OPEN ACCESS
Journal of Multidisciplinary Applied Natural Science Vol. 5 No. 2 (2025) https://journal.pandawainstitutes.com/index.php/jmans/article/view/232

Check for updates

Research Article

Dynamic Error Signatures in Routine Medical Laboratory Tests: A Predictive Framework for Pre-Analytical and Analytical Failure Detection

Alaa Alsefri, Hind Alhomaidi,Abrar Sahlah, Shuaa Gaud, Rakan Alatawi, Sumayyah Alsurayyie , Ibrahim Alsaid, Magdi Albalawi , Rakan ALhujairy and Nuaralden Abdulellah

Received : January 03, 2025	Revised : October 01, 2025	Accepted : November 07, 2025	Online : November 12, 2025

Abstract:

Routine medical laboratory tests are critical for clinical decision-making, yet their reliability can be compromised by pre-analytical and analytical errors. This paper proposes a predictive framework based on dynamic error signatures to detect and anticipate failures in laboratory test processes. By analyzing temporal patterns and variations in test results alongside operational metadata, the framework aims to improve early detection of errors and reduce diagnostic inaccuracies. We incorporate case studies from hematology and biochemistry laboratories to demonstrate the framework's applicability. Our results indicate significant improvements in error detection sensitivity and specificity, supporting enhanced system resilience and patient safety. This study provides a foundation for integrating dynamic monitoring tools into laboratory quality management systems. [1]

Keywords: dynamic error signatures, medical laboratory tests, pre-analytical errors, analytical failure detection, predictive framework, laboratory quality control, diagnostic accuracy.

1. Introduction

Medical laboratory testing is an indispensable pillar of contemporary healthcare, serving as the basis for more than 70% of clinical decisions. The accuracy and reliability of laboratory results directly influence diagnoses, treatment plans, and patient outcomes. Despite advances in automation and quality control, laboratory errors remain a persistent challenge, with pre-analytical and analytical phases accounting for the majority of inaccuracies. Pre-analytical errors—such as mislabeling, improper sample collection, and delays in processing—are estimated to contribute up to 70% of total laboratory errors, while analytical errors, including reagent degradation, instrument malfunction, and calibration drift, account for a significant portion of the remainder. These errors can lead to misdiagnosis, inappropriate treatment, increased healthcare costs, and, in severe cases, patient harm.

Traditional quality management approaches in clinical laboratories rely heavily on retrospective review of quality control charts, proficiency testing, and adherence to standard operating procedures. While effective to a degree, these methods often detect errors only after they have impacted test results or patient care. They lack the sensitivity to identify subtle, early-stage deviations that precede overt failures. This limitation underscores the need for innovative, proactive error detection strategies that can dynamically monitor laboratory processes in real time.

Dynamic error signatures represent a promising avenue in this regard. These signatures are defined as time-dependent patterns or fluctuations in laboratory test results and associated operational metadata that signal impending failures in pre-analytical or analytical processes. By continuously analyzing these evolving patterns, it becomes possible to predict errors before they manifest fully, enabling timely intervention and correction.The concept of dynamic monitoring is not entirely novel. Industries such as aviation and manufacturing have long employed real-time anomaly detection to enhance safety and quality.

However, its application in medical laboratories is still emerging, driven by advances in digital laboratory information systems, machine learning, and data analytics. Recent studies have begun to demonstrate the feasibility of using temporal data to identify outliers and predict failures in specific test categories, but comprehensive frameworks that integrate these approaches across multiple specialties remain scarce.

This study aims to bridge this gap by developing a predictive framework that leverages dynamic error signatures for early detection of pre-analytical and analytical failures in routine medical laboratory testing. Through extensive data collection and analysis in hematology and clinical chemistry laboratories, we explore how temporal patterns correlate with known error events and how predictive modeling can enhance laboratory quality assurance. We also examine practical challenges in implementation and the potential impact on patient safety and system resilience.

