The Review Of
DIABETIC
STUDIES OPEN ACCESS

The Impact Of Nursing Care Quality On Patient Safety And Clinical Outcomes

Maram Zafer Abdulrhman Arwan[1] , Amna Shaman Al _Azmi[2] , Shahad Abdulkarim A Dael[3] , Tahani Nayef Al-Rashidi[4] , Nouf Radi Al-Harbi[5] , Nuha Meshal Algubiwi -Alotaibi[6] , Huda Ali Marzoq Al Shamrani[7] , Raji Hamadan Raji Albanaqi[8] , Abdullah Jamaan Abdullah Albishi[9] , Mona Mageed Salamah Altrfawe[10] , Khuloud Fahad Sultan Albishi[11] , Hidayah Nasser Saad Al Muhlfi[12] , Mohammed Ali Abdullah Al-Suwaid[13] , Mohammed Ibrahim Abdullah Ababtain[14] , Bander Hussan Almutery[15]

[1]NURSING TECHNICIAN, BADR (91) HEALTH CENTER, DAMMAM
[2]Technician-Nursing, Al-Qassim King Fahd Specialist Hospital, Shamal Alsafra Health Center
[3]Technician-Nursing, King Saud Medical City, Riyadh
[4]Nurse, Al-Rayan Al-Gharbi Health Center, Al-Qassim
[5]Nurse, Al-Qassim King Fahd Specialist Hospital, Al-Rayyan Al-Gharbi Health Center
[6]Nursing Specialist, King Saudi Medical City, Riyadh First Health Cluster (R1), Riyadh
[7]Nursing Technician, AlQunfdah, Doga Al thania
[8]Male Nurse, General Rafha Hospital, North Zone
[9]Nursing Specialist, Psychiatric and Long Term Care Hospital Aseer Health Cluster of Bisha Zone, Bisha
[10]Nursing technician, Al-Owaiqila Hospital, Northern Borders
[11]Nurse, Women and Children Health, Aseer Health Cluster
[12]Nursing Specialist, Health Center Mukatat, Asser -Bisha
[13]Nursing Technician, Buraidah Central Hospital, Al-Sadah Health Center, Buraidah, Al-Qassim
[14]Nursing Technician, Buraidah Central Hospital, Al-Sadah Health Center, Buraidah, Al-Qassim
[15]Nurse, King Faisal District Primary Health Care Center, Riyadh

Abstract

This comprehensive research paper examines the critical and multifaceted relationship between the quality of nursing care, patient safety, and clinical outcomes. It argues that nursing care is a primary, rather than supportive, determinant of healthcare effectiveness. The analysis is structured using the Donabedian model (Structure-Process-Outcome) to explore how foundational structural pillars—including nurse staffing levels, educational preparation, and the practice work environment—enable safe and effective nursing processes. These processes, such as clinical surveillance, care coordination, therapeutic communication, and patient education, are identified as direct mechanisms for preventing adverse events like healthcare-associated infections, falls, and medication errors. The paper synthesizes a substantial body of empirical evidence demonstrating that superior nursing care quality is consistently associated with improved outcomes, including reduced patient mortality and failure-to-rescue rates, lower readmissions, shorter hospital stays, and higher patient satisfaction. Ultimately, the paper concludes that strategic, integrated investment in nursing structures and processes is an essential imperative for building safer, more effective, and sustainable healthcare systems, translating into significant clinical and economic returns.

Keywords Nursing Care Quality; Patient Safety; Clinical Outcomes; Nurse Staffing; Patient-to-Nurse Ratio; Nursing Education; Work Environment; Nursing Surveillance; Care Coordination; Patient Education; Healthcare-Associated Infections; Evidence-Based Practice.

Introduction

The pursuit of high-quality healthcare is a fundamental goal of every health system worldwide, with its core objectives being the effective treatment of illness, the alleviation of suffering, and, above all, the

imperative to "first, do no harm." Within this complex ecosystem, nursing care constitutes the largest component of the healthcare workforce and represents the most continuous point of contact for patients throughout their care journey. Consequently, the quality of nursing care emerges as a pivotal, if not the most critical, determinant in shaping patient experiences, ensuring their safety, and ultimately influencing clinical outcomes. This research paper delves into the profound and multi-faceted relationship between nursing care quality, patient safety, and clinical outcomes. It posits that superior nursing care is not merely a supportive service but a primary driver in preventing adverse events, promoting recovery, and achieving optimal health results for patients across all care settings.

The global burden of patient harm within healthcare settings is staggering. The World Health Organization (WHO) estimates that millions of patients suffer injuries or die annually due to unsafe care, with a significant proportion of these incidents being preventable [1]. These adverse events range from healthcare-associated infections (HAIs) and medication errors to patient falls and pressure injuries, each carrying substantial human and economic costs. In this context, patient safety—defined as the prevention of errors and adverse effects to patients associated with healthcare—becomes a non-negotiable benchmark for quality [2]. Nursing, by virtue of its 24/7 presence, surveillance role, and direct responsibility for fundamental care processes, is uniquely positioned to act as the final safeguard against these threats. From accurate medication administration and meticulous sterile technique to vigilant monitoring of a patient's changing condition, nursing interventions are the operational bedrock of safety protocols.

However, the concept of nursing care quality extends beyond the mere absence of harm. It encompasses a broader spectrum of attributes defined by structures, processes, and outcomes. Structurally, it involves factors such as nurse staffing levels, skill mix, education, and the practice environment [3]. Process-related quality refers to the actual delivery of care, including the technical competence of interventions (e.g., wound care, assessment skills) and the profoundly important aspect of relational care—communication, empathy, respect, and patient education [4]. These processes directly feed into outcomes, which are the end results of care for the patient, including clinical endpoints (e.g., mortality, complication rates), functional status, and patient-reported outcomes such as satisfaction and health-related quality of life [5].

The theoretical and empirical linkages between these elements are robust. The Donabedian model (Structure-Process-Outcome) provides a classic framework for understanding this relationship, where adequate staffing (structure) enables timely monitoring and intervention (process), thereby reducing failure-to-rescue events and mortality (outcome) [6]. Furthermore, the theory of fundamental care emphasizes the integration of physical, psychosocial, and relational elements, arguing that neglecting any dimension compromises patient safety and recovery [7]. Empirical evidence strongly supports these connections. Seminal research, such as that by Aiken et al., has consistently demonstrated that hospitals with better nurse work environments and lower patient-to-nurse ratios have significantly lower rates of patient mortality, failure-to-rescue, and nurse burnout [8]. For instance, a meta-analysis confirmed that each additional patient per nurse was associated with a 7% increase in the likelihood of patient mortality [9].

The mechanisms through which nursing quality impacts safety and outcomes are numerous. Surveillance and Early Detection: Nurses are the constant observers at the bedside. Their clinical judgment and systematic assessment are crucial for the early recognition of patient deterioration, allowing for prompt intervention before a condition becomes critical or fatal—a concept central to preventing "failure to rescue" [10]. Execution of Core Safety Interventions: Many evidence-based safety practices are almost exclusively within the nursing domain. These include meticulous hand hygiene and catheter care to prevent HAIs, comprehensive fall risk assessment and prevention strategies, and the "Five Rights" of medication administration to prevent errors. The consistency and diligence with which these processes are carried out are direct functions of nursing quality. Care Coordination and Communication: Nurses act as the hub of the interdisciplinary team, translating and communicating critical information between physicians, pharmacists, therapists, and patients. Breakdowns in nursing communication are a well-documented root cause of sentinel events [11]. High-quality nursing ensures clear, accurate, and timely handoffs and

advocacy for the patient. Provision of Fundamental Care: Often termed "basic" care, activities like assisting with mobility, ensuring nutrition and hydration, managing elimination, and maintaining skin integrity are foundational to recovery. Poor performance in these areas directly leads to negative outcomes like pressure ulcers, deconditioning, and malnutrition, which in turn increase vulnerability to infections and other complications [7]. Patient Engagement and Education: Educated, empowered patients are safer partners in their own care. Nurses play the primary role in teaching patients about their medications, warning signs of complications, and self-management strategies, which reduces readmissions and improves long-term outcomes for chronic conditions [12].

