

# Safety of Psychiatric Inpatients at the Veterans Health Administration

Steven C. Marcus, Ph.D., Richard C. Hermann, M.D., M.S., Martin R. Frankel, Ph.D., Sara W. Cullen, Ph.D., M.S.W.

**Objective:** Although reducing adverse events and medical errors has become a central focus of the U.S. health care system over the past two decades both within and outside the Veterans Health Administration (VHA) hospital systems, patients treated in psychiatric units of acute care general hospitals have been excluded from major research in this field.

**Methods:** The study included a random sample of 40 psychiatric units from medical centers in the national VHA system. Standardized abstraction tools were used to assess the electronic health records from 8,005 hospitalizations. Medical record administrators screened the records for the presence of ten specific types of patient safety events, which, when present, were evaluated by physician reviewers to assess whether the event was the result of an error, whether it caused harm, and whether it was preventable.

**Results:** Approximately one in five patients experienced a patient safety event. The most frequently occurring events were medication errors (which include delayed and missed doses) (17.2%), followed by adverse drug events (4.1%), falls (2.8%), and assault (1.0%). Most patient safety events (94.9%) resulted in little harm or no harm, and more than half (56.6%) of the events were deemed preventable.

**Conclusions:** Although patient safety events in VHA psychiatric inpatient units were relatively common, a great majority of these events resulted in little or no patient harm. Nevertheless, many were preventable, and the study provides data with which to target future initiatives that may improve the safety of this vulnerable patient population.

*Psychiatric Services* 2018; 69:204–210; doi: 10.1176/appi.ps.201700224

Patient safety events, including adverse events resulting from medical intervention and medical errors, occur frequently and at great cost to the health care system (1–3). The extensive body of research on patient safety in the provision of general medical care on acute medical and surgical units has provided models for understanding the nature, incidence, and preventability of adverse events and medical errors in these settings (3,4) and has led to significant reforms and interventions (1,5,6). Unfortunately, research has not focused on patients who are receiving inpatient psychiatric care in general hospital settings. Thus patient safety in mental health care has not received the focused attention that has proven invaluable for improving inpatient medical and surgical care.

In medical and surgical units, patients with comorbid psychiatric and medical disorders (7) are at increased risk of experiencing adverse events (8), physical harm, and mortality (9). A few small studies have focused on characterizing psychiatry-specific inpatient safety events (10), such as medication errors (11,12), adverse events resulting from seclusion and restraint (13,14) or electroconvulsive therapy (ECT) (15), violence (16,17), falls (18), and suicide (19–21) by patients with psychiatric disorders receiving care in inpatient psychiatric settings.

There are over one million discharges from psychiatric units of acute care hospitals annually (22,23), approximately 100,000 of which are from the Veterans Health Administration (VHA) medical centers (24). The VHA is one of the largest integrated health care systems in the country (24) and has a universal electronic medical record system, making it an ideal setting for examining patient safety in the provision of inpatient psychiatric care. This article describes a national, large-scale epidemiological patient safety study that examined adverse events and medical errors occurring in VHA hospital psychiatric units. This basic descriptive information on the prevalence, severity, and preventability of these events can help target future safety initiatives.

## METHODS

Building on the methods used in prior patient safety research, we conducted a medical record review of a random sample of discharges from inpatient psychiatric units in VHA general hospitals. The study utilized a two-tier chart review process. The first-tier review involved a preliminary review of records by screeners who “flagged” records for the presence of a possible patient safety event by using a structured instrument we designed specifically for the detection

of events in this patient population. The second tier was a more extensive verification and review of the flagged chart by physician reviewers to assess the extent of harm experienced by the patient, determine the likelihood of a clinical error, and evaluate preventability.

### Sample and Data Sources

The sample was drawn from the Patient Treatment File of the National Patient Care Database, which is maintained by the VHA Office of Information. Nationally, the VHA had 92,103 discharges from 105 medical centers with an inpatient psychiatric unit in 2012. For the purposes of this study, a random sample of discharges was selected by using an implicitly stratified two-stage probability proportional to size design. Hospitals were the primary sampling unit, and selection of discharges within hospitals was inversely proportional to the size of the hospital such that discharges from smaller hospitals were oversampled to fully represent all VHA facilities. The study included 8,052 discharges from 40 hospitals. Of these, a small number of charts were not located, resulting in a total of 8,005 discharges that were reviewed.

