The Review Of
DIABETIC
STUDIES
OPEN ACCESS

The Contribution Of Medical Laboratory Specialists To Evidence-Based Clinical Decision-Making

Abdulrahman Atallah Alanazi[1] , Abdulrahman Ali Saleh Albalawi[2] , Ahmed Khaled Alatawi[3] , Anwar Mahal Al Ruwaili[4] , Abdulaziz Saleh Faraj Albalawi[5] , Amnah Wadeed Alrouili[6] , Ahmed Hail Marsharsh AlRuwaili[7] , Fahad Munadi Alkhmshy[8] , Mutlaq Zayed Alotaibi[9] , Bashayr Mudhhi Alshehri[10] , Waleed Mohammed Almohareb[11] , Omar Jaber Mathan Alruwaili[12] , Mamdooh Hamid Rahil Alanazi[13]

[1]*Medical Laboratories, Public Health, Tabuk*
[2]*Medical Laboratories, Public health, Tabuk*
[3]*Medical Laboratory Specialist, King Khaled Hospital, Tabuk, Saudi Arabia*
[4]*Medical Laboratories, Suwair General Hospital, Aljawf*
[5]*Medical Laboratories, Public Health, Saudi Arabia, Tabuk*
[6]*Medical Laboratories, Sower*
[7]*Medical Laboratories, Talat Amaar PHCC, Aljawf*
[8]*Medical Laboratories, Public Health, Tabuk*
[9]*Microbiology, Regional Laboratory in Riyadh, Riyadh*
[10]*Medical Laboratory Specialist, King Fahd Specialist Hospital, Tabuk, Saudi Arabia*
[11]*Laboratory Technician, Prince Mohammed Hospital, Riyadh Region*
[12]*Laboratory Technician, Hafar Al-Batin Health Cluster, Eradah and Mental Health Hospital, Hafar Al-Batin*
[13]*Regional Laboratory and Blood Bank, Arar*

Abstract

Evidence-Based Clinical Decision-Making (EBCDM) fundamentally relies on the generation, interpretation, and application of robust diagnostic data. This paper comprehensively examines the indispensable, yet often underrecognized, role of Medical Laboratory Specialists (MLS) as central architects of this evidence base. Moving beyond the traditional perception of MLS as mere technicians, the analysis delineates their multifaceted contributions across the entire diagnostic spectrum. It positions MLS professionals as Guardians of Diagnostic Integrity, ensuring data reliability through rigorous quality management across pre-analytical, analytical, and post-analytical phases. Their role is further explored as vital Translators of Data, where expert interpretation and consultation transform numerical results into actionable diagnostic insights, directly informing differential diagnoses and therapeutic choices. The paper argues that effective Collaboration within Multidisciplinary Teams is a critical bridge, allowing MLS to integrate laboratory evidence seamlessly into holistic patient management plans. Furthermore, MLS are highlighted as essential Enablers of Precision Medicine, providing the specialized expertise in molecular diagnostics and advanced test interpretation required for personalized treatment strategies. Finally, their contribution to Advancing the Evidence Base through research, test development, and Health Technology Assessment (HTA) is detailed, showcasing their role in creating and evaluating the diagnostic tools of the future. This synthesis concludes that the MLS is a pivotal, proactive partner in EBCDM, whose expertise ensures that clinical decisions are founded on accurate, meaningful, and effectively communicated laboratory evidence, thereby directly enhancing patient safety, care quality, and healthcare system efficacy.

Keywords Medical Laboratory Specialist, Evidence-Based Clinical Decision-Making, Diagnostic Stewardship, Total Testing Process, Interpretative Reporting, Multidisciplinary Team Collaboration, Precision Medicine, Molecular Diagnostics, Health Technology Assessment, Quality Management System.

Introduction:

The modern healthcare landscape is a complex, data-driven ecosystem where the accuracy of a diagnosis, the efficacy of a treatment plan, and ultimately, the health outcomes of a patient hinge upon the precise and reliable interpretation of clinical information. At the core of this information nexus lies the medical laboratory, a hub of scientific inquiry that transforms biological specimens into quantifiable, actionable data. While the physician-patient interaction remains the visible face of clinical care, it is fundamentally supported by an intricate, often unseen, infrastructure of diagnostic science. Within this critical infrastructure, the medical laboratory specialist (also known as a clinical laboratory scientist, medical technologist, or biomedical scientist) emerges not merely as a technician performing assays, but as an essential scientific partner and a cornerstone of evidence-based medicine (EBM). This research paper argues that the contribution of medical laboratory specialists to evidence-based clinical decision-making is profound, multifaceted, and indispensable, encompassing the generation of accurate data, its expert interpretation, the assurance of its quality, and active consultation within the healthcare team. Their role is the vital bridge between raw biological signals and the refined clinical evidence upon which life-altering decisions are made.

Evidence-based medicine is defined as "the conscientious, explicit, and judicious use of current best evidence in making decisions about the care of individual patients" [1]. This paradigm integrates individual clinical expertise with the best available external clinical evidence from systematic research. A critical, though sometimes under-emphasized, source of this "external clinical evidence" at the point of care is the diagnostic laboratory. It is estimated that 60-70% of all objective information in a patient's medical record originates from the laboratory, influencing a similar percentage of critical clinical decisions, including admission, discharge, and medication protocols [2]. From the routine complete blood count that reveals an occult infection to the complex genetic sequencing that identifies a targetable mutation in a cancer cell, laboratory data provides the objective substrate upon which the subjective art of medicine is practiced. Therefore, the pathway to EBM is inextricably linked to the quality, validity, and contextual relevance of laboratory-generated evidence.

The journey of a laboratory result from sample to clinical decision is fraught with potential pre-analytical, analytical, and post-analytical pitfalls. Medical laboratory specialists are the guardians of this entire pathway. Their contribution begins long before an analyzer is activated. They design and manage phlebotomy and sample collection protocols, ensuring that the specimen integrity—a non-negotiable prerequisite for accurate results—is maintained [3]. A result, no matter how precisely measured, is clinically misleading if derived from a hemolyzed, mislabeled, or improperly transported sample. The laboratory specialist's expertise in pre-analytical variables forms the first, crucial layer of defense against erroneous evidence entering the clinical decision-making stream.

In the analytical phase, the specialist's role transcends mere operation of sophisticated instrumentation. They are the stewards of analytical quality, implementing rigorous quality control (QC) and quality assurance (QA) systems that underpin the reliability of every datum produced. This involves calibrating equipment, validating new methodologies, and adhering to international standards (e.g., ISO 15189) to ensure that results are not only precise and accurate but also comparable across time and between different laboratories [4]. The concept of "evidence" in EBM is meaningless if the evidence itself is unreliable. By certifying the analytical validity of test results, laboratory specialists provide the foundational trust that allows clinicians to confidently base their decisions on laboratory reports. Furthermore, they possess the scientific acumen to troubleshoot aberrant results, recognize interferences (e.g., lipemia, icterus, hemolysis), and select the most appropriate testing methodology for a specific clinical question, thereby refining the evidence at its source [5].