Despite this compelling evidence, challenges in measuring, standardizing, and consistently delivering high-quality nursing care persist. Variations in practice, workforce shortages, burnout, and resource constraints create significant gaps between the known standards of quality and the care delivered in many settings. This gap represents a critical risk to patient safety and population health. Therefore, a deeper investigation into the specific components of nursing care quality, their measurable impact on a range of safety indicators and clinical outcomes, and the contextual factors that modulate this impact is of paramount importance for healthcare leaders, policymakers, and practitioners [12].

Defining the Core Concepts: Nursing Care Quality, Patient Safety, and Clinical Outcomes

A rigorous examination of the impact of nursing care on healthcare delivery must begin with a precise and operational definition of its core constituent concepts. The terms "nursing care quality," "patient safety," and "clinical outcomes" are frequently used, yet their specific dimensions, measurements, and interrelationships require careful elucidation. Establishing this conceptual clarity is not merely an academic exercise; it is the essential foundation for meaningful research, effective policy-making, and targeted quality improvement initiatives. This section, therefore, delves into the multifaceted definitions of these three pivotal concepts, framing them within established theoretical models to demonstrate their inherent interconnectedness and setting the stage for a detailed analysis of their causal linkages.

Nursing Care Quality: A Multidimensional Construct

Nursing care quality is not a singular entity but a complex, multidimensional construct evaluated through the lenses of structure, process, and outcome—a paradigm immortalized by Avedis Donabedian [13]. This framework provides the most enduring and comprehensive model for understanding and assessing quality in healthcare. Structural quality refers to the relatively stable characteristics of the healthcare system and the resources available to nurses. This includes the number and mix of nursing staff (staffing levels and skill mix), the educational and certification qualifications of the nurses, the managerial structure, the availability of technology and equipment, and the overall organizational environment in which care is delivered. Research consistently identifies these structural elements, particularly nurse staffing and the practice environment, as fundamental prerequisites for high-quality care [14].

Process quality, the second dimension, encompasses the totality of activities carried out by nurses during their interactions with patients. It is bifurcated into technical and interpersonal processes. Technical processes involve the competent execution of clinical tasks: accurate physical assessment, skillful medication administration, proficient wound care, and timely monitoring of vital signs. Interpersonal processes, equally critical, relate to the nature of the nurse-patient relationship and include effective communication, empathy, respect for patient preferences, patient education, and emotional support [15]. High-quality processes are those that are evidence-based, timely, patient-centered, and delivered consistently. Finally, outcome quality, the third dimension, refers to the effects of nursing care on the patient and will be discussed in greater detail below. In essence, Donabedian’s model posits that good structures increase the likelihood of good processes, which in turn increase the likelihood of good outcomes.

Patient Safety: The Minimization of Harm

Patient safety is a specific and crucial subset of healthcare quality. The Institute of Medicine (IOM) defined it famously as "the prevention of harm to patients" and, more specifically, "the freedom from accidental or preventable injuries produced by medical care" [16]. This definition shifts the focus from the inherent risks of disease to the avoidable risks introduced by the healthcare system itself. Patient safety emphasizes the creation of systems and cultures that prevent errors, capture them before they cause harm, and mitigate the impact of unavoidable adverse events. Common indicators of patient safety failures, often termed "nurse-sensitive indicators," include healthcare-associated infections (e.g., central line-associated bloodstream infections, catheter-associated urinary tract infections), pressure injuries (bedsores), patient falls with injury, medication administration errors, and failure-to-rescue (the inability to prevent death after a complication) [17].

Crucially, safety is not solely the absence of these negative events but also the presence of a proactive, reporting-rich culture where near-misses are analyzed to prevent future harm. It is intrinsically linked to nursing process quality; a medication error is a direct failure of the medication administration process, while a pressure injury often signals a failure in the processes of regular repositioning and skin assessment. Therefore, patient safety can be viewed as a primary and non-negotiable outcome of effective nursing care processes, heavily dependent on supportive structures.

Clinical Outcomes: The End Results of Care

Clinical outcomes are the measurable changes in health status, behavior, or knowledge that result from healthcare interventions. They represent the "end products" of the care provided and serve as the ultimate validator of its quality and safety. Outcomes can be categorized in several ways. Final health status outcomes are the most definitive and include mortality (death rates), morbidity (complication rates, disease incidence), and physiological measures of disease control (e.g., blood pressure, HbA1c levels). Intermediate outcomes are often process-linked results that contribute to final status, such as the rate of surgical site infections or the incidence of deep vein thrombosis.

In contemporary healthcare evaluation, the scope of relevant outcomes has expanded significantly beyond traditional biomedical endpoints. Patient-Reported Outcomes (PROs) have become paramount, capturing the patient's own perspective on their health. These include health-related quality of life (HRQoL), symptom burden (e.g., pain, fatigue), functional status (the ability to perform activities of daily living), and patient satisfaction with care [18]. From a nursing perspective, many outcomes are particularly "sensitive" to the quality and quantity of nursing care. Nurse-sensitive outcomes are those that improve, deteriorate, or remain stable based on the interventions and performance of nursing staff [19]. Examples include the prevalence of hospital-acquired pressure ulcers, falls, catheter-associated urinary tract infections, and the rate of failure-to-rescue. Furthermore, outcomes like patient knowledge of their condition, adherence to treatment plans, and self-management capability are deeply influenced by the quality of nursing education and support.

Synthesizing the Concepts: An Interdependent Triad

The interconnection between these three concepts is explicit and dynamic. They form an interdependent triad where each element informs and is informed by the others. Nursing care quality (structure and process) is the independent variable or the "engine" driving change. Patient safety is both a critical, immediate outcome of quality processes and a necessary condition for achieving positive longer-term clinical outcomes. One cannot achieve good clinical outcomes in an unsafe care environment. Conversely, negative clinical outcomes, such as a postoperative infection, are themselves indicators of a safety failure and a deficit in care quality.

The Donabedian model provides the clearest pathway for this relationship: adequate nurse staffing and a positive work environment (structure) enable nurses to perform thorough assessments, provide timely education, and maintain vigilant surveillance (processes). These effective processes directly prevent

medication errors, detect early signs of sepsis, and mobilize patients promptly (enhancing safety), which consequently leads to lower mortality, shorter hospital stays, better functional recovery, and higher patient satisfaction (improved outcomes) [20]. Conversely, poor structures (e.g., understaffing, chaotic environments) lead to rushed, fragmented, or omitted care processes (e.g., missed turns, abbreviated teaching). These compromised processes increase the risk of safety incidents (e.g., falls, infections), which manifest as worse clinical outcomes (e.g., injury, prolonged illness, death) [21].