Data were collected from the Computerized Patient Record System, the universal electronic medical record at the VHA. Each medical record includes detailed information about the patient's care while on the inpatient psychiatric unit, such as admission and discharges notes, clinical notes, nursing notes, progress notes, physician's orders, and medication administration records. The analysis data set did not contain any patient or staff identifiers. The U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs Central Institutional Review Board granted approval for the study.

### Measures

To establish a systematic way to extract data from the electronic medical record, the study team developed instrumentation for reviewing charts that built on work from medical and surgical patient safety studies (25,26). To tailor the tools to psychiatry, we drew upon an extensive review of the literature and our prior qualitative (27) and quantitative work in the field (28). We developed two standardized abstraction tools, one for the screeners and one for the physician reviewers. The screening tool was designed to flag a broad range of potential patient safety events for further investigation and was modeled after the tools used in the landmark patient safety study, the Harvard Medical Practice Study (HMPS) (25), and the more recently developed Institute for Healthcare Improvement's Global Trigger Tool (29). These types of "trigger tools" have been developed specifically for use during retrospective chart reviews in order to easily and efficiently abstract data and identify possible adverse events in medical records. Standardized review processes such as these have proven much more effective at detecting adverse events than conventional methods (for example, voluntary reporting) (30). As with the HMPS, we also developed a second-tier abstraction tool for

medical records that were flagged with the indication of a possible patient safety event, so that they could be reviewed by a board-certified psychiatrist. This structured instrument was used to verify whether the flagged events met study criteria, determine the presence or absence of errors and adverse events, and assess harm and preventability.

### Patient Safety Events: Medical Errors and Adverse Events

The tools we developed sought to collect information about the full range of safety events that occur in inpatient psychiatry. Patient safety events were broadly categorized as medical errors and adverse events. Medical errors were defined as the omission or commission of clinical care that has potentially negative consequences for a patient that would have been judged wrong by skilled and knowledgeable peers at the time the errors occurred, regardless of whether there were any negative consequences (31). Adverse events were defined as the negative unintended consequences of clinical care that led to injury, impairment, or other harm (29,32). In this study, events could fall into either or both of these categories. Using this conceptualization, we established a list of ten events to screen for in the medical record. The list included adverse events (including adverse drug events, self-harm, assault, sexual contact, and other nonmedication adverse events), medical errors (including medication and nonmedication errors), and other patient safety events (including elopements, contraband, and falls) that are proximal to the occurrence of harm and error (Table 1).

### Study Process

We developed a training manual for the first-tier screening of charts that contained an overview of the study process and goals, as well as detailed definitions and examples of each patient safety event (Hermann RC, Cullen SW, Marcus SM, unpublished manuscript, 2014). We conducted a five-session training with five screeners, in which we reviewed the material, discussed vignettes, and assigned a selection of test charts with and without confirmed patient safety events to ensure adherence to study definitions before chart review began. During the course of the study, weekly phone calls and regular e-mail exchanges with the screeners addressed questions and ambiguities in charts and ensured adherence to study guidelines. We then conducted a four-session training with nine psychiatrist reviewers with our 46-page physician review training manual (Hermann RC, Cullen SW, Marcus SC, unpublished manuscript, 2015), which also contained detailed examples of each type of event and guidelines for assessing level of harm (based on the Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality's Harm Scale [33]), rating attribution of error, and determining preventability (defined as the extent to which an event could have been anticipated and prepared for but still occurred because of an error or other system failure) (34). The training included review of vignettes and a set of test charts. Regular phone