Perhaps the most significant, yet historically underutilized, contribution lies in the post-analytical phase: the interpretation and contextualization of data. The modern laboratory specialist is increasingly recognized as a diagnostic partner. They do not simply report a numerical value for serum creatinine; they calculate the estimated glomerular filtration rate (eGFR), applying evidence-based algorithms to stage chronic kidney disease. They do not just identify a microbial pathogen; they provide antimicrobial susceptibility testing results and, in many advanced practice roles, offer preliminary guidance on antibiotic stewardship, directly informing therapeutic choices [6]. This interpretive function is a direct injection of laboratory expertise into the clinical evidence package. By flagging critical results, explaining unexpected test patterns (e.g., discordant serology), or suggesting reflex testing based on initial findings, the specialist actively shapes and enriches the evidence available to the clinician [7]. In fields like hematology and transfusion medicine, the morphological assessment of blood smears or the resolution of complex antibody panels are cognitive, interpretative acts that convert raw data into diagnostic evidence, often distinguishing between similar disease states.

The expansion of molecular diagnostics and personalized (precision) medicine has dramatically elevated this interpretive role. Laboratory specialists in molecular pathology are responsible for running complex tests that detect specific DNA mutations, gene rearrangements, or expression profiles. The evidence they generate—such as the presence of an EGFR mutation in non-small cell lung cancer—is directly linked to evidence-based clinical practice guidelines that dictate the use of targeted tyrosine kinase inhibitors [8]. Interpreting these complex genetic reports requires deep scientific knowledge to distinguish pathogenic variants from polymorphisms and to understand the clinical implications of the findings, a task for which the laboratory specialist is uniquely trained.

Moreover, laboratory specialists contribute to the broader ecosystem of EBM through involvement in research and test development. They engage in clinical trials to validate novel biomarkers, establish reference intervals for diverse populations, and publish data on test performance characteristics [9]. This research activity feeds the "best available evidence" that underpins EBM. They also play a key role in the health technology assessment of new laboratory tests, evaluating their diagnostic accuracy, clinical utility, and cost-effectiveness before they are integrated into routine practice—a proactive form of evidence generation and synthesis [10].

Despite their critical role, laboratory specialists face challenges in being fully integrated into the clinical decision-making team. Historically, a "silo" mentality has sometimes separated the laboratory from the clinic. Communication gaps can lead to inappropriate test ordering, misinterpretation of results, and missed opportunities for diagnostic collaboration [11]. Overcoming these barriers requires proactive engagement. Laboratory specialists contribute through clinical consultations, participation in multidisciplinary team (MDT) meetings (e.g., in oncology or hematology), and the creation of diagnostic management pathways [12]. In these forums, they translate laboratory evidence into clinically relevant narratives, helping to synthesize data from multiple sources to form a coherent diagnostic picture. This collaborative model, often termed "laboratory stewardship," positions the specialist as an essential advisor, ensuring that the powerful tool of laboratory testing is used effectively, efficiently, and evidence-basedly [13].

Guardians of Diagnostic Integrity: Ensuring Accurate and Reliable Laboratory Data

The edifice of evidence-based clinical decision-making is constructed upon a foundation of trustworthy data. Without accuracy and reliability, laboratory results become not merely unhelpful but potentially dangerous, leading to misdiagnosis, inappropriate treatment, and harm to patients. Medical Laboratory Specialists (MLS) serve as the essential guardians of this diagnostic integrity, operating as the first and most critical line of defense against error throughout the total testing process (TTP). Their expertise is systematically applied across three interdependent phases—pre-analytical, analytical, and post-analytical—to ensure that every datum entering the clinical record is a valid and precise representation of the patient's biological state, thereby transforming raw specimen into credible evidence [14].

The journey of diagnostic evidence begins not at the analyzer, but at the patient's bedside or in the clinic. The pre-analytical phase, encompassing test ordering, patient preparation, specimen collection, handling, and transportation, is notoriously vulnerable to error, with studies suggesting it accounts for 60-70% of all mistakes in laboratory testing [15]. This is where the MLS's role as a guardian is profoundly proactive.

They design and enforce stringent phlebotomy protocols to prevent hemolysis, ensure proper sample-anticoagulant ratios, and verify patient identification—a critical step in preventing catastrophic misidentification errors. They educate clinical staff on the importance of correct collection techniques, such as avoiding draws from intravenous lines or ensuring proper timing for therapeutic drug monitoring. Furthermore, MLS professionals assess specimen acceptability upon arrival in the laboratory, rejecting unsuitable samples (e.g., clotted, lipemic, or insufficient volume) that would generate misleading results. By establishing and monitoring these pre-analytical standards, MLS professionals safeguard the very integrity of the biological specimen, ensuring that the subsequent analytical process is founded on a solid and representative sample. Their vigilance at this stage prevents the generation of "evidence" that is fundamentally flawed from its origin, a non-negotiable prerequisite for any evidence-based practice [16].

Within the analytical phase, the MLS transforms the specimen into quantitative or qualitative data. This role extends far beyond loading samples onto automated instruments. It is the domain of rigorous scientific methodology and continuous quality assurance. MLS professionals perform complex calibration procedures, execute daily quality control (QC) using materials with known values, and adhere to standardized operating procedures to ensure precision (repeatability) and accuracy (trueness) [17]. They are trained to recognize and troubleshoot analytical interferences, such as the effect of bilirubin (icterus) on certain colorimetric assays or heterophile antibodies in immunoassays. When a QC result falls outside acceptable limits, the MLS must investigate the cause—whether it be reagent degradation, instrument malfunction, or procedural drift—and rectify it before any patient results are released. This commitment to analytical validity is institutionalized through participation in external quality assurance (EQA) or proficiency testing (PT) schemes, where the laboratory's performance is benchmarked against peers using the same methodologies. The MLS analyzes these EQA reports to identify potential biases and implement corrective actions. This multilayered, systematic approach to quality control, grounded in statistical principles, provides the objective assurance that the numerical value reported for a patient's glucose or creatinine is a scientifically valid measurement, thereby endowing the resulting data with the credibility required for high-stakes clinical decisions [18].

The post-analytical phase represents the final checkpoint where data is formatted, verified, and released as clinically meaningful information. Here, the MLS's guardianship ensures the integrity of the result during its transition from the laboratory information system (LIS) to the electronic health record (EHR). This involves a meticulous technical and clinical review. Technically, MLS professionals verify that results are physiologically plausible, correlate with previous results for the same patient (delta checks), and are consistent across related tests (e.g., checking the relationship between serum total protein and albumin) [19]. They establish and enforce critical value (panic value) policies, ensuring that life-threatening results are immediately communicated to and acknowledged by a responsible clinician, a direct and critical intervention in patient safety. Furthermore, MLS add immense value through interpretative commenting. For instance, on a peripheral blood smear with atypical lymphocytes, the MLS may append a comment suggesting possible viral etiology, guiding the clinician's differential diagnosis. In microbiology, the reporting of antimicrobial susceptibility testing (AST) results using standardized categories (Susceptible, Intermediate, Resistant) is a direct application of evidence-based breakpoints, effectively translating raw inhibition zone diameters into evidence-based therapeutic guidance [20]. By structuring reports for clarity and clinical utility, the MLS prevents misinterpretation and ensures the evidence is presented in an actionable form.