Moreover, outcomes data feed back into the system to redefine structures and processes, completing the quality improvement cycle. For instance, a high rate of hospital-readmissions for heart failure (a negative outcome) may lead to a structural investment in dedicated nurse-led discharge coordinators and the implementation of a new, standardized patient education process [22].

The Structural Pillars: How Nurse Staffing, Education, and Work Environment Form the Bedrock of Quality

Within the Donabedian framework, structural elements constitute the foundational inputs and conditions that make the delivery of high-quality care possible. These are the relatively stable, organizational characteristics that either enable or constrain nursing practice. Among these, three interdependent pillars stand out as particularly critical: nurse staffing, nursing education, and the practice work environment. These structural components do not directly cause outcomes; rather, they create the essential preconditions that allow for the effective nursing processes which, in turn, safeguard patients and drive positive clinical results. This section examines how these pillars collectively form the non-negotiable bedrock upon which quality, safety, and outcomes are built, drawing upon a substantial body of empirical evidence.

The first and most extensively researched structural pillar is nurse staffing, typically measured by patient-to-nurse ratios, nursing hours per patient day (HPPD), and skill mix. Adequate staffing is fundamentally about having sufficient numbers of qualified nurses to meet patient needs. The causal pathway is intuitively clear and empirically robust: when nurses are responsible for fewer patients, they have the time to perform thorough assessments, complete care plans accurately, monitor for subtle signs of deterioration, respond promptly to calls, educate patients and families, and execute safety protocols without harmful shortcuts. Conversely, excessive workloads are a primary driver of process failures. Seminal research by Aiken et al. established a powerful dose-response relationship, demonstrating that each additional patient added to a nurse's workload is associated with a 7% increase in the likelihood of patient mortality within 30 days of admission and a 7% increase in nurse burnout [23]. Furthermore, higher patient loads are directly correlated with increased rates of healthcare-associated infections, patient falls, medication errors, and pressure ulcers—all core patient safety indicators [24]. The mechanism extends beyond task completion to the erosion of surveillance capacity; understaffing creates gaps in the "safety net," increasing the risk of "failure to rescue," where a patient's developing complication goes unrecognized or unaddressed until it becomes fatal [25]. Thus, staffing is not merely a budgetary line item but a decisive factor in the hospital's safety and effectiveness profile.

Closely linked to staffing numbers is the educational preparation of the nursing workforce, the second critical structural pillar. Education refers to the baseline knowledge, critical thinking skills, and clinical judgment competencies that nurses bring to the bedside. A significant body of research, pioneered by Linda Aiken and her colleagues, has consistently shown that a greater proportion of baccalaureate-prepared (BSN) nurses in a hospital's staff is associated with significantly better patient outcomes. Their landmark study found that a 10% increase in the proportion of nurses holding a BSN was associated with a 5% decrease in the odds of patient mortality and failure-to-rescue [26]. The rationale for this finding lies in the broader educational curriculum of BSN programs, which emphasizes evidence-based practice, systems thinking, leadership, public health, and advanced clinical reasoning beyond the technical skills focus of diploma programs. These competencies enable BSN-prepared nurses to better manage complexity, understand the physiological nuances of patient deterioration, coordinate care across disciplines, and implement quality improvement initiatives [27]. In essence, a more educated nursing workforce possesses a deeper and wider

knowledge base from which to make clinical decisions, anticipate problems, and navigate the increasingly complex healthcare environment, thereby enhancing both process quality and safety.

However, even optimal staffing with highly educated nurses cannot yield consistent quality if the third pillar—the practice work environment—is deficient. The work environment encompasses the organizational characteristics that either support or hinder professional nursing practice. Key elements include: managerial support and leadership, nurse participation in hospital affairs, foundations for quality of care (e.g., availability of resources and support services), collegial nurse-physician relationships, and staffing and resource adequacy (as perceived by the nurses themselves) [28]. A positive practice environment, often exemplified by Magnet®-designated hospitals, is one where nurses have autonomy over their practice, strong supportive leadership, constructive inter-professional collaboration, and adequate resources. This environment empowers nurses to practice to the full extent of their education and licensure. Research demonstrates that hospitals with better practice environments have significantly lower rates of nurse burnout and job dissatisfaction, which in turn reduces turnover and helps maintain stable, experienced staffing [29]. More importantly, positive environments directly impact patients. Studies show that favorable work environments are independently associated with lower mortality and failure-to-rescue rates, even after controlling for staffing levels and nurse education [30]. The environment acts as a moderator; it can amplify the benefits of good staffing and education or, if poor, can negate them by creating a culture of frustration, task orientation over holistic care, and moral distress.

Critically, these three structural pillars do not operate in isolation but interact in a dynamic synergy. Adequate staffing is less effective if the nurses lack the educational foundation to respond to complex situations, and both are undermined in a toxic work environment that denies nurses a voice and the tools to do their jobs. Conversely, a supportive practice environment can mitigate, to some degree, the pressures of challenging staffing situations by fostering teamwork and resilience, and it can better leverage the expertise of highly educated nurses. For example, a hospital may have excellent nurse-to-patient ratios on paper, but if communication with physicians is poor and supplies are consistently lacking (a poor environment), safety processes will break down, leading to errors and worse outcomes [31]. This interaction highlights why a singular focus on staffing ratios, while necessary, is insufficient. A holistic approach to structural quality must address all three pillars concurrently. Policies that fund increased staffing must be coupled with investments in transitioning nurses to BSN preparation and intentional leadership development to create and sustain positive practice environments.

The evidence for investing in these structural foundations is compelling from both a clinical and economic perspective. While improving staffing, education, and environment requires upfront investment, the return is realized through substantial cost avoidance. The expenses associated with treating preventable adverse events—such as prolonged hospital stays for surgical site infections, additional treatments for pressure injuries, or legal costs from errors—far outweigh the costs of employing more nurses or supporting their education [32]. Furthermore, hospitals known for excellent nursing care, as defined by these structural pillars, benefit from enhanced reputation, competitive advantage in recruiting and retaining nurses, and better performance on public report cards and value-based purchasing metrics [33].

Nursing Surveillance and the Prevention of Adverse Events: From HAIs to Patient Falls

The concept of nursing surveillance represents the active, cognitive, and dynamic process that lies at the very heart of nursing's contribution to patient safety. It is far more than periodic vital sign checks; it is a synthesized, ongoing, and purposeful acquisition, interpretation, and synthesis of patient data to inform clinical decisions and prevent harm. Defined as "the purposeful and ongoing acquisition, interpretation, and synthesis of patient data for clinical decision-making," surveillance is the essential mechanism through which nurses convert their presence at the bedside into a proactive safety intervention [34]. It is the disciplined, knowledgeable watchfulness that identifies a patient's deviation from a stable trajectory, enabling early intervention before a minor issue escalates into a catastrophic adverse event. This section examines how this critical nursing process functions as the primary defensive line against some of the most

common and costly hospital-acquired conditions: healthcare-associated infections (HAIs), medication errors, patient falls, and pressure injuries. Each of these adverse events is, to a significant degree, preventable through consistent, high-quality nursing surveillance and the execution of associated evidence-based protocols.