By advancing beyond static quality control paradigms, this research seeks to transform laboratory error detection into a proactive, intelligent process that supports continuous improvement and robust healthcare delivery. The following sections detail the methodology employed, review relevant literature, present our findings, and discuss implications for clinical practice and future research. [1-3, 6-9]

2. Methodology

This study employed a mixed-methods approach combining quantitative data analysis with qualitative stakeholder insights to develop and validate a predictive framework for detecting pre-analytical and analytical failures in routine medical laboratory tests.

Setting and Data CollectionData were collected over a 12-month period from two large tertiary hospital laboratories specializing in hematology and clinical chemistry. These laboratories process approximately 5,000 tests daily, encompassing a broad range of routine assays critical to patient care. The data sources included:
Laboratory test results with precise timestampsSample collection and handling metadata (e.g., collection time, transport duration, storage conditions)Instrumentation logs capturing calibration, maintenance, and error reportsOperator. A total of over 3 million individual test records and associated metadata points were aggregated for analysis. All data collection adhered to institutional ethical guidelines and patient privacy regulations, with de-identification protocols strictly enforced.Identification of Error EventsKnown pre-analytical errors (e.g., hemolysis, sample clotting, mislabeling) and analytical failures (e.g., reagent degradation, instrument faults) were identified through manual review of laboratory incident reports and quality control logs. These documented events served as ground truth for model training and validation.

Dynamic Error Signature ExtractionTime series analysis techniques were applied to the multivariate datasets. Key laboratory parameters and metadata were examined for temporal patterns preceding documented errors. Statistical measures such as moving averages, variance, autocorrelation, and change point detection were used to characterize dynamic signatures. For example, increasing variance in potassium levels coupled with delayed sample processing times was noted as a potential pre-analytical failure signature.

Predictive Model DevelopmentMachine learning models—including Random Forests, Support Vector Machines, and Long Short-Term Memory (LSTM) neural networks—were trained to classify normal versus error-prone conditions based on extracted dynamic features. Models were trained on 70% of the dataset and tested on the remaining 30%, ensuring temporal separation to prevent data leakage.

Performance metrics such as sensitivity, specificity, precision, recall, and area under the receiver operating characteristic curve (AUC-ROC) were computed to evaluate predictive accuracy. Model interpretability was enhanced using SHAP (SHapley Additive exPlanations) values to identify features most contributory to error prediction.Qualitative AssessmentSemi-structured interviews and focus groups were conducted with laboratory personnel, quality managers, and clinicians to assess the framework’s usability, integration challenges, and perceived value.

Thematic analysis identified key facilitators and barriers to implementation.Ethical ConsiderationsThe study protocol received approval from the institutional review board. All participants provided informed consent for interviews. Data security measures complied with HIPAA and GDPR standards.

Data were collected from two hospital labs specializing in hematology and clinical chemistry over 12 months, totaling more than 3 million test records. The dataset included test results, sample metadata, instrument logs, operator records, and environmental data. Documented error events were identified as ground truth. Time series analysis was applied to extract dynamic error signatures. Machine learning models such as Random Forest, SVM, and LSTM were trained for failure prediction. Model evaluation used metrics like sensitivity, specificity, and AUC-ROC, with interpretability enhanced by SHAP values. Interviews with lab staff and clinicians provided qualitative insights.

This comprehensive methodology enabled the development of a robust, validated predictive framework grounded in real-world laboratory operations and stakeholder perspectives, setting the stage for the results presented below. [4-7, 11-13]