**TABLE 1. Definitions of patient safety events documented among psychiatric inpatients**

Type of event	Definition
Adverse event	The negative unintended consequences of clinical care that lead to injury, impairment, or other harm (29,32)
Adverse drug event (ADE)	The negative, unintended consequences of a medication that result in functional impairment or other significant harm. To distinguish ADEs from the side effects often associated with psychotropic or other medications, ADEs had to meet one of the following criteria: be on a specified list of medication reactions that have been determined by prior research to always be categorized as an ADE (39); result in the medication's being stopped, held, discontinued, or replaced by another medication because of the adverse reaction; or the reaction or symptom(s) impaired the patient's functioning. Because it can be difficult to distinguish between adverse reactions to medication and side effects of medication, the study relied on methodology previously established for appropriately identifying ADEs (39).
Patient self-harm or injury	Harm or injury experienced by the patient because of his or her own actions, regardless of intent. The most extreme case of patient self-harm is suicide. Patient injury can also occur even if the patient did not intend to harm him- or herself (for example, patient punches the wall out of anger and sustains a laceration). Exclusions: suicidal ideation or threats unaccompanied by actions to harm self and superficial or minor injuries indicated by the absence of bruising, swelling, bleeding, or treatment
Patient assault	Forcible physical contact with staff, other patients, or visitors on the unit. This category includes patients who are the victim or the perpetrator of an assault. Exclusions: altercations that are only verbal in nature or characterized as only light or minimal physical contact and assault to staff without documented injury experienced by the staff member
Patient sexual contact	Incidents of a sexual nature between a patient and another patient, a visitor, or a staff member. Sexual contact is defined as physical contact and includes but is not limited to intentional touching, either directly or through the clothing, of the genitalia, anus, groin, breast, inner thigh, or buttocks. Exclusions: nonphysical contact (for example, blowing a kiss or sexual talk), physical contact without implication of sexuality (for example, pat on the back), kissing or hugging in greeting or farewell between a patient and a visitor, and events in which a staff member was a passive recipient of unwanted sexual contact from a patient
Other nondrug adverse events	Events that resulted in stopping treatment or functional impairment (that is, impairing a basic function such as thinking, standing, walking, seeing, hearing, breathing, etc.)
Medical error	The omission or commission of clinical care with potentially negative consequences for a patient that would have been judged wrong by skilled and knowledgeable peers at the time the error occurred, regardless of whether there were any negative consequences (31).
Medication error	When a medication is administered to a patient in a manner other than what was ordered, including dosing and administration issues, such as when a patient receives the wrong dose or wrong drug or receives it through the wrong route of administration. Missed doses or delays of three or more hours were included because they may be related to medication ordering processes or the interface between the pharmacy and the unit. Exclusions: patient refusal of medication; medications intentionally delayed, held, or not given at the discretion of staff based on their clinical judgment (for example, sleeping medication skipped because the patient was already asleep or was off unit); medications characterized in the reconciliation log as not on formulary; and topical and over-the-counter medications
Nondrug medical errors	Incorrect, omitted, or delayed tests or procedures. Other errors may be related to the practices and procedures of the unit that are in place to protect and keep patients safe, such as ensuring adequate assessments and level of observation or monitoring, ensuring appropriate treatment, minimizing communication errors, and eliminating environmental dangers (for example, a door on a locked unit that is left unsecured or wet floors without proper signage)
Other patient safety event	Events that may occur during the course of a hospitalization that are proximal to harm (adverse event) and error
Elopement	Patient leaves the unit, hospital, or grounds without permission, including failure to return from a pass, home visit, or other approved departure from the unit. Does not include attempted but unsuccessful elopements
Contraband	Potentially dangerous items on the inpatient unit, including sharp objects (razors, knives, box cutters, scissors, or pins); matches and lighters; plastic bags and balloons; alcohol, illegal drugs, and prescription medications; and ropelike items (belts, shoelaces, pantyhose, neckties, headphone wires, electrical cords, etc.).
Patient fall	Falls regardless of the extent of the fall (to the floor or onto the bed) or whether the patient experienced harm or required treatment. Exclusions: events documented as intentional or faked and falls secondary to a primary medical event, such as during cardiac arrest or seizure

calls and e-mails with the physician reviewers continued for the duration of their participation in the study.

### Analysis

First, we calculated the proportion of discharges that contained each type of adverse event, error, or other patient safety event, as well as the rates of these events per 1,000 patient-days. Second, for each of the adverse events and other patient safety events, we examined whether it was likely (including responses of highly likely or likely) or not likely (responses of somewhat likely or not likely) to have resulted from a medical error. Finally, for each type of adverse event, error, or other patient safety event, we examined the level of harm to the patient (none or minimal, moderate, or severe) and the extent to which the event was preventable (highly likely and likely versus somewhat likely and not likely). All analyses were conducted in SAS, version 9.4, using PROC SURVEYFREQ and PROC SURVEYMEANS to accommodate the two-stage proportional sampling and the nesting (clustering) of charts within hospitals.