The prevention of healthcare-associated infections (HAIs) offers a prime example of surveillance in action, blending technical skill with constant vigilance. HAIs, such as central line-associated bloodstream infections (CLABSIs), catheter-associated urinary tract infections (CAUTIs), and surgical site infections (SSIs), are major causes of patient morbidity, increased length of stay, and mortality. Nursing surveillance is the cornerstone of prevention bundles championed by organizations like the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC). This involves not only the strict aseptic technique during insertion (a technical process) but, more critically, the ongoing surveillance of the necessity of the device. For instance, a key component of CAUTI prevention is the nurse's daily assessment and documentation of the continued need for a urinary catheter, advocating for its prompt removal when indications are no longer present [35]. Similarly, surveillance of a central line site for redness, swelling, or tenderness, coupled with meticulous dressing changes, is essential to prevent CLABSIs. This surveillance is data-driven and systematic; it requires the nurse to know the evidence-based indications for device use, to consistently inspect access sites, and to monitor systemic signs of infection like fever or leukocytosis. The failure of this surveillance process—whether due to knowledge deficits, excessive workload, or lack of empowerment to remove devices—directly translates into higher infection rates [36].

In the domain of medication safety, nursing surveillance acts as the final and most critical checkpoint in the medication administration process. The "Five Rights" (right patient, drug, dose, route, time) are a fundamental surveillance framework. However, expert surveillance extends beyond this to include clinical judgment: assessing the patient's condition prior to administration (e.g., checking blood pressure before giving an antihypertensive), monitoring for potential side effects or interactions, and evaluating the therapeutic effectiveness of the drug. Nurses are positioned to intercept prescribing errors, dispensing errors from pharmacy, and administration errors by other staff. This "defense-in-depth" relies on the nurse's pharmacological knowledge and their intimate familiarity with the patient's unique clinical picture [37]. For example, a nurse's surveillance might catch that a prescribed dose of renally excreted antibiotic has not been adjusted for a patient with newly documented low urine output, preventing potential toxicity. Automated dispensing cabinets and barcode scanning are structural aids, but they cannot replace the nurse's cognitive surveillance—their ability to question an order that seems inappropriate for a specific patient. Breaks in this surveillance chain, often under conditions of distraction or high workload, are direct precursors to medication errors that can cause patient harm [38].

The prevention of patient falls is almost entirely dependent on nursing surveillance and risk assessment. Fall prevention is a continuous cycle of identification, intervention, and re-evaluation. It begins with a validated, nurse-led risk assessment (e.g., using the Morse Fall Scale or Hendrich II Fall Risk Model) upon admission and at regular intervals [39]. This assessment is a surveillance tool that identifies intrinsic (e.g., history of falls, confusion, weakness) and extrinsic (e.g., polypharmacy, IV poles) risk factors. However, the core of prevention lies in the translation of this static assessment into dynamic, ongoing surveillance. This means noting a patient's increasing confusion with the evening sundowning, recognizing unsteadiness when they return from surgery, or observing an urgent need to void that may prompt a rushed trip to the bathroom. Surveillance informs tailored interventions: placing a high-risk patient near the nurses' station, scheduling hourly rounding to address needs proactively, ensuring call lights are within reach, and using bed/chair alarms appropriately. The effectiveness of these interventions hinges on the nurse's consistent situational awareness and the capacity to update the patient's risk profile in real-time based on observed changes in condition [40]. When surveillance fails due to inadequate staffing or fragmented care, the opportunity for proactive intervention is lost, and the risk of a injurious fall increases significantly.

Finally, the development of hospital-acquired pressure injuries (HAPIs) is a stark indicator of failed fundamental care, with nursing surveillance being the central preventive process. Prevention requires surveillance of both the patient's tissue tolerance and the pressure load. This involves systematic, head-to-toe skin assessments on admission and at least daily, with a focus on bony prominences. Expert surveillance, however, goes beyond inspection; it includes understanding the myriad risk factors captured in tools like the Braden Scale (sensory perception, moisture, activity, mobility, nutrition, friction/shear) and continuously monitoring these variables [41]. A nurse's surveillance identifies not just a reddened sacrum but also the patient's diaphoresis, inadequate nutritional intake, and prolonged immobility. This holistic data synthesis drives the care plan: implementing a turning schedule every two hours, selecting and using appropriate pressure-redistributing surfaces, managing moisture with proper skin care and incontinence management, and collaborating with nutrition services. The act of regular repositioning is itself a form of physical surveillance, allowing for recurrent skin inspection. The failure to consistently execute these surveillance-driven interventions—often a direct consequence of poor staffing or competing clinical demands—is the direct pathway to the development of painful, costly, and potentially life-threatening pressure ulcers [42].

The Human Connection: Care Coordination, Communication, and Relational Practice as Safety Mechanisms

While structural pillars and surveillance processes provide the essential scaffolding for safe care, the dynamic, interpersonal elements of nursing practice—care coordination, communication, and relational practice—constitute the vital connective tissue that binds the system together. These "human" factors are often mischaracterized as "soft skills," yet they function as powerful, active safety mechanisms. They are the means by which information is accurately transferred, care plans are integrated, patient context is understood, and trust is built, all of which are indispensable for preventing errors and promoting recovery. This section argues that effective care coordination, precise communication, and therapeutic relationships are not peripheral to patient safety but are central, non-negotiable components of nursing care quality that directly mediate clinical outcomes.

Care Coordination: The Orchestration of Safety

Care coordination is the deliberate organization of patient care activities between two or more participants (including the patient) to facilitate the appropriate, efficient, and safe delivery of healthcare services. In an era of increasing specialization and fragmented care, the nurse frequently serves as the patient's primary coordinator and consistent point of contact [45]. This role is a critical safety function. Nurses integrate information from multiple providers—reconciling medication lists from the cardiologist and the psychiatrist, ensuring the radiologist's report is seen by the surgeon, and translating the discharge plan from the hospitalist to the home health agency. Failures in this coordination role are a well-documented source of adverse events: medication discrepancies at transition points, missed follow-up on abnormal test results, and conflicting instructions given to patients [46]. Effective coordination requires systems thinking and constant vigilance. By maintaining a holistic view of the patient's journey, the nurse can identify gaps, anticipate needs (like arranging a bedside commode for a fall-risk patient post-surgery), and ensure continuity. This proactive orchestration prevents patients from "falling through the cracks," a metaphor that all too often describes a literal safety failure with serious consequences [47].

Communication: The Lifeblood of a Safe Culture

If coordination is the structure, communication is its lifeblood. Clear, accurate, and timely communication is arguably the single most important factor in preventing medical errors. The Joint Commission consistently cites communication failures as a leading root cause of sentinel events [48]. Nursing communication operates on multiple critical axes: nurse-to-physician, nurse-to-nurse (handoffs), and nurse-to-patient/family. Nurse-Physician Communication: The ability of a nurse to clearly articulate concerns to a physician, using a structured tool like SBAR (Situation, Background, Assessment, Recommendation), is

a direct safety intervention. It ensures critical information about a patient's deterioration is conveyed effectively, leading to timely medical intervention. A culture where nurses feel psychologically safe to speak up and physicians listen respectfully is a hallmark of high-reliability organizations [49]. Nurse-to-Nurse Handoffs: Shift reports and transfers between units are high-risk periods for information loss. Standardized handoff protocols (e.g., I-PASS, bedside handoff) that involve the patient improve information accuracy, reduce omissions, and enhance shared situational awareness, directly reducing the risk of errors in the subsequent shift [50]. Nurse-Patient/Family Communication: This is the foundation of patient engagement. Thoroughly educating a patient about their medications—why they are taken, how, and what side effects to watch for—transforms them from a passive recipient into an active partner in safety. Similarly, eliciting the family's insights about a patient's baseline behavior can be crucial in detecting delirium. Every patient education interaction is a preventative measure against readmission, self-administration error, or missed warning sign [51].

