

1 **The effect of pre-anaesthetic assessment clinic: a systematic review of randomised and**  
2 **non-randomised prospective controlled studies**

3

4 Eirunn Wallevik Kristoffersen<sup>1, \*</sup>, Anne Opsal<sup>1</sup>, Tor Tveit<sup>1,2,3</sup>, Rigmor C Berg<sup>4,5</sup>, Mariann

5 Fossum<sup>1</sup>

6

7 <sup>1</sup>Department of Health and Nursing Science, University of Agder, Grimstad/Kristiansand,

8 Norway

9 <sup>2</sup>Department of Anaesthesiology and Intensive Care, Soerlandet Hospital, Kristiansand,

10 Norway

11 <sup>3</sup>Department of Technology and e-Health, Soerlandet Hospital, Kristiansand, Norway

12 <sup>4</sup>Department of Community Medicine, University of Tromsø, Tromsø, Norway

13 <sup>5</sup>Norwegian Institute of Public Health, Oslo, Norway

14

15 \*Corresponding author:

16 Eirunn Wallevik Kristoffersen

17 Department of Health and Nursing Science, University of Agder, Grimstad/Kristiansand,

18 Norway

19 E-mail: [eirunn.w.kristoffersen@uia.no](mailto:eirunn.w.kristoffersen@uia.no)

20

21 Word count: 3996

22

23

24 **ABSTRACT**

25 **Objectives:** The aim of this systematic review was to examine the effectiveness of pre-  
26 anaesthetic assessment clinics (PACs) implemented to improve quality and patient safety in  
27 perioperative care.

28 **Design:** Systematic review.

29 **Data sources:** The electronic databases CINAHL Plus with Full Text (EBSCOhost), Medline,  
30 and Embase (OvidSP) were systematically searched from 1st April, 1996 to 4th February,  
31 2021.

32 **Eligibility criteria:** The main inclusion criterion was that the study, using empirical  
33 quantitative methods, addressed the effectiveness of PACs.

34 **Data extraction and synthesis:** Titles, abstracts, and full texts were screened in duplicate by  
35 two authors. Risk of bias assessment, using the Joanna Briggs Institute critical appraisal  
36 checklist for quasi-experimental studies, and data extraction were performed by one author  
37 and checked by the other author. Results were synthesised narratively owing to the  
38 heterogeneity of the included studies.

39 **Results:** Seven prospective controlled studies were conducted. Most studies had a high risk  
40 of bias. Three studies reported a significant reduction in the length of the hospital stay, and  
41 two studies reported a significant reduction in cancellation of surgery for medical reasons  
42 when patients were seen in the PAC. In addition, the included studies presented mixed  
43 results regarding anxiety in patients.

44 **Conclusion:** This systematic review demonstrated a reduction in the length of hospital stay  
45 and cancellation of surgery when the patients had been assessed in the PAC. There is a need  
46 for high-quality prospective studies to gain a deeper understanding of the effectiveness of  
47 PACs.

48 **PROSPERO registration number:** CRD42019137724

49

50 **Keywords:** pre-anaesthetic assessment clinic, preoperative care, quality, safety, systematic  
51 review

52

53

54

55

56

57

58

## 59 **ARTICLE SUMMARY**

60

### 61 **Strengths and Limitations of this study**

- 62 • Only prospective studies were included in this systematic review.
- 63 • The systematic review was conducted in accordance with international guidelines.
- 64 • Only seven studies were identified, highlighting the need for further research on pre-  
65 anaesthetic assessment clinics.
- 66 • Overall, the quality of the included studies was low, and the current practice  
67 possesses limited evidence base.