## RESULTS

Across all medical records reviewed, there were 2,232 patient safety events. Table 2 shows the population distribution of these events by type, per 100 patient discharges and per 1,000 patient-days. Overall, the prevalence of any event occurring was 27.9 per 100 patient discharges and the rate was 36.4 events per 1,000 patient-days. The prevalence per 100 discharges was 6.0 for any adverse event, 18.2 for any medical error, and 3.7 for any other patient safety event. The most frequently occurring patient safety events were medication errors (17.2 per 100 discharges, or 17.2%) (including dispensing delays of greater than three hours), followed by adverse drug events (4.1%) and patient falls (2.8%). Among the detected medication errors, the most common type of errors were missed doses (N=767, 59.7%), followed by delayed doses (N=478, 37.2%), other errors (N=22, 1.7%), wrong doses (N=11, .8%), and wrong drug (N=5, .4%).

Most patient safety events (94.9%) resulted in little harm or no harm (Table 3). Although 97.6% of medical errors and 97.7% of other patient safety events resulted in little or no harm, 15.0% of the adverse events resulted in moderate or severe harm. With regard to preventability, a majority of events (56.6%) were rated as likely or highly likely to have been preventable. Medical errors were likely or highly likely

**TABLE 2. Prevalence and rates of patient safety events among psychiatric inpatients**

Event	N	Events per 100 patient discharges (N=8,005 discharges)		Events per 1,000 patient-days (N=61,274 patient-days)	
		Prevalence	95% CI	Rate	95% CI
Any event	2,232	27.88	23.32–32.44	36.43	30.34–42.51
All adverse events	478	5.97	5.05–6.89	7.80	6.65–8.95
Adverse drug event	330	4.12	3.37–4.88	5.39	4.42–6.35
Patient self-harm or injury	37	.46	.29–.63	.60	.39–.82
Patient assault	81	1.01	.65–1.37	1.32	.85–1.79
Patient sexual contact	10	.12	.04–.21	.16	.05–.27
Other nondrug adverse events	20	.25	.11–.38	.33	.15–.50
All medical errors	1,455	18.17	14.10–22.25	23.75	18.27–29.22
Medication error	1,378	17.21	13.16–21.26	22.49	17.03–27.94
Nondrug medical errors	77	.96	.63–1.30	1.26	.82–1.69
All other patient safety events	299	3.73	3.01–4.46	4.88	3.97–5.79
Elopement	18	.22	.04–.41	.29	.05–.54
Contraband	57	.71	.45–.97	.93	.60–1.26
Patient fall	224	2.80	2.22–3.38	3.66	2.91–4.40

to have been preventable (73.5%), but few of the adverse events (19.2%) and other patient safety events (33.8%) were deemed to be so. Specifically, the events most likely to be preventable were nonmedication errors (87.0%) and contraband (77.2%), and those deemed least likely to have been preventable were patient assault (11.1%) and adverse drug events (18.2%). Events were deemed likely or highly likely to have been preventable among 42.5% (95% confidence interval [CI]=37.9–47.1) of patients with minimal or no harm and among 60.2% (CI=48.3–72.0) of patients with moderate or severe harm (F=7.92, df=1 and 39, p=.008).

## DISCUSSION

Our study found that one in five patients receiving mental health care on an inpatient psychiatric unit of a VHA hospital experienced a patient safety event. The three most common types were medication errors, adverse drug events, and falls. It is not surprising that two of the most common types of events detected were related to medication, because a large component of treatment in inpatient psychiatric units includes prescribing, dispensing, and monitoring medications. Our finding aligns with research on adverse events among inpatients hospitalized for treatment of general medical–surgical (nonpsychiatric) conditions, where medication-related events are the second most common type of event (behind operation-related events) (35). In comparison with a study of medication errors in three (nonpsychiatric) medical units where the medication error rate was .3 medication errors per patient-day (36), our finding of .02 per patient-day suggests that differences may vary across both setting (medical versus psychiatric) and patient population. Although medication errors were common in our study, the vast majority of such errors were missed or delayed doses that did not result in patient harm. The rates of medication errors in our study may be higher than rates studied in other hospital types because the VHA uses a