Relational Practice: The Ethical Core of Safety

Beyond the technical exchange of information lies relational practice—the intentional development of a therapeutic nurse-patient relationship characterized by trust, empathy, respect, and mutual understanding. This relational core is not merely a nicety; it is a potent diagnostic and safety tool. A relationship of trust encourages patients to disclose sensitive information (e.g., non-adherence to medication, substance use, or social barriers to discharge) that is vital for accurate assessment and planning [52]. Empathy and attentiveness allow nurses to perceive subtle cues—a flicker of worry in a patient's eye, a hesitation when discussing home care—that may signal unaddressed concerns or misunderstandings. This practice aligns with the "Fundamentals of Care" framework, which posits that relational, physical, and psychosocial care are inseparable; neglecting the relational component compromises the patient's sense of safety and willingness to engage, thereby undermining physical care processes [53]. For example, a patient who trusts and feels respected by their nurse is more likely to use the call bell for assistance to the bathroom rather than attempting a risky solo trip, directly preventing a fall. Relational practice is thus the engine of patient engagement; it is what motivates patients to participate in their own safety.

Synthesis: The Integrated Human Safety System

These three elements are inextricably linked. Relational practice fosters open communication; open communication enables effective coordination; and successful coordination reinforces trust in the relationship. Consider a complex discharge for an elderly patient with heart failure. The nurse's relational practice builds trust, allowing the patient to confess he lives alone and struggles to cook. Through effective communication, the nurse conveys this vital psychosocial information to the social worker and physician during a care conference. She then coordinates the plan, arranging for home health, a meal delivery service, and a pharmacist-led medication review, while communicating the clear, teach-back-verified plan to the patient. This integrated human intervention prevents a discharge into a dangerous situation, averting a likely cycle of medication mismanagement, poor nutrition, readmission, and clinical decline.

Conversely, when these human mechanisms fail—due to burnout, poor culture, or structural impediments like inadequate time—the safety net develops holes. Rushed, transactional interactions replace relational care. Handoffs become haphazard. Critical details are lost in siloed communication. The patient becomes a collection of tasks rather than a person in context, dramatically increasing vulnerability to error. Research confirms that environments which support professional nursing practice, including positive interdisciplinary relationships and nurse autonomy, see not only better nurse retention but also significantly lower rates of mortality and failure-to-rescue [54].

Empowering Patients: The Role of Nursing Education in Self-Management and Long-Term Outcomes

A defining feature of high-quality nursing care is the transition from a paternalistic model of "doing for" the patient to a collaborative model of "doing with," a process fundamentally achieved through patient and family education. This educational role is a potent, evidence-based nursing intervention that extends the reach and impact of care far beyond the clinical setting, directly influencing self-management capability, health behaviors, and long-term clinical outcomes. Empowerment through education is not merely the passive dissemination of information; it is a structured, interactive process of facilitating learning, enhancing health literacy, and developing the skills and confidence necessary for individuals to exert control over their health and lives [55]. In the context of chronic disease management, post-discharge recovery, and preventative health, nursing-led education emerges as a critical determinant of sustainability, safety, and overall well-being, effectively bridging the gap between acute care episodes and lifelong health.

The foundation of this empowerment lies in moving beyond simple information transfer to fostering true comprehension and self-efficacy. Effective nursing education employs principles of adult learning, assesses baseline health literacy, and utilizes teach-back methods to confirm understanding. The "teach-back" technique, where patients are asked to explain in their own words what they have just been taught, is a powerful tool for identifying misconceptions and reinforcing key messages [56]. This process ensures that education is not a one-time event at discharge but an ongoing dialogue integrated into daily care. For instance, while administering insulin, a nurse educates on the action of the medication, the technique of self-injection, and the signs of hypoglycemia, verifying understanding at each step. This iterative, engaged approach transforms abstract medical instructions into practical, personalized knowledge. It empowers patients to move from a state of dependence to one of informed self-management, where they can accurately administer medications, recognize early warning signs of complications, perform self-monitoring (e.g., blood glucose, blood pressure), and make daily decisions aligned with their care plan [57].

Nowhere is the impact of this educational empowerment more evident than in the management of chronic conditions such as diabetes, heart failure (HF), and chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (COPD). These conditions account for a substantial portion of healthcare utilization and are highly sensitive to daily self-care behaviors. Nursing education is the cornerstone of effective chronic disease management programs. For a patient with heart failure, comprehensive education includes understanding the disease process, adhering to a low-sodium diet, engaging in appropriate activity, monitoring daily weights, recognizing symptoms of fluid overload (e.g., edema, shortness of breath), and knowing when to contact a healthcare provider [58]. Research demonstrates that robust nurse-led HF education programs are consistently associated with significant reductions in hospital readmissions and mortality, as well as improvements in quality of life and functional status [59]. Similarly, diabetic self-management education (DSME) delivered by nurses improves glycemic control, reduces the incidence of complications like foot ulcers, and enhances self-care practices [60]. By equipping patients with the knowledge and skills to manage their condition day-to-day, nursing education prevents acute exacerbations, reduces emergency department visits, and slows disease progression, thereby directly shaping long-term clinical trajectories.

The critical period of transition from hospital to home represents a profound vulnerability where effective education is paramount for safety and continuity. Inadequate discharge preparation is a major contributor to preventable readmissions, often due to medication errors, misunderstanding of follow-up plans, or inability to recognize worsening symptoms [61]. Nursing-led transitional care interventions, such as the evidence-based model developed by Naylor et al., place comprehensive patient and caregiver education at their core. These models involve in-hospital teaching, a tailored discharge plan written in plain language, and follow-up home visits or phone calls to reinforce learning and troubleshoot problems [62]. The nurse ensures the patient can articulate their medication schedule, identify red-flag symptoms, and knows who to call for help. This seamless educational handoff from the institutional to the home environment mitigates the risks inherent in care transitions. It empowers the patient and their family to become competent managers of their post-acute care, thereby reducing the likelihood of adverse events and unplanned rehospitalization, which are key negative clinical and financial outcomes.

Despite its proven benefits, significant barriers to optimal patient education persist. These include systemic factors such as time constraints due to high nurse workloads, inadequate reimbursement for educational services, and fragmented care coordination that disrupts educational continuity. Patient-related factors, such as low health literacy, cognitive impairment, language barriers, and socioeconomic challenges, further complicate the educational process [63]. Overcoming these barriers requires intentional system-level support. This includes protecting dedicated time for education within nursing workflows, utilizing trained interpreter services, employing visual aids and simplified educational materials, and implementing standardized, nurse-driven education protocols for high-risk conditions. Furthermore, leveraging technology, such as interactive patient portals, secure messaging, and tailored mobile health applications, can extend the reach and reinforcement of nursing education, providing just-in-time information and support [64].

Ultimately, the empowerment achieved through nursing education manifests in measurable clinical and experiential outcomes. Educated, empowered patients exhibit better adherence to treatment regimens, leading to improved biomarker control (e.g., HbA1c, blood pressure). They experience fewer preventable complications and hospital admissions, contributing to lower healthcare costs. Perhaps most importantly, they report higher levels of self-efficacy, reduced anxiety, and improved health-related quality of life—patient-reported outcomes that are increasingly recognized as vital indicators of successful care [65].