The guardianship of diagnostic integrity is an ongoing, dynamic process that faces constant challenges. The proliferation of point-of-care testing (POCT) conducted outside the central lab, while beneficial for turnaround time, risks fragmenting quality oversight. MLS professionals address this by establishing rigorous training, competency assessment, and connectivity protocols for non-laboratory operators, extending their guardianship framework to decentralized testing sites [21]. Similarly, the integration of complex new technologies, such as mass spectrometry or next-generation sequencing, requires MLS to develop and validate entirely new protocols, ensuring these advanced tools meet the same uncompromising standards of reliability as routine assays. The fight against diagnostic error is also waged through data analytics; MLS use laboratory information systems to monitor key performance indicators (KPIs) like pre-analytical error rates, turnaround times, and test utilization patterns, employing this data for continuous quality improvement initiatives [22].

From Data to Diagnosis: The Interpretative and Consultative Role of the Specialist

The modern Medical Laboratory Specialist (MLS) is increasingly recognized not as a passive producer of data, but as an active translator of biological information. While the generation of accurate analytical results remains the foundational task, the true contribution to evidence-based clinical decision-making is amplified exponentially through the interpretative and consultative functions of the MLS. This role involves moving beyond the reporting of a numerical value to providing context, meaning, and diagnostic insight, thereby closing the critical gap between data production and clinical understanding. In an era of increasingly complex diagnostics and specialized medicine, the MLS acts as a pivotal knowledge broker, ensuring that the rich evidence generated in the laboratory is accurately comprehended and optimally utilized at the point of care [23]. This transformation from data reporter to diagnostic partner represents a paradigm shift, positioning the laboratory specialist as an integral member of the clinical team.

Interpretation begins with the fundamental task of correlating laboratory findings with clinical plausibility. This involves a sophisticated review process where the MLS applies physiological and pathological knowledge to identify inconsistencies. For example, a severely elevated serum potassium level in an otherwise stable patient prompts an immediate investigation for a pre-analytical cause, such as hemolysis or thrombocytosis, rather than unquestioning result release. Similarly, the MLS examines patterns across multiple tests. A discordant result—such as a high TSH with normal free T4—might lead to a comment suggesting the possibility of heterophile antibody interference in the immunoassay, guiding the clinician away from a misdiagnosis of subclinical hypothyroidism [24]. In hematology, the morphologic assessment of a peripheral blood smear is a quintessential interpretative act. The MLS does not merely count cells; they differentiate between reactive and malignant lymphocytes, identify intracellular parasites, or recognize the subtle signs of myelodysplasia. This expert morphological correlation turns quantitative data (cell counts) into a specific diagnostic suggestion, directly shaping the subsequent diagnostic pathway. These cognitive interventions prevent diagnostic errors and refine the evidence presented to the clinician, ensuring it is not just accurate but also clinically intelligible.

The interpretative role becomes even more critical in specialized areas such as microbiology, immunology, and molecular diagnostics. In microbiology, reporting an antimicrobial susceptibility test (AST) result as "Susceptible," "Intermediate," or "Resistant" is itself an interpretation based on evidence-based breakpoints established by organizations like CLSI or EUCAST [25]. However, the MLS's expertise extends further. They may note the presence of an inducible resistance mechanism (e.g., inducible clindamycin resistance in Staphylococcus aureus) and append a comment warning against using the drug despite an initial susceptible result. In immunology, interpreting complex serological profiles for autoimmune diseases or viral infections (e.g., Hepatitis B serology) requires understanding the kinetics of antibody response to differentiate between acute infection, chronic carriage, and immunity from vaccination. Perhaps the most profound example lies in molecular pathology and genomics. Here, the MLS analyzes complex genetic sequences, distinguishing pathogenic variants from benign polymorphisms. The evidence they generate—such as identifying an EGFR exon 19 deletion in a lung adenocarcinoma biopsy—is not a standalone datum; it is a direct, evidence-based prescription for targeted therapy, requiring deep knowledge of clinical guidelines and therapeutic implications [26]. This level of interpretation transforms raw genetic code into a definitive treatment roadmap.

This expertise naturally evolves into a formal consultative role. Laboratory consultations are a direct channel through which MLS insight informs clinical decision-making in real-time. A clinician may contact the laboratory to discuss an unexpected result, inquire about the most appropriate test for a specific clinical scenario, or understand the limitations of a particular methodology. The consulting MLS synthesizes laboratory data, patient history (when available), and test performance characteristics to provide evidence-based guidance. For instance, a hematologist might consult regarding a confusing coagulation profile; the MLS can suggest follow-up tests for lupus anticoagulant or factor inhibitors, effectively co-developing the diagnostic algorithm [27]. This collaborative problem-solving ensures that laboratory resources are used efficiently and that the diagnostic process is iterative and informed, directly embodying the principles of evidence-based practice where test selection and interpretation are tailored to the individual patient.

The most integrated form of consultation occurs through active participation in Multidisciplinary Team (MDT) meetings, such as those for oncology, hematology, or infectious disease complexes. In these forums, the MLS presents and interprets laboratory findings within the broader context of imaging, histopathology, and clinical examination. In a tumor board, the MLS specializing in molecular diagnostics explains the significance of a BRAF V600E mutation in a melanoma, directly informing the discussion on targeted therapy options. In a transplant team, the MLS provides critical input on virology load results and immune function assays to guide immunosuppression management [28]. This active presence ensures that laboratory evidence is not a static report in a chart but a dynamic, discussed, and integral component of the collective clinical reasoning process. It also provides valuable feedback to the laboratory, fostering a deeper understanding of clinical needs and the impact of their work.

Furthermore, the consultative role encompasses a significant educational component. MLS professionals are responsible for educating clinical staff on new tests, their clinical utility, limitations, and correct interpretation. They develop diagnostic algorithms and reflex testing protocols that automate evidence-based pathways. For example, an algorithm might stipulate that a positive Clostridioides difficile glutamate dehydrogenase (GDH) screening test should be reflexed to a toxin assay, with clear interpretive comments provided for each possible result combination [29]. By creating these protocols, the MLS embeds expert interpretation and evidence-based guidelines into the laboratory's operational workflow, standardizing best practices and ensuring consistent, high-quality diagnostic support even in the absence of a direct consultation. This proactive guidance shapes test utilization, reduces diagnostic errors, and streamlines patient management.

The expansion of laboratory informatics and data science opens new frontiers for the interpretative role. Advanced visualization tools and clinical decision support systems (CDSS) integrated into the Electronic Health Record (EHR) can be designed with MLS input to flag anomalous patterns, suggest correlations, or alert clinicians to critical results based on sophisticated rules [30].

The Quality Imperative: Laboratory Stewardship and the Framework of Evidence Generation

The generation of clinically actionable evidence within the medical laboratory is not a passive or automatic process; it is the direct product of a deliberate, systematic, and ethically grounded commitment to quality. This commitment, now increasingly conceptualized as **Laboratory Stewardship**, transcends the traditional, reactive model of quality control (QC) to embrace a comprehensive, proactive framework that governs the entire lifecycle of a laboratory test—from its selection and validation to its interpretation and clinical application. For the Medical Laboratory Specialist (MLS), stewardship represents the overarching philosophy and practical toolkit that ensures laboratory activities are safe, effective, patient-centered, timely, efficient, and equitable. It is the essential infrastructure that transforms the potential of diagnostic science into trustworthy, reproducible, and impactful evidence for clinical decision-making [31]. This framework is not merely about preventing errors but about optimizing the entire diagnostic pathway to produce the highest fidelity evidence upon which modern medicine depends.