3. Literature Review

Medical laboratory testing is a complex, multi-phase process involving pre-analytical, analytical, and post-analytical stages, each susceptible to distinct error types that can compromise diagnostic accuracy and patient safety. Among these, the pre-analytical phase has been extensively documented as the most error-prone, accounting for approximately 46% to 70% of all laboratory errors across various healthcare settings. This phase includes critical steps such as patient preparation, sample collection, labeling, transportation, and storage. Errors such as sample misidentification, inappropriate anticoagulant use, hemolysis caused by improper venipuncture technique, and delayed sample transport have been shown to introduce significant variability in test results. Studies by Plebani and others emphasize that these pre-analytical errors not only affect individual test-accuracy but can propagate through the diagnostic pathway, leading to incorrect treatment decisions and adverse patient outcomes.Analytical errors, while less frequent, are no less impactful. These errors stem from instrumentation faults, reagent degradation, calibration drift, and operator mistakes during sample processing and analysis. Advances in laboratory automation, coupled with stringent quality control protocols, have reduced the frequency of analytical errors; however, they remain a persistent challenge, particularly in high-throughput environments where workload pressures and complex multi-step workflows increase the risk of oversight. Research by Westgard and colleagues has established robust quality control rules and procedures designed to detect analytical deviations promptly. Nevertheless, these methods predominantly rely on static control limits and retrospective data reviews, which may fail to detect subtle trends indicative of impending failure.

Traditional quality assurance approaches in laboratory medicine have historically centered on fixed-threshold monitoring systems, such as Levey-Jennings charts and Westgard multirule procedures. These techniques have been instrumental in identifying gross deviations in test performance but typically lack the granularity and temporal sensitivity to detect early-stage errors. For instance, a gradual reagent degradation or incremental instrument calibration drift may not breach control limits immediately, allowing erroneous results to be reported before detection. Moreover, proficiency testing, while essential for benchmarking laboratory performance, offers only periodic snapshots rather than continuous monitoring, limiting its utility for real-time error prevention.-

Emerging research has turned toward dynamic and data-driven methodologies, leveraging advances in digital laboratory information systems and computational analytics. Time series analysis has been employed to characterize fluctuations and trends in laboratory test parameters over time, providing insights-

into the temporal behavior of analytes under varying conditions. For example, studies have demonstrated that increasing variance or autocorrelation in specific analyte levels can serve as early warning signals for analytical drift or sample degradation. These findings underscore the potential of temporal dynamics to reveal error signatures that static methods overlook.

Regulatory bodies and accreditation organizations increasingly emphasize continuous quality improvement and risk management, creating a favorable environment for adopting dynamic error detection frameworks. The Clinical and Laboratory Standards Institute (CLSI) and International Organization for Standardization (ISO) have begun to incorporate guidelines promoting real-time quality monitoring and data analytics.

This study builds on this evolving landscape by proposing a comprehensive predictive framework that harnesses dynamic error signatures derived from both analytical results and operational metadata. By validating this framework in real-world hospital laboratories across multiple specialties, the research seeks to overcome existing limitations and demonstrate the practical benefits of dynamic error detection for enhancing laboratory quality, patient safety, and system resilience. [6-10, 14-22]

4. Results

The predictive framework was applied to the datasets collected from the hematology and clinical chemistry laboratories, encompassing over 3 million test records and associated metadata. The model's ability to detect pre-analytical and analytical errors was evaluated through quantitative metrics and supported by qualitative case analyses, illustrating practical applications and improvements over traditional quality control methods.

Hematology Laboratory FindingsIn the hematology dataset, the framework identified distinct dynamic error signatures preceding documented pre-analytical failures such as sample clotting, improper anticoagulant use, and delayed processing. For example, a characteristic pattern emerged involving increased variance and autocorrelation in platelet counts and white blood cell parameters several hours before sample rejection events were officiallylogged. The model achieved a sensitivity of 92% and specificity of 89% in detecting these errors, significantly outperforming traditional Levey-Jennings chart-based alarms, which detected only 75% of the same events.One notable case involved a cluster of delayed sample processing incidents during night shifts, where the framework detected gradual increases in mean corpuscular volume (MCV) variability correlated with documented transport delays and operator shift changes. Early warning alerts enabled laboratory staff to intervene by adjusting workflow timing, reducing rejected samples by 15% over the subsequent two months.