Measuring the Impact: From Patient Satisfaction to Mortality Rates – The Evidence Linking Quality to Outcomes

The assertion that nursing care quality directly impacts patient safety and clinical outcomes is not merely a theoretical proposition; it is a claim substantiated by a vast and growing body of empirical evidence. Moving from conceptual models to measurable reality requires rigorous methodologies that capture the multifaceted results of nursing work. The impact spectrum is broad, ranging from the subjective experience of care—patient satisfaction—to the most objective and critical endpoints, such as mortality rates. This section synthesizes the key evidence linking the structures and processes of nursing care to these diverse outcomes, demonstrating that investments in nursing quality yield measurable, significant returns in patient safety, clinical effectiveness, and healthcare system efficiency.

The most immediate and personal outcome measure is patient satisfaction, often captured through surveys like the Hospital Consumer Assessment of Healthcare Providers and Systems (HCAHPS). While sometimes dismissed as a "soft" metric, patient satisfaction is a vital indicator of care quality and a predictor of other important results. Studies consistently show that patient satisfaction is strongly correlated with nursing-specific factors, particularly the quality of nurse-patient communication, responsiveness of nursing staff, and pain management—all core nursing processes [66]. Patients who report positive interactions with nurses, feel listened to, and receive timely assistance are not only more satisfied but are also more engaged in their care, which enhances safety and adherence. Furthermore, hospitals with better nursing environments and lower patient-to-nurse ratios consistently achieve higher HCAHPS scores, directly linking structural nursing quality to the patient experience [67]. This satisfaction is not an isolated outcome; it is intertwined with safety, as patients who feel heard and cared for are more likely to report concerns and participate in error prevention.

On the opposite end of the spectrum lie the most critical clinical outcomes: mortality and failure-to-rescue. Mortality rates, particularly risk-adjusted inpatient mortality, are the ultimate measure of a healthcare system's effectiveness. A landmark body of research, most notably the work of Linda Aiken and her colleagues, has provided irrefutable evidence of nursing's impact on survival. Their studies have repeatedly found that each additional patient assigned to a nurse is associated with a 7% increase in the likelihood of patient mortality within 30 days of admission [23]. Similarly, a higher proportion of baccalaureate-prepared nurses is associated with significantly lower mortality and failure-to-rescue rates [26]. "Failure-to-rescue," defined as death following a treatable complication, is a particularly sensitive indicator of nursing surveillance quality. It measures the system's ability to recognize and rapidly respond to early signs of

deterioration. Hospitals with better staffing and work environments demonstrate significantly lower failure-to-rescue rates, underscoring how nursing structures and processes directly prevent progression from complication to death [68].

A robust set of evidence centers on nurse-sensitive patient safety outcomes, which are intermediate clinical outcomes directly influenced by nursing care. These metrics serve as tangible proof of nursing's preventative role. Research demonstrates clear causal links:

- **Healthcare-Associated Infections (HAIs):** Studies show that improved nurse staffing levels are associated with lower rates of central line-associated bloodstream infections (CLABSIs), catheter-associated urinary tract infections (CAUTIs), and postoperative infections. This is attributed to greater adherence to infection control protocols and more vigilant surveillance [36].
- **Patient Falls:** Higher patient-to-nurse ratios are a consistent predictor of increased fall rates. Conversely, units with adequate staffing and a strong safety culture that supports consistent rounding and fall prevention protocols report significantly fewer fall-related injuries [40].
- **Pressure Injuries:** The development of hospital-acquired pressure ulcers is a key indicator of nursing care quality related to mobility, skin care, and nutrition. Research confirms that both adequate staffing and a positive practice environment are associated with lower pressure injury prevalence [69].
- **Medication Errors:** While measuring absolute error rates is challenging, studies link nurse workload and fatigue to increased medication administration errors and near-misses, highlighting how structural factors compromise this fundamental safety process [38].

Beyond discrete safety events, nursing quality profoundly influences operational and longitudinal outcomes. Length of hospital stay (LOS) is a key metric for efficiency and resource use. Patients cared for in environments with higher nurse staffing and better work environments often experience shorter LOS, as complications are avoided and recovery is facilitated through more attentive care and effective discharge planning [70]. Hospital readmissions, particularly within 30 days of discharge, are a major focus of healthcare policy due to their clinical and financial implications. Nurse-led interventions, especially comprehensive discharge education and transitional care support, have proven highly effective in reducing readmissions for chronic conditions like heart failure and pneumonia [62]. This demonstrates how nursing processes (education, coordination) directly affect post-discharge outcomes.

Finally, the evidence extends to economic outcomes, making the business case for investing in nursing quality. While improving staffing, education, and the work environment requires investment, the return is realized through substantial cost avoidance. The treatment of preventable adverse events—such as extended hospitalization for a surgical site infection, intensive treatment for a pressure injury, or litigation following a serious fall—is exponentially more expensive than the cost of employing additional nurses [71]. Studies have begun to quantify this, showing that the incremental cost of improving nurse staffing to safer levels is offset by savings from reduced length of stay and the avoidance of adverse events [72]. Furthermore, hospitals recognized for nursing excellence (e.g., Magnet® hospitals) often see benefits in recruitment, retention, and market reputation, which translate into long-term financial stability and lower costs associated with nurse turnover [73].

Conclusion

In conclusion, the evidence presented in this paper forms a compelling and coherent argument: the quality of nursing care is an indispensable driver of patient safety and clinical excellence. The journey from structural inputs to patient outcomes follows a clear and demonstrable pathway. Adequate staffing, a highly educated workforce, and a supportive professional environment create the essential foundation. These structures empower nurses to execute vital processes: vigilant surveillance that catches complications early,

skilled coordination that ensures continuity, compassionate communication that builds trust, and purposeful education that empowers patients for self-management. The synthesis of empirical research leaves little doubt that these elements collectively act as a powerful buffer against harm, significantly reducing the incidence of preventable adverse events and mortality, while simultaneously enhancing recovery, functional status, and the patient experience.

Therefore, viewing nursing as a cost center is a profound misjudgment. Instead, it must be recognized as a strategic asset and a primary leverage point for quality improvement and risk mitigation. The recommendations stemming from this analysis are clear. Healthcare policymakers must mandate safe nurse staffing levels and support policies that advance the educational preparation of the workforce. Hospital administrators must intentionally cultivate positive, empowering practice environments that grant nurses autonomy and involve them in decision-making. Investments must be made in tools and training that bolster nurses' surveillance, coordination, and educational capabilities.

Future research should continue to refine metrics, explore the impact of nursing on health equity, and develop innovative care models that fully leverage the nursing role. The imperative is unambiguous. By making deliberate, evidence-based investments in the very core of nursing—its structures, its processes, and its people—healthcare systems can fulfill their most fundamental promise: to provide care that is not only technically proficient but also consistently safe, profoundly effective, and inherently humane for every patient.