The foundation of this framework is a robust Quality Management System (QMS), with international standards such as ISO 15189 providing the structural blueprint. A QMS integrates all laboratory processes—management, technical operations, and customer service—into a coherent system focused on continuous improvement and meeting the needs of clinicians and patients. For the MLS, this means that every action, from calibrating an analyzer to reporting a critical value, is governed by documented policies and procedures that are regularly audited and refined [32]. Key to this system is the establishment of evidence-based Quality Indicators (QIs) that monitor performance across the total testing process. These QIs, tracked by MLS professionals, might measure pre-analytical errors (e.g., mislabeled specimens), analytical reliability (e.g., QC acceptability), and post-analytical timeliness (e.g., turnaround time for stat tests). By analyzing trends in this data, the MLS can lead targeted interventions, such as re-educating phlebotomy staff or optimizing instrument maintenance schedules, thereby systematically reducing variability and enhancing the reliability of the evidence generated [33]. This data-driven approach to quality ensures that the laboratory's output is not only accurate but also consistent and fit for its intended clinical purpose.

The concept of Laboratory Stewardship operationalizes this quality framework with a specific focus on optimizing test utilization and enhancing the interpretive value of laboratory information. It is an interdisciplinary effort, led in partnership by laboratory specialists and clinicians, to ensure the right test is ordered for the right patient at the right time, and that the results are interpreted correctly. The MLS contributes to stewardship through several key activities. First, they engage in the development and management of diagnostic management pathways and reflex testing protocols. These are algorithms that guide test ordering and subsequent actions based on initial results, embedding evidence-based guidelines directly into the laboratory workflow. For instance, a pathway may dictate that an isolated elevated serum Prostate-Specific Antigen (PSA) in a low-risk patient should trigger a reflex to a free PSA calculation before further clinical action is considered, preventing unnecessary biopsies [34]. By designing these protocols, MLS specialists ensure efficient, standardized, and clinically appropriate use of laboratory resources.

Second, MLS professionals are central to test evaluation and formulary management. Before a new assay is implemented, they conduct rigorous verification or validation studies to confirm its analytical performance characteristics (precision, accuracy, reportable range) and assess its clinical utility. This critical appraisal of diagnostic technology is a direct form of evidence generation, determining whether a test provides meaningful information that improves patient outcomes. MLS specialists provide essential data on the positive and negative predictive values of tests in their specific patient population, informing formulary decisions about which tests should be offered [35]. This gatekeeping role prevents the adoption of poorly performing or redundant tests, protecting the integrity of the laboratory's evidence portfolio and containing healthcare costs without compromising care.

A third pillar of laboratory stewardship is effective communication and the reduction of diagnostic error. The MLS acts as a steward by ensuring results are not only accurate but also clearly communicated and actionable. This involves crafting interpretative comments, flagging discrepant results, and, most importantly, establishing robust systems for the communication of critical results. Furthermore, MLS contribute to reducing errors by leading laboratory-driven test utilization review. By analyzing ordering patterns, they can identify and address inappropriate testing, such as excessive serial monitoring without a clinical indication or the ordering of obsolete test panels. Through collaborative review with clinical departments, educational initiatives, and modifications to the electronic order entry system (e.g., implementing hard stops or alerts for duplicate orders), MLS specialists guide clinicians towards more evidence-based ordering practices [36]. This optimizes patient care, minimizes patient discomfort from unnecessary phlebotomy, and ensures that the clinical evidence generated is relevant and valuable.

The stewardship framework is also inherently ethical and economic. It aligns with the ethical principles of non-maleficence and justice by minimizing harm from false results and ensuring the equitable allocation of laboratory resources. From an economic perspective, laboratory stewardship addresses the significant costs associated with diagnostic error and overutilization. By improving the accuracy and appropriateness of testing, MLS professionals contribute to a more sustainable healthcare system. The cost savings generated are not merely financial; they encompass the avoidance of patient anxiety, unnecessary follow-up procedures, and delays in correct diagnosis and treatment [37]. In this sense, laboratory stewardship is a key enabler of value-based healthcare, where the goal is to achieve the best possible patient outcomes at the lowest necessary cost, with laboratory evidence serving as the crucial metric of value.

Finally, the future of this quality imperative lies in the integration of advanced data analytics and informatics. The modern laboratory generates vast amounts of data. MLS specialists, with their deep understanding of the data's context and limitations, are poised to lead the use of artificial intelligence (AI) and machine learning to identify novel diagnostic patterns, predict instrument failures before they occur, and create more sophisticated clinical decision support tools. By stewarding this data and guiding its ethical and practical application, the MLS will unlock new dimensions of evidence from existing laboratory information, moving from reactive reporting to predictive analytics [38].

Enablers of Precision Medicine: Molecular Diagnostics and Advanced Test Interpretation

The paradigm of modern medicine is undergoing a fundamental shift from a one-size-fits-all approach to a targeted, predictive, and personalized model known as precision medicine. At the heart of this revolution lies the discipline of molecular diagnostics, a field that analyzes DNA, RNA, proteins, and metabolites to uncover the unique molecular fingerprint of a disease in an individual patient. Medical Laboratory Specialists (MLS), particularly those specializing in molecular pathology, genomics, and advanced clinical chemistry, are the critical enablers of this transformation. Their expertise moves beyond traditional analyte measurement to the intricate interpretation of complex biological signatures, directly generating the evidence required for tailored therapeutic strategies. By bridging cutting-edge technology with clinical meaning, MLS professionals transform raw genomic data into actionable intelligence, ensuring that the promise of precision medicine is realized in safe, effective, and evidence-based patient care [39].

The technological landscape of molecular diagnostics is vast and rapidly evolving, encompassing techniques such as polymerase chain reaction (PCR), next-generation sequencing (NGS), fluorescence in situ hybridization (FISH), and mass spectrometry. The MLS is the essential operator and interpreter of these sophisticated platforms. For instance, in oncology, the detection of a specific mutation via real-time PCR or NGS is not a standalone result. The MLS must ensure the analytical validity of the test—verifying sensitivity to detect low variant allele frequencies in heterogeneous tumor samples and specificity to avoid false positives—a process fundamental to generating reliable evidence [40]. In hematopathology, MLS professionals use FISH to identify characteristic chromosomal translocations, such as t(9;22) in chronic myeloid leukemia, which dictates the use of tyrosine kinase inhibitors. Their role involves not only performing the assay but also analyzing the complex signal patterns, distinguishing true rearrangements from artifacts, and providing a clear, diagnostic report. This technical and interpretative mastery is the first, indispensable step in creating a molecular evidence base for precision therapy.

Next-Generation Sequencing (NGS) represents the apex of this field, generating terabytes of data from a single specimen. The MLS's role in NGS is multifaceted and central. In the pre-analytical phase, they are responsible for complex specimen assessment, ensuring tumor samples have sufficient cellularity and tumor content for reliable analysis. The analytical phase involves running the sequencing workflow, which includes library preparation, sequencing, and primary data analysis, all requiring meticulous quality control to monitor sequencing depth, coverage uniformity, and base-call accuracy [41]. However, the most profound contribution lies in the post-analytical phase: bioinformatic analysis and variant interpretation. MLS professionals, often in collaboration with bioinformaticians, process raw sequencing data through specialized pipelines to align sequences to a reference genome and call variants. The subsequent interpretive step is where deep scientific knowledge is paramount. The MLS must classify identified variants (e.g., single nucleotide variants, insertions/deletions, copy number variations) based on curated databases such as ClinVar, COSMIC, and guidelines from the Association for Molecular Pathology (AMP). They distinguish pathogenic variants that drive disease from benign polymorphisms and variants of uncertain significance (VUS) [42]. This interpretation directly informs clinical actionability, determining whether a mutation is targetable by an existing drug or eligible for a clinical trial.