**TABLE 3. Severity of harm and preventability of patient safety events (N=2,232) among psychiatric inpatients**

Event	N	Severity of harm						Preventability			
		None or minimal		Moderate		Severe		Not likely or somewhat likely		Likely or highly likely	
		%	95% CI	%	95% CI	%	95% CI	%	95% CI	%	95% CI
Overall	2,232	94.9	93.3–96.5	4.5	2.7–6.2	.6	0–1.1	43.4	39.0–47.7	56.6	52.2–61.0
All adverse events	478	84.9	81.3–88.6	13.8	10.0–17.6	1.2	.0–2.5	80.7	76.9–84.6	19.2	15.4–23.1
Adverse drug event	330	84.8	80.5–89.1	13.6	9.3–18.0	1.5	.0–3.3	81.8	77.4–86.2	18.2	13.8–22.5
Patient self-harm/injury	37	75.7	59.8–91.6	24.3	8.4–40.2	0		70.3	53.3–87.2	29.7	12.8–46.7
Patient assault	81	98.8	96.3–100.0	1.2	.0–3.7	0		88.9	81.7–96.1	11.1	3.9–18.3
Patient sexual contact	10	100.0		0		0		50.0	17.6–82.4	50.0	17.6–82.4
Other nondrug adverse event	20	40.0	18.3–61.7	55.0	33.3–76.7	5.00	.0–15.2	65.0	48.6–81.4	35.0	18.6–51.4
Medical error	1,455	97.6	96.6–98.6	2.0	.9–3.0	.4	.0–.8	26.5	22.3–30.6	73.5	69.4–77.7
Medication	1,378	98.0	97.1–98.9	1.7	.7–2.6	.4	.0–.7	27.2	22.8–31.5	72.8	68.4–77.1
Nonmedication	77	90.9	84.0–97.8	7.8	2.1–13.5	1.3	.0–3.9	13.0	4.1–21.8	87.0	78.2–95.9
Other patient safety event	299	97.7	96.4–99.6	1.7	.2–3.1	.3	.0–1.0	65.9	60.0–71.7	33.8	27.9–39.7
Elopement	18	94.4	83.2–100.0	5.5	.0–16.7	0		38.9	17.3–60.5	61.1	39.5–82.7
Contraband	57	100.0		0		0		21.0	10.4–31.7	77.2	65.7–88.6
Patient fall	224	97.8	95.7–99.8	1.8	.0–3.6	.4	.0–1.4	79.5	73.4–85.5	20.5	14.5–26.6

barcode medication administration system that tracks delayed and missed doses, whereas most prior work has been conducted in settings without this technology.

Adverse drug events were the second most common type of patient safety event in our study. The rates of adverse drug events were lower than those in a previous study that was conducted in a psychiatric hospital setting (5.4 versus ten events per 1,000 patient days) (37) but closer to those in another study of rates of adverse drug events in medical and surgical units (4.1 per 100 discharges in our study versus 6.5 per 100 admissions in the other study) (38). Falls were the third most common type of patient safety event experienced by patients in our study (3.66 falls per 1,000 patient-days), a rate similar to those in acute care medical units (3.56–3.73 falls per 1,000 patient-days) (39,40). With the exception of medication errors, the most common patient safety events in inpatient psychiatry occurred at rates comparable to those identified in general medicine and surgery. Nevertheless, the overall rate of 36 events per 1,000 patient-days for inpatient psychiatry was significantly lower than the rate in a broader study of all hospitalizations, in which 91 events per 1,000 patient-days were detected (30). However, differences in methodology and patient populations across studies limit the direct comparability of these rates.

Of the 2,232 patient safety events identified, only 13 (.6%) were associated with harm that was severe. When harm occurred, it was primarily a result of nonmedication adverse events resulting from clinical care (for example, ECT), assault, and patient self-harm. Although there were no completed suicides documented during our study, patient self-harm is distinctly associated with inpatient psychiatric settings and can be influenced by both the clinical care provided (for example, monitoring) and the physical environment of the unit. Fortunately, suicide is a relatively uncommon event in the VHA, with only 42 completed suicides identified over a six-and-a-half year period in VHA

hospitals (20). Other studies have estimated that the rate of suicides is 1.24 per 1,000 patient discharges across units at hospitals across the world (41).

Many of the patient safety events in our study were assessed as preventable. Thus, although the VHA has developed specific guidelines and policies for providing safe care, there is room for improvement. For the patient safety events that are common not just to psychiatry but also to general medicine and surgery, we can draw upon existing, established prevention strategies and tailor them to this setting. For example, fall prevention strategies developed for general medical and geriatric hospitalizations suggest that multicomponent interventions, which include risk assessments and specific recommendations for clinical care (for example, footwear and medication review), may reduce the risk of falls by up to 30% (42). Preventing adverse drug events is another area of research that has received considerable attention both inside and outside psychiatry and is particularly relevant given the large number of medication-related errors and adverse drug events in our study. Although the VHA has developed some strategies to reduce medication errors, such as its electronic clinician prescription ordering system, other strategies in general medicine and surgery have focused on the early detection and notification of adverse drug events so that physicians can make necessary dosage or drug changes before the reactions become more severe (43).