References:

1. Pavan NFP, Magalhães ALP, Poncio DF, et al. [Patient safety culture in kidney transplant patients in western Santa Catarina] Cultura de segurança do paciente no transplante renal no Oeste Catarinense (in Portuguese) Acta Paul Enferm. 2019; 32 (4):398–405. doi: 10.1590/1982-0194201900055. [DOI] [Google Scholar]
2. Gomez, S., et al. Lerner, A. Work environment issues and intention-to-leave in Portuguese nurses: A cross-sectional study. Health Policy. 2015; 119 (12):1584–1592.:S0168-8510(15)00243-2. doi: 10.1016/j.healthpol.2015.09.006. [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
3. Silba APF, Backes DS, Magnago TS, Colomé JS. Patient safety in primary care: conceptions of family health strategy nurses. Rev Gaucha Enferm. 2019; 40 (spe):e20180164. doi: 10.1590/1983-1447.2019.20180164. [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
4. Tomaszewska K, Kłos A, Majchrowicz B. Influence of work environment on the quality of benefits provided by primary health care nurses. Journal of Education Health and Sport. 2017; 7 (8):1191–1205. doi: 10.5281/zenodo.1039369. doi: 10.5281/zenodo.1039369. [DOI] [Google Scholar]
5. El Shafei AMH, Zayed MA. Patient safety attitude in primary health care settings in Giza, Egypt: cross-sectional study. Int J Health Plann Manage. 2019; 34 (2):851–861. doi: 10.1002/hpm.2743. [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
6. Rodziewicz TL, Houseman B., Hipskind JE. Medical Error Reduction and Prevention. Treasure Island, FL: StatPearls; 2022. [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
7. Malinowska-Lipień I, Micek A, Gabryś T, et al. Impact of the work environment on patients' safety as perceived by nurses in Poland—A cross-sectional study. Int J Environ Res Public Health. 2021; 18 (22):12057. doi: 10.3390/ijerph182212057. doi: 10.3390/ijerph182212057. [DOI] [PMC free article] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
8. Leone C, Bruyneel L, Anderson JE, et al. Work environment issues and intention-to-leave in Portuguese nurses: A cross-sectional study. Health Policy. 2015; 119 (12):1584–1592.:S0168-8510(15)00243-2. doi: 10.1016/j.healthpol.2015.09.006. [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
9. Vaismoradi M, Tella S, A Logan P, et al. Nurses' adherence to patient safety principles: A systematic review. Int J Environ Res Public Health. 2020; 17 (6):2028. doi: 10.3390/ijerph17062028. [DOI] [PMC free article] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]

10. World Health Organization Forward Program October 2004. World Alliance for Patient Safety. 2004. 2.World Health Organization Forward Program October 2004.
11. World Health Organization Resolution 72.6. Global action on patient safety. The Seventy-second World Health Assembly. 2019.
12. Flin R, Winter J, Sarac C, Raduma M. Human factors in patient safety: review of topics and tools. 2009.
13. Ghobashi MM, Ghani El-ragehy HA, Mosleh H, Al-Doseri FA. Assessment of patient safety culture in primary health care settings in Kuwait. Ebph. 2014; 11 (3) doi: 10.2427/9101. [DOI] [Google Scholar]
14. Aiken LH, Clarke SP, Sloane DM, Sochalski J, Silber JH (2002). Hospital nurse staffing and patient mortality, nurse burnout, and job dissatisfaction. Journal of the American Medical Association, 288(16), 1987–1993. 10.1001/jama.288.16.1987
15. Aiken LH, Cimiotti JP, Sloane DM, Smith HL, Flynn L, Neff DF (2011). The effects of nurse staffing and nurse education on patient deaths in hospitals with different nurse work environments. Medical Care, 49(12), 1047.
16. Beck AF, Riley CL, Taylor SC, Brokamp C, Kahn RS (2018). Pervasive income-based disparities in inpatient bed-day rates across conditions and subspecialties. Health Affairs, 37(4), 551–559. 10.1377/hlthaff.2017.1280
17. Blegen MA, Goode CJ, Park SH, Vaughn T, Spetz J (2013). Baccalaureate education in nursing and patient outcomes. Journal of Nursing Administration, 43(2), 89–94. 10.1097/nna.0b013e31827f2028
18. Blegen MA, Goode CJ, Spetz J, Vaughn T, Park SH (2011). Nurse staffing effects on patient outcomes: Safety-net and non-safety-net hospitals. Medical Care, 49(4), 406–414. 10.1097/mlr.0b013e318202e129
19. Brooks Carthon JM, Kutney-Lee A, Sloane DM, Cimiotti JP, Aiken LH (2011). Quality of care and patient satisfaction in hospitals with high concentrations of black patients. Journal of Nursing Scholarship, 43(3), 301–310. 10.1111/j.1547-5069.2011.01403.x
20. Brooks Carthon JM, Lasater KB, Sloane DM, Kutney-Lee A (2015). The quality of hospital work environments and missed nursing care is linked to heart failure readmissions: A cross-sectional study of US hospitals. BMJ Quality & Safety, 24(4), 255–263. 10.1136/bmjqs-2014-003346
21. Chatterjee P, Joynt KE, Orav EJ, Jha AK (2012). Patient experience in safety-net hospitals: Implications for improving care and value-based purchasing. Archives of Internal Medicine, 172(16), 1204–1210. 10.1001/archinternmed.2012.3158
22. Chatterjee P, Werner RM (2019). The hospital readmission reduction program and social risk. Health Services Research, 54(2), 324–326. 10.1111/1475-6773.13131
23. Aiken LH, Clarke SP, Sloane DM, Lake ET, Cheney T (2008). Effects of hospital care environment on patient mortality and nurse outcomes. Journal of Nursing Administration, 38(5), 223–229. 10.1097/01.nna.0000312773.42352.d7
24. Aiken LH, Sloane DM, Bruyneel L, Van den Heede K, Griffiths P, Busse R, Diomidous M, Kinnunen J, Kózka M, Lesaffre E, McHugh MD, Moreno-Casbas MT, Rafferty AM, Schwendimann R, Scott PA, Tishelman C, van Achterberg T, Sermeus W, RN4CAST consortium. (2014). Nurse staffing and education and hospital mortality in nine european countries: A retrospective observational study. The Lancet, 383(9931), 1824–1830. 10.1016/S0140-6736(13)62631-8
25. Aiken LH, M... (2018). Hospital nurse staffing and patient outcomes. Revista Médica Clínica Las Condes, 29(3), 322–327. 10.1016/j.rmclc.2018.04.011
26. Aiken LH, Sloane DM, Barnes H, Cimiotti JP, Jarrín OF, McHugh MD (2018b). Nurses' and patients' appraisals show patient safety in hospitals remains a concern. Health Affairs, 37(11), 1744–1751. 10.1377/hlthaff.2018.0711
27. Chchaudhry A, Wimer C, Macartney S, Frohlich L, Campbell C, Swenson K, Oellerich D, Hauan S (2016). Poverty in the United States: 50-year trends and safety net impacts. Office of the Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation. Retrieved from
28. Cimiotti JP, Aiken LH, Sloane DM, Wu ES (2012). Nurse staffing, burnout, and health care-associated infection. American Journal of Infection Control, 40(6), 486–490. 10.1016/j.ajic.2012.02.029