The output of this process is a molecular diagnostic report that is itself a cornerstone of evidence-based clinical decision-making. A report for a non-small cell lung carcinoma biopsy, for example, will detail the presence or absence of mutations in genes like EGFR, ALK, ROS1, BRAF, and KRAS, among others. The MLS ensures this report clearly states the therapeutic implications, citing relevant clinical guidelines and FDA-approved drug indications. For example, the identification of an EGFR exon 19 deletion is reported with a comment that it predicts sensitivity to EGFR tyrosine kinase inhibitors like osimertinib, directly linking laboratory evidence to a specific, life-prolonging treatment option [43]. Similarly, in pharmacogenomics, MLS professionals interpret genetic variants in genes like CYP2C19 or VKORC1 to guide dosing of clopidogrel or warfarin, moving from a trial-and-error approach to a precision dosing model based on individual metabolism. This interpretative reporting transforms a complex molecular profile into a clear, clinically directive document.

Beyond inherited and somatic genetics, the scope of precision medicine extends to other "omics" and advanced protein analyses. MLS professionals in clinical chemistry and immunology enable precision medicine through therapeutic drug monitoring (TDM) and the measurement of novel biomarkers. TDM, using techniques like liquid chromatography-tandem mass spectrometry (LC-MS/MS), allows for the precise adjustment of drug doses (e.g., antibiotics, immunosuppressants, antiepileptics) based on individual pharmacokinetics, maximizing efficacy and minimizing toxicity [44]. In oncology, the measurement of serum proteins like PD-L1 via immunohistochemistry or circulating tumor DNA (ctDNA) via liquid biopsy requires expert interpretation to guide immunotherapy or monitor minimal residual disease. The MLS evaluates the technical aspects of these assays and provides the quantitative or qualitative result within its clinical context, determining biomarker positivity based on validated scoring algorithms.

The enabling role of the MLS in this domain is inherently collaborative. They function as vital consultants within multidisciplinary tumor boards and molecular review committees. In these forums, they explain the technical limitations of the tests (e.g., detection thresholds, tissue requirements), clarify the significance of VUS results, and recommend potential follow-up testing strategies. This collaborative dialogue ensures that molecular evidence is not misinterpreted and that its integration into the patient's care plan is scientifically sound [45].

Bridging the Gap: Effective Communication and Collaboration in Multidisciplinary Teams

The generation of accurate, interpretative, and high-quality laboratory evidence, while fundamental, does not automatically translate into optimal patient care. The final and perhaps most critical step in the contribution of the Medical Laboratory Specialist (MLS) to evidence-based clinical decision-making is the effective translation of this evidence across the interface between the laboratory and the clinic. Historically, a professional and physical silo has existed, where the laboratory was viewed as a remote "black box" producing data, and the clinician as the sole interpreter and actor. Modern healthcare models, particularly those centered on complex conditions like cancer, infectious diseases, and metabolic disorders, dismantle these silos through Multidisciplinary Teams (MDTs). Within this framework, the MLS emerges as an essential bridge, actively collaborating to ensure laboratory evidence is not just reported but is dynamically integrated, contextualized, and applied within the holistic patient narrative. This collaborative integration is the capstone of the evidence-based practice cycle, transforming isolated data points into coherent diagnostic and therapeutic stories [46].

The most structured forum for this collaboration is the formal Multidisciplinary Team Meeting, such as a tumor board, transplant committee, or infection control panel. Active participation in these meetings represents a paradigm shift for the MLS from a supporting role to a core deliberative one. Here, the MLS presents and interprets laboratory findings in real-time, fielding questions and providing crucial context that is absent from a static report. For example, in an oncology MDT, the molecular specialist does not merely state that an NPM1 mutation was detected; they explain its prognostic significance in acute myeloid leukemia, discuss the assay's sensitivity in detecting minimal residual disease, and clarify how the result interacts with cytogenetic findings presented by the pathologist [47]. Similarly, in a case of persistent fever of unknown origin, the clinical microbiologist can elucidate the limitations of negative blood cultures, suggest the potential value of serological or molecular tests for fastidious organisms, and advise on the interpretation of contradictory serology results. This direct, synchronous dialogue prevents the misinterpretation of complex data, ensures all team members share a common understanding of the laboratory evidence, and allows for the immediate synthesis of laboratory, radiological, and clinical findings into a unified action plan. The MLS's voice in these discussions ensures the laboratory's perspective is woven into the fabric of the decision, making the resulting plan truly evidence-based from all angles.

Beyond formal meetings, effective bridging occurs through proactive, day-to-day consultative interactions. The laboratory consultation is a vital, often under-documented, channel of communication. When a clinician calls with a question about an unexpected result, the appropriate test for a specific clinical scenario, or the implications of an interferent, the consulting MLS engages in a sophisticated form of knowledge translation. They must rapidly synthesize their deep understanding of assay principles, disease pathophysiology, and the patient's clinical context (as provided) to offer evidence-based guidance. This could involve recommending a reflex test, explaining the kinetics of a biomarker like procalcitonin in sepsis to guide antibiotic duration, or advising on the differential diagnosis suggested by a complex protein electrophoresis pattern [48]. These consultations are teachable moments that build clinical trust, educate ordering providers on optimal test utilization, and directly steer individual patient management in real-time. By being accessible and communicative experts, MLS professionals break down the perceived barrier of the laboratory wall, positioning themselves as diagnostic partners.

However, collaboration is a two-way street that also requires the MLS to be an effective educator and a steward of health system resources. Misordering and misinterpretation of tests are significant sources of diagnostic error and waste. The MLS bridges this gap by leading educational initiatives for clinical staff, developing clear, accessible test guidelines, and collaborating on the design of electronic order entry systems. By embedding evidence-based algorithms and interpretive comments into the laboratory information system (LIS) and electronic health record (EHR), the MLS guides appropriate test selection at the point of order. For instance, implementing a diagnostic algorithm for suspected C. difficile infection that reflexively sequences equivocal toxin results can standardize care and improve diagnostic accuracy across all clinical services [49]. Furthermore, participation in antimicrobial stewardship programs is a premier example of collaborative bridging. The MLS provides critical data on local resistance patterns (antibiograms) and rapid diagnostic results, while infectious disease pharmacists and physicians enact treatment changes. This team-based approach, fueled by laboratory evidence, improves patient outcomes, reduces antimicrobial resistance, and lowers healthcare costs [50]. Such initiatives demonstrate that effective communication is not merely about transmitting information but about designing systems that foster shared understanding and evidence-based behaviors.

The barriers to effective bridging are nonetheless significant and must be acknowledged to be overcome. These include persistent professional hierarchies that undervalue the MLS's clinical insight, geographic separation from clinical units, overwhelming clinical workloads that limit time for consultation, and information system barriers where the LIS and EHR do not communicate seamlessly [51]. Furthermore, differences in professional vocabulary can lead to misunderstandings. To overcome these challenges, intentional strategies are required. Cultivating an institutional culture that values laboratory input is paramount. This can be fostered by MLS leaders advocating for and securing mandatory seats on key clinical committees and MDTs. Developing structured communication tools, such standardized critical value reporting protocols and structured consultation request forms, can improve efficiency and clarity. Perhaps most importantly, fostering interpersonal relationships through joint rounds, shared educational sessions, and cross-training builds the mutual respect and shared mental models that are the bedrock of high-functioning teams [52].