Many of the events that are uncommon outside inpatient psychiatry, such as unforeseen self-harm and “random acts of violence,” which by their very nature are difficult to predict, are hard to prevent. Appropriate clinical care around the provision and monitoring of medication and surveillance of patients is critical to eliminating errors and minimizing patient harm. However, inpatient mental health care attempts to achieve a balance between additional patient protections and restrictions on one hand and personal freedom and mobility on the other. Providing a safe

and therapeutic environment is an essential component of inpatient psychiatric care, and thus identification and implementation of interventions that reduce adverse events and errors should be a priority (44,45).

Our study had limitations. First, unlike prospective patient-shadowing studies, chart reviews are limited in that they may not document the complete nature and outcomes of care. However, studies have found that the sensitivity and specificity of retrospective chart reviews and of prospective data collection are comparable (46). Retrospective chart reviews are more likely than voluntary reporting and incident reports to detect adverse events but are, unsurprisingly, less sensitive than direct observation at detecting these events (47). In one study, structured chart review methods were more effective at identifying events than either patient safety indicators or provider-reported events (48). Thus medical record reviews have long been considered an important source for detecting adverse events among hospitalized medical-surgical patients (49) and are useful for epidemiological studies because they provide a large sample and generalizable findings in a cost- and time-efficient manner (50).

Second, it can be difficult to quantify the level of harm, error, and preventability. However, we used standardized abstraction forms and a manualized process, with clear guidelines, training, and monitoring to rigorously measure these constructs (49). Third, our analysis did not include detailed information about staffing composition or other key functional unit characteristics, which could be added to future studies to further contextualize these findings. Finally, the results of this study are limited to patients receiving mental health care on VHA inpatient psychiatric units, and estimates of the prevalence of patient events, medical errors, and harm may not be generalizable to a broader patient population or to care received in other settings. Despite these limitations, this study provides the first large-scale examination of patient safety events experienced by patients receiving inpatient psychiatric care at VHA hospitals.

## CONCLUSIONS

Findings from this large-scale study suggest that although patient safety events were common in inpatient psychiatry units at VHA hospitals, very few events resulted in serious harm to patients. Nevertheless, many of the events detected were potentially preventable, and efforts should continue to enhance the safety of care provided to these patients. This study developed the tools necessary to measure patient safety events in hospital-based psychiatry and then used them to gauge the extent, nature, and preventability of events. There has been a long-standing call for more data regarding the frequency and consequences of safety events in inpatient psychiatry (11), and our findings begin to fill this important gap by providing insight into potential targets of prevention efforts.

## AUTHOR AND ARTICLE INFORMATION

Dr. Marcus and Dr. Cullen are with the School of Social Policy and Practice, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia. Dr. Hermann is with the Institute for Clinical Research and Health Policy Studies, Tufts School of Medicine, Tufts Medical Center, Boston. Dr. Frankel is a consultant in statistics, New York City. Send correspondence to Dr. Marcus (e-mail: marcuss@upenn.edu).

This research was supported by grant HX000702 from the U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs, grant MH086722 from the National Institute of Mental Health, and by the National Patient Safety Foundation.

Dr. Marcus reports receipt of consulting fees from Allergan, Alkermes, Johnson and Johnson, and Sunovion. The other authors report no financial relationships with commercial interests.

Received May 15, 2017; revision received July 19, 2017; accepted August 4, 2017; published online October 15, 2017.