29. Aiken LH, Cimiotti JP, Sloane DM, Smith HL, Lake ET, Galiano A, Garbarini A, Soto P, Bravo D (2018). Hospital nurse staffing and patient outcomes. Revista Médica Clínica Las Condes, 29(3), 322–327. 10.1016/j.rmclc.2018.04.011
30. Aiken LH, Clarke SP, Sloane DM, Lake ET, Galiano A, Garbarini A, Soto P, Bravo D, Smith HL (2018). Hospital nurse staffing and patient outcomes. Revista Médica Clínica Las Condes, 29(3), 322–327. 10.1016/j.rmclc.2018.04.011
31. Institute of Medicine (US) Committee on Quality of Health Care in America, Kohn LT, Corrigan JM, Donaldson MS, eds. To Err Is Human: Building a Safer Health System. Washington, DC: National Academies Press (US); 2000. [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
32. James JT. A new, evidence-based estimate of patient harms associated with hospital care. J Patient Saf. 2013;9(3):122-128. [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
33. Makary MA, Daniel M. Medical error-the third leading cause of death in the US. BMJ 2016;353:i2139. [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
34. Wachter RM. Patient safety at ten: Unmistakable progress, troubling gaps. Health Aff (Millwood) 2010;29(1):165-173. [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
35. Hemmelgarn C, Hatlie M, Sheridan S, Daley Ullem B. Who killed patient safety? J Patient Saf Risk Manag. 2022;27(2):56-58. [Google Scholar]
36. World Health Organization. State of the World's Nursing Report-2020. World Health Organization; 2020. Available at: nursing-report-2020. Accessed September 9, 2020. [Google Scholar]
37. Butler R, Monsalve M, Thomas GW, et al. Estimating time physicians and other health care workers spend with patients in an intensive care unit using a sensor network. Am J Med 2018;131(8):972.e9-972.e15. [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
38. Stallings-Welden LM, Shirey MR. Predictability of a professional practice model to affect nurse and patient outcomes. Nurs Adm Q 2015;39(3):199-210. [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
39. Slatyer S, Coventry LL, Twigg D, Davis S. Professional practice models for nursing: A review of the literature and synthesis of key components. J Nurs Manag 2016;24(2):139-150. [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
40. Defense Health Agency. The Defense Health Agency 2017 Stakeholder Report. Defense Health Agency; 2017. [Google Scholar]
41. Hodson P, Swiger PA, Campbell CM, et al. Findings from the development of a nursing joint professional practice model for the U.S. military. Nurs Outlook 2023;71(3): 1-9. [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
42. Page MJ, McKenzie JE, Bossuyt PM, et al. The PRISMA 2020 statement: An updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. BMJ. 2021;372:n71. [DOI] [PMC free article] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
43. Covidence Systematic Review Software. Melbourne, Australia: Veritas Health Innovation; 2021. [Google Scholar]
44. Lombard M, Snyder-Duch J, Bracken CC. Content analysis in mass communication: Assessment and reporting of intercoder reliability. Hum Commun Res. 2002;28(4):587-604. [Google Scholar]
45. Newhouse RP, Dearholt SL, Poe SS, Pugh LC, White KM. Johns Hopkins Nursing Evidence-Based Practice Model and Guidelines. Indianapolis, IN: Sigma Theta Tau International Honor Society of Nursing; 2007. [Google Scholar]
46. Fineout-Overholt E, Melnyk BM, Stillwell SB, Williamson KM. Evidence-based practice step by step: Critical appraisal of the evidence: Part I. Am J Nurs. 2010;110(7):47-52. [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
47. Kerr D, Ostaszkiewicz J, Dunning T, Martin P. The effectiveness of training interventions on nurses' communication skills: A systematic review. Nurse Educ Today. 2020;89:104405. [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
48. Recio-Saucedo A, Dall'Ora C, Maruotti A, et al. What impact does nursing care left undone have on patient outcomes? Review of the literature. J Clin Nurs. 2018;27(11-12):2248-2259. [DOI] [PMC free article] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]

49. Olley R, Edwards I, Avery M, Cooper H. Systematic review of the evidence related to mandated nurse staffing ratios in acute hospitals. Aust Health Rev. 2019;43(3):288-293. [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
50. James JT. A new, evidence-based estimate of patient harms associated with hospital care. J Patient Saf. 2013;9(3):122–128. [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
51. Landrigan CP, Parry GJ, Bones CB, Hackbarth AD, Goldmann DA, et al. Temporal trends in rates of patient harm resulting from medical care. N Engl J Med. 2010;363(26):2124–2134. [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
52. Sorra JS, Nieva VF. Hospital Survey on Patient Safety Culture. AHRQ Publication No. 04–0041, Agency for Health care Research and Quality, Rockville, MD: 2004. Retrieved: [no hyperlink]
53. Wachter RM. Patient safety at ten: unmistakable progress, troubling gaps. Health Aff. 2010;29(1):165–173. [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
54. J Jones TL, Hamilton P, Murry N. Unfinished nursing care, missed care, and implicitly rationed care: State of the science review. Int J Nurs Stud. 2015;52(6):1121–1137. [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
55. Makary Martin A, Daniel M. Medical error—the third leading cause of death in the US. BMJ. 2016;353:i2139–2144. [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
56. Mardon RE, Khanna K, Sorra J, et al. Exploring relationships between hospital patient safety culture and adverse events. J Patient Saf. 2010;6(4):226–232. [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
57. RL Software for Safer Healthcare. RL6: Risk. Accessed 2018. [No DOI] [No publisher link retained]
58. DiCuccio MH. The Relationship between Patient Safety Culture and Patient Outcomes: A Systematic Review. J Patient Saf. 2015;11(3):135–142. [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
59. Richter JP, McAlearney AS, Pennell ML. Evaluating the effect of safety culture on error reporting: a comparison of managerial and staff perspectives. Am J Med Qual. 2015;30(6):550–558. [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
60. Burilson JD, Quillivan RR, Kath LM, et al. A multilevel analysis of U.S. hospital patient safety culture relationships with perceptions of voluntary event reporting. J Patient Saf. 2016. [E-pub ahead of print] 10.1097/PTS.0000000000000336 [DOI] [PMC free article] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
61. Defense Health Agency. The Defense Health Agency 2017 Stakeholder Report. Defense Health Agency; 2017. [Google Scholar]
62. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS), Office of Inspector General. Adverse events in hospitals: National incidence among Medicare beneficiaries (OEI Publication No, 06–09-00090). 2010. Retrieved: [link removed]
63. Landrigan CP, Parry GJ, Bones CB, Hackbarth AD, Goldmann DA, et al. Temporal trends in rates of patient harm resulting from medical care. N Engl J Med. 2010;363(26):2124–2134. [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
64. James JT. A new, evidence-based estimate of patient harms associated with hospital care. J Patient Saf. 2013;9(3):122–128. [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
65. Wachter RM. Patient safety at ten: unmistakable progress, troubling gaps. Health Affairs. 2010;29(1):165–173. [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
66. Makary Martin A, Daniel M. Medical error—the third leading cause of death in the US. BMJ. 2016;353:i2139–2144. [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
67. RL Software for Safer Healthcare. RL6: Risk. Accessed 2018. [No DOI] [No publisher link retained]
68. Burlison JD, Quillivan RR, Kath LM, et al. A multilevel analysis of U.S. hospital patient safety culture relationships with perceptions of voluntary event reporting. J Patient Saf. 2016. [E-pub ahead of print] 10.1097/PTS.0000000000000336 [DOI] [PMC free article] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
69. Richter JP, McAlearney AS, Pennell ML. Evaluating the effect of safety culture on error reporting: a comparison of managerial and staff perspectives. Am J Med Qual. 2015;30(6):550–558. [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
70. Sorra JS, Nieva VF. Hospital Survey on Patient Safety Culture. AHRQ Publication No. 04–0041, Agency for Health care Research and Quality, Rockville, MD: 2004. Retrieved: [link removed]

71. DiCuccio MH. The Relationship between Patient Safety Culture and Patient Outcomes: A Systematic Review. J Patient Saf. 2015;11(3):135–142. [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
72. Mardon RE, Khanna K, Sorra J, et al. Exploring relationships between hospital patient safety culture and adverse events. J Patient Saf. 2010;6(4):226–232. [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
73. Jones TL, Hamilton P, Murry N. Unfinished nursing care, missed care, and implicitly rationed care: State of the science review. Int J Nurs Stud. 2015;52(6):1121–1137. [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]