Technology, while sometimes a barrier, also offers powerful tools for bridging the gap. Secure messaging platforms integrated into the EHR allow for asynchronous, documented consultations. Clinical Decision Support (CDS) systems, co-designed by MLS and clinical informaticians, can push evidence-based interpretive guidance directly to clinicians at the moment of result review. Digital dashboards that display real-time laboratory metrics, such as contamination rates for blood cultures, can spark collaborative quality improvement projects between the laboratory and clinical wards [53].

Advancing the Evidence Base: Research, Test Development, and Health Technology Assessment

The contribution of the Medical Laboratory Specialist (MLS) to evidence-based clinical decision-making extends far beyond the operational delivery of routine testing. A profound, yet frequently understated, dimension of their role lies in their active participation in the creation, validation, and critical evaluation of the diagnostic evidence base itself. Through engagement in biomedical research, the meticulous development and validation of novel assays, and participation in health technology assessment (HTA), MLS professionals function as key architects of the very tools and knowledge that underpin modern medicine. This proactive involvement ensures that the laboratory's evolution is not merely reactive to clinical trends but is a driving force in generating robust, translatable scientific evidence that expands diagnostic possibilities and refines therapeutic pathways [54]. In this capacity, the MLS moves from being a consumer of published evidence to a direct generator and guardian of new knowledge, solidifying the laboratory's position as an engine of innovation within the healthcare system.

A primary avenue for this contribution is through active involvement in clinical and translational research. MLS professionals are uniquely positioned at the intersection of basic science and clinical practice, making them ideal collaborators in research studies. They play crucial roles in the analytical validation of novel biomarkers discovered in research laboratories. This involves designing experiments to determine a new assay's analytical sensitivity, specificity, precision, accuracy, and reportable range—the essential first step in establishing its reliability as a source of evidence [55]. For instance, in oncology trials, MLS specialists are responsible for performing and validating companion diagnostic tests that stratify patients for targeted therapies, ensuring the trial's molecular inclusion criteria are met with high fidelity. Furthermore, MLS contribute to establishing population-specific reference intervals, a fundamental type of evidence that defines the boundaries of "normal," which can vary based on age, ethnicity, and geography. Their expertise in pre-analytical variables is also vital for biorepository management, ensuring that samples collected for future research retain their analytical integrity. By authoring and co-authoring peer-reviewed publications on test performance, clinical utility, and diagnostic algorithms, MLS professionals directly feed new evidence into the scientific literature, influencing guidelines and practice standards [56]. This research engagement ensures that the transition of a promising biomarker from a research concept to a clinically validated tool is guided by rigorous laboratory science.

The formal process of in-house test development, often termed Laboratory Developed Test (LDT) or in-house assay validation, is where the MLS's role as an evidence-builder is most concentrated. In response to unmet clinical needs—such as detecting an emerging pathogen or quantifying a novel therapeutic drug—MLS professionals design, optimize, and validate new testing methodologies. This process is a comprehensive exercise in evidence generation. It begins with a thorough literature review to define the clinical need and scientific rationale. The analytical validation phase produces a wealth of data: precision studies under various conditions, interference testing, method comparison against a gold standard (if one exists), and stability assessments. Each step generates evidence about the test's performance characteristics [57]. The subsequent clinical validation phase seeks to answer whether the test provides meaningful information that improves patient outcomes. This involves studies to determine diagnostic sensitivity, specificity, and predictive values in relevant patient populations. For example, the development and validation of a rapid molecular assay for a newly identified respiratory virus by MLS staff requires not just proving it can detect the viral RNA, but also demonstrating its clinical correlation with patient symptoms and its superiority to existing diagnostic methods in terms of speed or accuracy. This end-to-end ownership of the test development lifecycle makes the MLS a direct producer of the primary evidence required for implementing new diagnostics.

Perhaps the most holistic and policy-relevant contribution is the MLS's involvement in Health Technology Assessment (HTA) for laboratory diagnostics. HTA is a multidisciplinary process that systematically evaluates the properties, effects, and impacts of a health technology, such as a new laboratory test. It addresses not just analytical and clinical validity, but also clinical utility, cost-effectiveness, and broader ethical, legal, and social implications [58]. MLS professionals provide the indispensable technical evidence at the core of this assessment. They supply critical data on the test's analytical performance, its place within the existing diagnostic pathway, and its impact on laboratory workflow and resources. More importantly, they collaborate with epidemiologists, health economists, and clinicians to help design studies that assess whether the test leads to better health outcomes—such as reduced mortality, shorter hospital stays, or improved quality of life—compared to the current standard of care.

This evaluative role is essential in an era of rapid innovation and constrained healthcare budgets. A new test with excellent analytical sensitivity may be prohibitively expensive or may lead to overdiagnosis without improving patient management. The MLS, with their deep understanding of test limitations and result interpretation, is crucial for defining the appropriate use criteria and identifying potential risks of misuse. For example, in evaluating a new high-sensitivity troponin assay, the MLS contributes evidence not only on its improved low-end detection but also on the implications for clinical workflow, the need for new diagnostic cut-offs, and the potential for increased hospital admissions, thus informing a balanced assessment of its net clinical benefit [59]. By participating in HTA, MLS professionals ensure that the adoption of new technologies is driven by a comprehensive evidence base that considers value, not just technical prowess, thereby guiding sustainable and effective innovation.

The commitment to advancing the evidence base also manifests in continuous improvement and post-market surveillance of existing tests. MLS professionals monitor the real-world performance of assays through quality indicator programs and proficiency testing. They investigate discrepancies and emerging patterns, such as a shift in antimicrobial resistance profiles or the detection of a new variant causing assay interference. This vigilance often leads to iterative refinements of testing protocols or the identification of the need for new tests, sparking new cycles of development and validation. Furthermore, they contribute to systematic reviews and meta-analyses in laboratory medicine, synthesizing global evidence to establish best practices [60].

Conclusion

In conclusion, the contribution of the Medical Laboratory Specialist to evidence-based clinical decision-making is profound, systemic, and indispensable. This research demonstrates that their role transcends the operational generation of test results to encompass the full continuum of evidence stewardship. As guardians, they ensure the foundational integrity of all diagnostic data. As interpreters and consultants, they unlock the clinical meaning embedded within complex laboratory findings, guiding differential diagnosis and therapeutic pathways. As collaborators, they bridge the traditional gap between the laboratory and the clinic, ensuring evidence is dynamically integrated into patient care within multidisciplinary teams. As enablers of precision medicine, they provide the expertise necessary to implement personalized, genomics-driven healthcare. Finally, as researchers and evaluators, they actively participate in expanding and refining the very evidence base upon which modern medicine relies.