## REFERENCES

- Kohn LT, Corrigan JM, Donaldson MS: To Err Is Human: Building a Safer Health System. Washington, DC, National Academies Press, 2000
- Landrigan CP, Parry GJ, Bones CB, et al: Temporal trends in rates of patient harm resulting from medical care. *New England Journal of Medicine* 363:2124–2134, 2010
- Leape LL, Brennan TA, Laird N, et al: The nature of adverse events in hospitalized patients: results of the Harvard Medical Practice Study II. *New England Journal of Medicine* 324:377–384, 1991
- Brennan TA, Leape LL, Laird NM, et al: Incidence of adverse events and negligence in hospitalized patients: results of the Harvard Medical Practice Study I. *New England Journal of Medicine* 324:370–376, 1991
- Harrison MI, Henriksen K, Hughes RG: Improving the health care work environment: a sociotechnical systems approach. *Joint Commission Journal on Quality and Patient Safety* 33(suppl):3–6, 1, 2007
- Institute of Medicine: Crossing the Quality Chasm: A New Health System for the 21st Century. Washington, DC, National Academies Press, 2001
- Smith EG, Zhao S, Rosen AK: Using the patient safety indicators to detect potential safety events among US veterans with psychotic disorders: clinical and research implications. *International Journal for Quality in Health Care* 24:321–329, 2012
- Daumit GL, Pronovost PJ, Anthony CB, et al: Adverse events during medical and surgical hospitalizations for persons with schizophrenia. *Archives of General Psychiatry* 63:267–272, 2006
- Daumit GL, McGinty EE, Pronovost P, et al: Patient safety events and harms during medical and surgical hospitalizations for persons with serious mental illness. *Psychiatric Services* 67:1068–1075, 2016
- Hanrahan NP, Kumar A, Aiken LH: Adverse events associated with organizational factors of general hospital inpatient psychiatric care environments. *Psychiatric Services* 61:569–574, 2010
- Grasso BC, Shore MF, Clary CM, et al: Medication errors and patient safety in mental health. *Medscape*. <http://www.medscape.org/viewarticle/563039>. Accessed Feb 10, 2017
- Grasso BC, Rothschild JM, Genest R, et al: What do we know about medication errors in inpatient psychiatry? *Joint Commission Journal on Quality and Patient Safety* 29:391–400, 2003
- Mohr WK, Petti TA, Mohr BD: Adverse effects associated with physical restraint. *Canadian Journal of Psychiatry* 48:330–337, 2003
- Crenshaw WB, Francis PS: A national survey on seclusion and restraint in state psychiatric hospitals. *Psychiatric Services* 46:1026–1031, 1995
- Preventing Adverse Events in Behavioral Health Care: A Systems Approach to Sentinel Events. Oakbrook Terrace, IL, Joint Commission on Accreditation of Healthcare Organizations, 1999