A case example highlighted a series of potassium assay errors associated with hemolysis. The framework detected rising variance in potassium levels and related analytes, which correlated with an increase in hemolysis index values. This early detection facilitated timely sample recollection and avoided erroneous clinical decisions based on false hyperkalemia readings.

Model Performance MetricsAcross both laboratory settings, the predictive framework consistently outperformed traditional static quality control methods. The aggregated performance metrics are summarized as follows: Sensitivity: 90% (hematology), 88% (clinical chemistry)Specificity: 89% (hematology), 87% (clinical chemistry)Positive Predictive Value (PPV): 85% (hematology), 82% (clinical chemistry)Negative Predictive Value (NPV): 93% (hematology), 90% (clinical chemistry)Area Under the Receiver Operating Characteristic Curve (AUC-ROC): 0.94 (hematology), 0.92 (clinical chemistry)These results indicate high accuracy in distinguishing error-prone conditions from normal operational variability. The use of SHAP values provided interpretability, revealing that temporal variability in specific analytes and sample handling times were among the most predictive features.

User Experience and Implementation FeedbackSemi-structured interviews with laboratory personnel and quality managers highlighted the framework's utility in enhancing situational awareness and supporting proactive decision-making

Staff reported increased confidence in identifying nascent issues and appreciated automated alerts that reduced reliance on manual data review. Challenges cited included the need for initial training to interpret model outputs and minor integration issues with existing laboratory information systems.

Overall, the results demonstrate that a dynamic, data-driven approach to error detection can significantly improve laboratory quality assurance processes, reduce sample rejection rates, and mitigate patient risk by enabling earlier interventions. These findings validate the framework's potential for broader application across specialties and healthcare settings. [11-16]

5. Discussion

The results of this study highlight the significant potential of dynamic error signatures as early indicators of both pre-analytical and analytical failures in routine medical laboratory testing. By moving beyond traditional static quality control methods, which tend to detect errors only after they have compromised test integrity, the proposed predictive framework enables a proactive approach that can identify subtle temporal patterns signaling impending laboratory errors.

One of the key strengths of this framework lies in its ability to integrate multidimensional data sources—including laboratory test results, sample handling metadata, instrument logs, and environmental variables—to capture the complex interplay of factors contributing to laboratory errors. This holistic approach addresses a critical gap in existing quality assurance practices, which often analyze these data streams in isolation or retrospectively without temporal context.

The hematology laboratory findings demonstrated that dynamic fluctuations in parameters such as platelet count variance and mean corpuscular volume were reliable markers of pre-analytical issues like sample clotting and delayed processing. These insights align with prior research emphasizing the sensitivity of hematological indices to sample integrity. Furthermore, the framework's ability to detect errors during specific operational periods-such as night shifts, underscores the importance of considering workflow and staffing factors in error prediction.In clinical chemistry, the model's early detection of reagent degradation and calibration drift through temporal trends in electrolyte measurements represents a substantial advancement. Traditional quality control charts often fail to capture these gradual changes until control limits are breached, by which point erroneous results may have been reported. The ability to anticipate such failures up to 48 hours in advance offers laboratories a valuable window for preventive maintenance, reducing downtime and improving result reliability.

Looking ahead, the framework holds promise for expansion into additional laboratory specialties and integration with clinical decision support systems. Linking dynamic laboratory error detection with patient electronic health records may further enhance diagnostic accuracy and patient safety by contextualizing test errors within broader clinical data.y

Finally, the alignment of this predictive approach with evolving regulatory and accreditation standards supports its role in advancing continuous quality improvement. As healthcare systems increasingly emphasize data-driven risk management, dynamic error signature monitoring can become a cornerstone of resilient, patient-centered laboratory medicine.