The evolving healthcare landscape, marked by increasing diagnostic complexity, emphasis on personalized care, and the imperative for value-based outcomes, demands this expanded paradigm of the MLS role. Recognizing and formally integrating the MLS as a diagnostic partner, rather than a supporting service, is crucial for optimizing patient outcomes and healthcare system efficiency. This requires continued investment in advanced education for MLS, fostering interdisciplinary training, designing digital health systems that facilitate collaboration, and promoting leadership roles for MLS in clinical and operational committees. Ultimately, the path to fully realized evidence-based practice is inextricably linked to leveraging the complete scientific, interpretative, and consultative expertise of the Medical Laboratory Specialist, solidifying their position as a cornerstone of safe, effective, and patient-centered care.

References:

1. Hallworth MJ, Epner PL, Ebert C, Fantz CR, Higgins TN, Kilpatrick ES, et al. IFCC Task Force on the Impact of Laboratory Medicine on Clinical Management and Outcomes. Current evidence and future perspectives on the effective practice of patient-centered laboratory medicine. Clin Chem. 2015;61:589–9. 10.1373/clinchem.2014.232629
2. World Health Organization. Cardiovascular diseases (CVDs) factsheet. Available at: https://www.who.int/en/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/cardiovascular-diseases-(cvds). Accessed April 26th 2020.
3. Khanji MY, Bicalho VVS, van Waardhuizen CN, Ferket BS, Petersen SE, Hunink MGM. Cardiovascular risk assessment. A systematic review of guidelines. Ann Intern Med. 2016;165:713–22. 10.7326/M16-1110
4. Rohr UP, Binder C, Dieterle T, Giusti F, Messina CGM, Toerien E, et al. The value of in vitro diagnostic testing in medical practice: a status report. PLoS One. 2016;11:e0149856. 10.1371/journal.pone.0149856
5. American College of Cardiology guidelines. Available at: https://www.acc.org/guidelines#doctype=Guidelines. Accessed April 23rd 2020.
6. Benjamin EJ, Muntner P, Alonso A, Bittencourt MS, Callaway CW, Carson AP, et al. American Heart Association Council on Epidemiology and Prevention Statistics Committee and Stroke Statistics Subcommittee Heart disease and stroke statistics - 2019 update: a report from the American Heart Association. Circulation. 2019;139:e56–528. 10.1161/CIR.0000000000000659
7. European Society of Cardiology Clinical guidelines. Available at: https://www.escardio.org/Guidelines/Clinical-Practice-Guidelines. Accessed April 23rd 2020.
8. Bhatnagar P, Wickramasinghe K, Williams J, Rayner M, Townsend N. The epidemiology of cardiovascular disease in the UK 2014. Heart. 2015;101:1182–9. 10.1136/heartjnl-2015-307516
9. The Australian Heart Foundation clinical information. Available at: https://www.heartfoundation.org.au/for-professionals/clinical-information/. Accessed April 23rd 2020.
10. National Institute for Health and Care Excellence Guidance and advice list. Available at: https://www.nice.org.uk/guidance/published?type=apg,csg,cg,mpg,ph,sg,sc,dg,hst,ipg,mtg,qs,ta. Accessed April 23rd 2020.
11. World Health Organization. Cardiovascular diseases (CVDs) factsheet. Available at: https://www.who.int/en/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/cardiovascular-diseases-(cvds). Accessed April 26th 2020.
12. Hallworth MJ. The “70% claim”: what is the evidence base? Ann Clin Biochem. 2011;48:487–8. 10.1258/acb.2011.011177
13. Hallworth MJ, Epner PL, Ebert C, Fantz CR, Higgins TN, Kilpatrick ES, et al. IFCC Task Force on the Impact of Laboratory Medicine on Clinical Management and Outcomes. Current evidence and future perspectives on the effective practice of patient-centered laboratory medicine. Clin Chem. 2015;61:589–9. 10.1373/clinchem.2014.232629
14. Becich MJ. Information management: moving from test results to clinical information. Clin Leadersh Manag Rev. 2000;14:296–300.
15. Sikaris KA. Enhancing the clinical value of medical laboratory testing. Clin Biochem Rev. 2017;38:107–14. [PMC free article] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
16. Epner PL, Gans JE, Graber ML. When diagnostic testing leads to harm: a new outcomes-based approach for laboratory medicine. BMJ Qual Saf. 2013;22(Suppl 2):ii6–ii10. doi: 10.1136/bmjqs-2012-001621. [DOI] [PMC free article] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]

17. Porter ME. What is value in health care? N Engl J Med. 2010;363:2477–81. doi: 10.1056/NEJMp1011024. [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
18. Epner PL. Appraising laboratory quality and value: What's missing? Clin Biochem. 2017;50:622–4. doi: 10.1016/j.clinbiochem.2017.04.013. [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
19. St John A, Edwards G, Fisher S, Badrick T, Callahan J. Crothers J. A call for a value based approach to laboratory medicine funding. Clin Biochem. 2015;48:823–6. doi: 10.1016/j.clinbiochem.2015.07.024. [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
20. Hallworth MJ, Epner PL, Ebert C, Fantz CR, Faye SA, Higgins TN, et al. IFCC Task Force on the Impact of Laboratory Medicine on Clinical Management and Outcomes. Current evidence and future perspectives on the effective practice of patient-centered laboratory medicine. Clin Chem. 2015;61:589–99. doi: 10.1373/clinchem.2014.232629. [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
21. Rohr UP, Binder C, Dieterle T, Giusti F, Messina CGM, Toerien E, et al. The value of in vitro diagnostic testing in medical practice: a status report. PLoS One. 2016;11:e0149856. 10.1371/journal.pone.0149856 [DOI] [PMC free article] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
22. Lundberg GD. The need for an outcomes research agenda for clinical laboratory testing. JAMA. 1998;280:565–6. doi: 10.1001/jama.280.6.565. [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
23. Roland M, Sibbald B, McDonald R. Care closer to home. Moving care. Health Serv J. 2007;117(Suppl):6–8. [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
24. Braga F, Infusino I, Panteghini M. Performance criteria for combined uncertainty budget in the implementation of metrological traceability. Clin Chem Lab Med. 2015;53 doi: 10.1515/cclm-2014-1240. in press. [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
25. Panteghini M. Traceability as a unique tool to improve standardization in laboratory medicine. Clin Biochem. 2009;42:236–40. doi: 10.1016/j.clinbiochem.2008.09.098. [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
26. Thienpont LM, Van Uytfanghe K, Rodriguez Cabaleiro D. Metrological traceability of calibration in the estimation and use of common medical decision-making criteria. Clin Chem Lab Med. 2004;42:842–50. doi: 10.1515/CCLM.2004.138. [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
27. Braga F, Panteghini M. Verification of in vitro medical diagnostics (IVD) metrological traceability: Responsibilities and strategies. Clin Chim Acta. 2014;432:55–61. doi: 10.1016/j.cca.2013.11.022. [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
28. Panteghini M, Ceriotti F. Obtaining reference intervals traceable to reference measurement systems: is it possible, who is responsible, what is the strategy? Clin Chem Lab Med. 2012;50:813–7. doi: 10.1515/cclm.2011.828. [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
29. Panteghini M. Application of traceability concepts to analytical quality control may reconcile total error with uncertainty of measurement. Clin Chem Lab Med. 2010;48:7–10. doi: 10.1515/CCLM.2010.020. [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
30. Panteghini M. Implementation of standardization in clinical practice: not always an easy task. Clin Chem Lab Med. 2012;50:1237–41. doi: 10.1515/cclm.2011.791. [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
31. Kallner A. Measurement performance goals: How they can be estimated and a view to managing them. Scand J Clin Lab Invest. 2010;70(Suppl 242):34–9. doi: 10.3109/00365513.2010.493364. [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
32. Petersen PH, Fraser CG, Kallner A, Kenny D. Strategies to set global analytical quality specifications in laboratory medicine. Scand J Clin Lab Invest. 1999;59:475–585. [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
33. Sandberg S, Fraser C, Horvath AR, Jansen R, Jones G, Oosterhuis W, et al. Defining analytical performance specifications: Consensus Statement from the 1st Strategic Conference of the European Federation of Clinical Chemistry and Laboratory Medicine. Clin Chem Lab Med. 2015;53 doi: 10.1515/cclm-2015-0067. in press. [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
34. Bossuyt X, Louche C, Wiik A. Standardisation in clinical laboratory medicine: an ethical reflection. Ann Rheum Dis. 2008;67:1061–3. doi: 10.1136/ard.2007.084228. [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
35. Florkowski C, Don-Wauchope A, Gimenez N, Rodriguez-Capote K, Wils J, Zemlin A. Point-of-care testing (POCT) and evidence-based laboratory medicine (EBLM) – does it leverage any advantage in