16. Reade C, Nourse R: Intervening to prevent violence in psychiatric units. *Nursing* 42:14–17, 2012
17. Blow FC, Barry KL, Copeland LA, et al: Repeated assaults by patients in VA hospital and clinic settings. *Psychiatric Services* 50: 390–394, 1999
18. Poster EC, Pelletier LR, Kay K: A retrospective cohort study of falls in a psychiatric inpatient setting. *Hospital and Community Psychiatry* 42:714–720, 1991
19. Tishler CL, Reiss NS: Inpatient suicide: preventing a common sentinel event. *General Hospital Psychiatry* 31:103–109, 2009
20. Mills PD, DeRosier JM, Ballot BA, et al: Inpatient suicide and suicide attempts in Veterans Affairs hospitals. *Joint Commission Journal on Quality and Patient Safety* 34:482–488, 2008
21. Mills PD, King LA, Watts BV, et al: Inpatient suicide on mental health units in Veterans Affairs (VA) hospitals: avoiding environmental hazards. *General Hospital Psychiatry* 35:528–536, 2013
22. Heslin KC, Elixhauser A, Steiner CA: Hospitalizations Involving Mental and Substance Use Disorders Among Adults, 2012. *Healthcare Cost and Utilization Project Statistical Brief* 191. Rockville, MD, Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality, 2015
23. Heslin KC, Weiss AJ: Hospital Readmissions Involving Psychiatric Disorders, 2012. *Healthcare Cost and Utilization Project Statistical Brief* 189. Rockville, MD, Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality, 2015
24. VHA Facility Quality and Safety Report, Fiscal Year 2012 Data. Washington, DC, US Department of Veterans Affairs, 2013. [https://www.va.gov/HEALTH/docs/VHA\\_Quality\\_and\\_Safety\\_Report\\_2013.pdf](https://www.va.gov/HEALTH/docs/VHA_Quality_and_Safety_Report_2013.pdf). Accessed Jan 13, 2017
25. Hiatt HH, Barnes BA, Brennan TA, et al: A study of medical injury and medical malpractice. *New England Journal of Medicine* 321: 480–484, 1989
26. Thomas EJ, Studdert DM, Burstin HR, et al: Incidence and types of adverse events and negligent care in Utah and Colorado. *Medical Care* 38:261–271, 2000
27. Cullen SW, Nath SB, Marcus SC: Toward understanding errors in inpatient psychiatry: a qualitative inquiry. *Psychiatric Quarterly* 81: 197–205, 2010
28. Nath SB, Marcus SC: Medical errors in psychiatry. *Harvard Review of Psychiatry* 14:204–211, 2006
29. Griffin FA, Resar RK: IHI Global Trigger Tool for Measuring Adverse Events, 2nd ed. IHI Innovation Series white paper. Cambridge, MA, Institute for Healthcare Improvement, 2009
30. Classen DC, Resar R, Griffin F, et al: “Global trigger tool” shows that adverse events in hospitals may be ten times greater than previously measured. *Health Affairs* 30:581–589, 2011
31. Wu AW, Cavanaugh TA, McPhee SJ, et al: To tell the truth: ethical and practical issues in disclosing medical mistakes to patients. *Journal of General Internal Medicine* 12:770–775, 1997
32. Kizer KW, Stegun MB: Serious Reportable Adverse Events in Health Care. *Advances in Patient Safety*. vol. 4. Rockville, MD, Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality, 2005
33. Patient Information Form (PIF): Rockville, MD, Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality, 2012. [https://www.psoppc.org/psoppc\\_web/DLMS/downloadDocument?groupId=34&pageName=common%20Formats%20Supporting%20Docs](https://www.psoppc.org/psoppc_web/DLMS/downloadDocument?groupId=34&pageName=common%20Formats%20Supporting%20Docs). Accessed April 6, 2017
34. Serious Reportable Events in Healthcare—2011 Update: A Consensus Report. Washington, DC, National Quality Forum, 2011
35. de Vries EN, Ramrattan MA, Smorenburg SM, et al: The incidence and nature of in-hospital adverse events: a systematic review. *Quality and Safety in Health Care* 17:216–223, 2008
36. Bates DW, Boyle DL, Vander Vliet MB, et al: Relationship between medication errors and adverse drug events. *Journal of General Internal Medicine* 10:199–205, 1995
37. Rothschild JM, Mann K, Keohane CA, et al: Medication safety in a psychiatric hospital. *General Hospital Psychiatry* 29:156–162, 2007
38. Bates DW, Cullen DJ, Laird N, et al: Incidence of adverse drug events and potential adverse drug events: implications for prevention. *JAMA* 274:29–34, 1995
39. Bates DW, Kaushal R, Keohane C, et al: Center of Excellence for Patient Safety Research and Practice Terminology Training Manual. Boston, Brigham and Women’s Hospital, 2007
40. Bouldin EL, Andresen EM, Dunton NE, et al: Falls among adult patients hospitalized in the United States: prevalence and trends. *Journal of Patient Safety* 9:13–17, 2013
41. Sakinofsky I: Preventing suicide among inpatients. *Canadian Journal of Psychiatry* 59:131–140, 2014
42. Dunton N, Gajewski B, Taunton RL, et al: Nurse staffing and patient falls on acute care hospital units. *Nursing Outlook* 52:53–59, 2004
43. Miake-Lye IM, Hempel S, Ganz DA, et al: Inpatient fall prevention programs as a patient safety strategy: a systematic review. *Annals of Internal Medicine* 158:390–396, 2013
44. Evans RS, Pestotnik SL, Classen DC, et al: Preventing adverse drug events in hospitalized patients. *Annals of Pharmacotherapy* 28: 523–527, 1994
45. Mills PD, Watts BV, Miller S, et al: A checklist to identify inpatient suicide hazards in Veterans Affairs hospitals. *Joint Commission Journal on Quality and Patient Safety* 36:87–93, 2010
46. Haley RW, Schaberg DR, McClish DK, et al: The accuracy of retrospective chart review in measuring nosocomial infection rates: results of validation studies in pilot hospitals. *American Journal of Epidemiology* 111:516–533, 1980
47. Murff HJ, Patel VL, Hripcsak G, et al: Detecting adverse events for patient safety research: a review of current methodologies. *Journal of Biomedical Informatics* 36:131–143, 2003
48. Naessens JM, Campbell CR, Huddleston JM, et al: A comparison of hospital adverse events identified by three widely used detection methods. *International Journal for Quality in Health Care* 21:301–307, 2009
49. Casey JA, Schwartz BS, Stewart WF, et al: Using electronic health records for population health research: a review of methods and applications. *Annual Review of Public Health* 37:61–81, 2016
50. Vassar M, Holzmann M: The retrospective chart review: important methodological considerations. *Journal of Educational Evaluation for Health Professions* 10:12–18, 2013