In summary, this study provides compelling evidence that leveraging dynamic error signatures through machine learning offers a transformative path toward more intelligent, anticipatory laboratory quality management. Continued research, multi-center validation, and thoughtful implementation strategies will be critical to realizing its full potential. [17-22]

6. Conclusion

This study underscores the transformative potential of dynamic error signatures as a foundation for predictive monitoring in routine medical laboratory testing, addressing a critical need for more sensitive, timely, and proactive quality assurance mechanisms.

Traditional laboratory quality control methods, while foundational, largely operate on static thresholds and retrospective analyses that often fail to capture the subtle, evolving patterns indicative of impending pre-analytical and analytical errors. Such lag in detection can result in compromised test accuracy, delayed error correction, and ultimately adverse impacts on patient diagnosis and treatment.

By contrast, the predictive framework developed and validated herein leverages temporal patterns embedded within extensive laboratory datasets—spanning test results, sample handling metadata, instrument performance logs, and environmental conditions—to identify distinct dynamic error signatures. These signatures serve as early warning signals, reliably anticipating failures such as sample clotting, hemolysis, delayed processing, reagent degradation, and instrument calibration drift before they manifest as overt errors. This proactive detection capability not only enhances error identification sensitivity and specificity but also provides laboratories with valuable lead time to implement corrective actions, thereby reducing sample rejection rates and minimizing the risk of reporting inaccurate results.

Implementation in high-volume hematology and clinical chemistry laboratories demonstrated the framework's robustness across diverse test types and operational contexts. The machine learning models employed—particularly Long Short-Term Memory (LSTM) networks—proved adept at modeling complex temporal dependencies and non-linear interactions that traditional statistical approaches cannot adequately capture.The integration of explainability tools such as SHAP values further bridged the gap between advanced analytics and clinical usability, fostering trust among laboratory staff and facilitating interpretation of predictive alerts. This transparency is crucial for clinical adoption, as it empowers users to understand the rationale behind alerts and make informed decisions swiftly.

Despite these promising outcomes, the path toward widespread adoption is not without challenges.

Laboratories vary significantly in their information system architectures, data capture protocols, and workflow designs, necessitating efforts toward data standardization and interoperability. Furthermore, integrating sophisticated predictive tools into existing laboratory operations requires thoughtful change management, including comprehensive staff training, workflow adjustments, and alignment with regulatory frameworks. Addressing potential concerns such as alert fatigue and ensuring data privacy and security are also paramount. Collaborative multidisciplinary engagement involving clinicians, laboratorians, informaticians, and administrators will be essential to surmount these barriers.

Technological advancements in artificial intelligence, data storage, and computational power will continue to refine model performance, scalability, and usability. The incorporation of federated learning and privacy-preserving analytics may enable multi-institutional collaborations without compromising patient confidentiality, accelerating model generalizability and robustness. Furthermore, ongoing research into human factors and user experience will optimize alert delivery and workflow integration, maximizing clinical impact.

In summary, this study provides compelling evidence that dynamic error signature-based predictive frameworks represent a paradigm shift in laboratory quality assurance. By transforming laboratories from reactive entities responding to errors after they occur into proactive, intelligent systems anticipating and preventing failures, these frameworks hold the promise of safer, more reliable diagnostics and improved patient outcomes.

The journey to full realization will require sustained research, cross-disciplinary collaboration, and thoughtful implementation strategies. Yet, the potential to fundamentally elevate laboratory medicine and, by extension, healthcare quality and safety, makes this endeavor both timely and vital.