clinical decision making? Crit Rev Clin Lab Sci. 2017;54:471–94. doi: 10.1080/10408363.2017.1399336. [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]

36. Speiser PW, Arlt W, Auchus RJ, Baskin LS, Conway GS, Merke DP, et al. Congenital adrenal hyperplasia due to steroid 21-hydroxylase deficiency: an Endocrine Society Clinical Practice Guideline [published correction appears in J Clin Endocrinol Metab. 2019;104:39–40] J Clin Endocrinol Metab. 2018;103:4043–88. doi: 10.1210/jc.2018-01865. [DOI] [PMC free article] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
37. Djulbegovic B, Guyatt G. Evidence vs consensus in clinical practice guidelines. J Am Med Assoc. 2019;322:725–6. doi: 10.1001/jama.2019.9751. [DOI] [PMC free article] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
38. Duffy MJ, Harbeck N, Nap M, Molina R, Nicolini A, Senkus E, et al. Clinical use of biomarkers in breast cancer: updated guidelines from the European Group on Tumor Markers (EGTM) Eur J Canc. 2017;75:284–98. doi: 10.1016/j.ejca.2017.01.017. [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
39. Gracia García S, Giménez Gómez N, Ruiz Mínguez A. Medicina basada en la evidencia – guías de práctica clínica. Bioquímica Patol Clínica. 2006;69:34–7. [Google Scholar]
40. Rabi DM, Kunneman M, Montori VM. When guidelines recommend shared decision-making. J Am Med Assoc. 2020;323:1345–6. doi: 10.1001/jama.2020.1525. [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
41. Wells SA, Asa SL, Dralle H, Elisei R, Evans DB, Gagel RF, et al. Revised American Thyroid Association guidelines for the management of medullary thyroid carcinoma. Thyroid. 2015;25:567–610. doi: 10.1089/thy.2014.0335. [DOI] [PMC free article] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
42. Institute of Medicine (U.S.A) Graham R, Mancher M, Wolman DM, Greenfield S, Steinberg E. Clinical practice guidelines we can trust. Washington, D.C: The National Academies Press; 2011. Committee on standards for developing trustworthy clinical practice guidelines. Available from: [Accessed 6 Jul 2020] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
43. Braga F, Panteghini M. Verification of in vitro medical diagnostics (IVD) metrological traceability: Responsibilities and strategies. Clin Chim Acta. 2014;432:55–61. doi: 10.1016/j.cca.2013.11.022. [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
44. Panteghini M. Traceability as a unique tool to improve standardization in laboratory medicine. Clin Biochem. 2009;42:236–40. doi: 10.1016/j.clinbiochem.2008.09.098. [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
45. Panteghini M. Application of traceability concepts to analytical quality control may reconcile total error with uncertainty of measurement. Clin Chem Lab Med. 2010;48:7–10. doi: 10.1515/CCLM.2010.020. [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
46. Dempsey C, Skoglund E, Muldrew KL, Garey KW. Economic health care costs of blood culture contamination: a systematic review. Am J Infect Contr 2019;47:963–7. [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
47. Nathwani D, Varghese D, Stephens J, Ansari W, Martin S, Charbonneau C. Value of hospital antimicrobial stewardship programs [ASPs]: a systematic review. Antimicrob Resist Infect Contr 2019;8:35. [DOI] [PMC free article] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
48. Plebani M, Laposata M, Lundberg GD. The brain-to-brain loop concept for laboratory testing 40 years after its introduction. Am J Clin Pathol 2011;136:829–33. [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
49. Snider SR, Favoretto AM, Baetz RA, Derzon JH, Madison BM, Mass D, et al. Effectiveness of practices to reduce blood culture contamination: a Laboratory Medicine Best Practices systematic review and meta-analysis. Clin Biochem 2012;45:999–1011. [DOI] [PMC free article] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
50. Morgan DJ, Malani P, Diekema DJ. Diagnostic stewardship-leveraging the laboratory to improve antimicrobial use. J Am Med Assoc 2017;318:607–8. [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
51. Dubrovsakaya Y, Scipione MR, Siegfried J, Jen SP, Pham V, Papadopoulos J, et al. Multilayer model of pharmacy participation in the antimicrobial stewardship program at a large academic medical center. Hosp Pharm 2017;52:628–34. [DOI] [PMC free article] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
52. Sabre Tehrani AS, Lee H, Mathews SC, Shore A, Makary MA, Pronovost PJ, et al. 25-Year summary of US malpractice claims for diagnostic errors 1986–2010: an analysis from the National Practitioner Data Bank. BMJ Qual Saf 2013;22:672–80. [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]

53. Makary MA, Daniel M. Medical error-the third leading cause of death in the US. BMJ 2016;353:i2139. [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
54. Singh H, Meyer AN, Thomas EJ. The frequency of diagnostic errors in outpatient care: estimations from three large observational studies involving US adult populations. BMJ Qual Saf 2014;23:727–31. [DOI] [PMC free article] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
55. Balogh E, Miller BT, Ball J, Institute of Medicine (U.S.), Committee on Diagnostic Error in Health Care. Improving diagnosis in health care. Washington, DC: The National Academies Press; 2015, xxvii: 444 p. [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
56. Ngo A, Gandhi P, Miller WG. Frequency that laboratory tests influence medical decision. J Appl Lab Med 2017;1:410–7. [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
57. Lundberg GD. Acting on significant laboratory results. J Am Med Assoc 1981;245:1762–3. [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
58. Epner PL, Gans JE, Graber ML. When diagnostic testing leads to harm: a new outcomes-based approach for laboratory medicine. BMJ Qual Saf 2013;22(2 Suppl):ii6–ii10. [DOI] [PMC free article] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
59. Rennert-May E, Chew DS, Conly J, Guirguis M, Slobodan J, Fryters S, et al. Clinical practice guidelines for creating an acute care hospital-based antimicrobial stewardship program: a systematic review. Am J Infect Contr 2019;47:979–93. [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
60. Braga F, Panteghini M. Standardization and analytical goals for glycated haemoglobin measurement. Clin Chem Lab Med. 2013;51:1719–26. doi: 10.1515/cclm-2013-0060. [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]