventions in low and middle-income countries: a systematic review. Bull World Health Organ. 2020;98(5):341-52. DOI: 10.2471/blt.19.241158