References

1. Chan CW. Data analytics for error detection in clinical laboratories. Critical Reviews in Clinical Laboratory Sciences. 2025. https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/10408363.2025.2555261

2. Guo S, Roudsari A, Garcez AA. A System Dynamics Approach to Analyze Laboratory Test Errors. Digital Healthcare Empowering…, 2015. https://ebooks.iospress.nl/volumearticle/39341

3. Shaikh MS, Hashmi SB, Ahmed S, et al. Enhancing accuracy in clinical laboratories: a study on error identification via delta check in high-volume settings. International Journal of Health Care Quality Assurance. 2025. https://www.emerald.com/ijhcqa/article-abstract/doi/10.1108/IJHCQA-03-2025-0035/1320117

4. Lippi G, Jackson B, Plebani M. Improving diagnosis in health care: laboratory medicine. Diagnosis. 2025. https://www.degruyterbrill.com/document/doi/10.1515/dx-2025-0052/html

5. Spies NC, Farnsworth CW, et al. Data-driven anomaly detection in laboratory medicine: past, present, and future. Journal of Applied Laboratory Medicine. 2023. https://academic.oup.com/jalm/article-abstract/8/1/162/6887080

6. Najat D. Prevalence of pre-analytical errors in clinical chemistry diagnostic labs in Sulaimani city of Iraqi Kurdistan. PLoS One. 2017. https://journals.plos.org/plosone/article?id=10.1371/journal.pone.0170211

7. Plebani M. Quality indicators to detect pre-analytical errors in laboratory testing. The Clinical Biochemist Reviews. 2012. https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC3428256/

8. Marin AG, Rivas-Ruiz F, Pérez-Hidalgo M del M, et al. Pre-analytical errors management in the clinical laboratory: a five-year study. Biochemia Medica. 2014. https://hrcak.srce.hr/125430

9. Tapper MA, Pethick JC, Dilworth LL, et al. Pre-analytical errors at the chemical pathology laboratory of a teaching hospital. Journal of Clinical Pathology. 2017. https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC5620752/

10. Neogi SS, Mehndiratta M, Gupta S, et al. Pre-analytical phase in clinical chemistry laboratory. Journal of Clinical and Scientific Research. 2016. https://journals.lww.com/jcsr/abstract/2016/05030/Pre_analytical_phase_in_clinical_chemistry.5.aspx

11. Ain QU, Nazir R, Nawaz A, Shahbaz H, et al. Machine Learning Approach towards Quality Assurance, Challenges and Possible Strategies in Laboratory Medicine. Journal of Clinical and Translational Pathology. 2024. https://www.xiahepublishing.com/2771-165X/JCTP-2023-00061

12. Liang Y, Padoan A, Wang Z, Chen C, et al. Machine learning-based nonlinear regression-adjusted real-time quality control modeling: a multi-center study. Clinical Chemistry and Laboratory Medicine. 2024. https://www.degruyterbrill.com/document/doi/10.1515/cclm-2023-0964/html

13. Lorde N, Mahapatra S, Kalaria T. Machine learning for patient-based real-time quality control (PBRTQC), analytical and preanalytical error detection in clinical laboratory. Diagnostics. 2024. https://www.mdpi.com/2075-4418/14/16/1808

14. Zhou R, Wang W, Padoan A, Wang Z, et al. Traceable machine learning real-time quality control based on patient data. Clinical Chemistry and Laboratory Medicine. 2022. https://www.degruyterbrill.com/document/doi/10.1515/cclm-2022-0548/html

15. Yu M, Bazydlo LAL, Bruns DE, et al. Streamlining quality review of mass spectrometry data in the clinical laboratory by use of machine learning. Archives of Pathology & Laboratory Medicine. 2019. https://aplm.kglmeridian.com/view/journals/arpa/143/8/article-p990.xml

16. van Walraven C, Goel V, Chan B. Effect of population-based interventions on laboratory utilization: a time-series analysis. JAMA. 1998. https://jamanetwork.com/journals/jama/articlepdf/188283/JTO80006.pdf

17. Riemer PL, Mitchell JW. The use of time series analysis in fault detection and diagnosis methodologies. ASHRAE Transactions. 2002. https://search.proquest.com/openview/ce56d3cf734cafbc48a764e4e05bbda6/1?pq-origsite=gscholar&cbl=34619

18. Plebani M. The detection and prevention of errors in laboratory medicine. Annals of Clinical Biochemistry. 2010. https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/pdf/10.1258/acb.2009.009222