68

## 69 **INTRODUCTION**

70 Anaesthesia constitutes an important part of surgery; however, it has the potential to  
71 activate physiological changes that can increase morbidity and mortality,[1] mainly  
72 depending on the patients' preoperative health condition and age.[2] Hospitals are treating  
73 patients with complex, comorbid healthcare problems who undergo progressively extensive  
74 surgeries and interventions.[3,4] To ensure the quality and safety of anaesthesia and  
75 surgery, precise knowledge of the clinical characteristics of patients undergoing surgery is  
76 critical to the perioperative treatment plan.[2] Over the past 50 years, perioperative  
77 mortality, including anaesthesia-related mortality, has declined, with the most significant  
78 decline observed in developed countries,[1,5] mainly due to new anaesthetics, improved  
79 monitoring equipment and training, availability of recovery rooms, and improved airway  
80 management.[4] However, an Australian study reported that 14% of anaesthetic-surgical  
81 complications and 39% of deaths attributed to anaesthesia were associated with insufficient  
82 and/or inadequate preoperative evaluation.[6] A Danish retrospective investigation showed  
83 that the deaths among patients undergoing surgery could have been prevented by a  
84 thorough preoperative evaluation,[7] indicating that risk factors are both patient-and

85 surgery-related and linked to organisational structures.[8] Future efforts should improve  
86 preoperative anaesthesia safety,[9] by improving planning and preparation for elective  
87 procedures and interventions.

88 In 1949, Lee discussed the value of the “anaesthetic outpatient clinic” in the preparation of  
89 patients for surgery.[10] Today, an increasing number of pre-anaesthesia assessment clinics  
90 (PACs) are supporting hospitals in handling the rise in the number and complexity of surgical  
91 procedures.[11] The PAC consultation, conducted by the anaesthesiologist, anaesthesia  
92 nurse, or both, is globally recognised as an evaluation method while optimising the patients’  
93 medical condition prior to surgery and anaesthesia, and is considered essential in securing  
94 anaesthetic practice since it detects anaesthesia-related risk factors and high-risk patients,  
95 improves patient outcomes, prepares the patient physically and psychologically for  
96 anaesthesia, and ensures the patient’s most favourable condition for surgery and  
97 anaesthesia.[12-14] Considering the well-prepared patients and staff, several researchers  
98 posit that with PAC, the number of surgical cancellations, length of hospital stay, and  
99 mortality rate are reduced, and tests are minimised.[8,15,16] Others assert that patients feel  
100 less anxious regarding the subsequent anaesthetic and surgical processes and are highly  
101 satisfied with this service when PACs are used.[15,17,18]

102 As Turunen *et al.* state, research on PACs is scarce regarding costs, financial savings, the  
103 impact on patient safety and quality of care, accuracy of operative patients, and effect on  
104 preoperative nursing levels.[19] Survey results indicate that anaesthesiologists perceive day  
105 of surgery delays due to missing information as common, even with PAC consultations.[20]  
106 The present systematic review examines the outcomes of PAC as systematic work on quality

107 and patient safety, including identifying the areas for improvement, implementing  
108 interventions, and ensuring that patient outcome improvement.

## 109 **METHODS**

110 The aim of this systematic review was to examine the effectiveness of PACs in improving  
111 quality and patient safety in preoperative care. A further aim was to determine the gaps in  
112 existing knowledge for future research. Our systematic review followed the guidelines in the  
113 Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions [21] and was reported in  
114 accordance with the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses  
115 (PRISMA) guidelines.[22] The protocol was published in PROSPERO: CRD42019137724.[23]  
116 We had two review questions:

- 117 1. What are the effects of PACs on patient satisfaction, anxiety, and safety?
- 118 2. What are the effects of PACs on cancellation rate, cost, and efficiency?

## 119 **Search strategies**

120 We performed a scoping search in different databases to identify the key terms for the  
121 literature search.[24,25] The final search was planned and conducted in close collaboration  
122 with a university librarian. On 11th September, 2018 we searched CINAHL Plus with Full Text  
123 (EBSCOhost), Medline, and Embase (OvidSP), and updated it on 4th February, 2021.  
124 Considering the lack of subject headings (e.g., MeSH) for PAC, we used text words such as  
125 preanaesthesia. The search in Medline is presented in Appendix 1. The search mode in  
126 CINAHL was Boolean/Phase, which supports Boolean searching or exact phrase searching. To  
127 ensure comprehensiveness, we used both the truncation and proximity operators. We  
128 limited the search to 1996 since this was the year one of the first known articles in this area

129 was published.[23] Complementary methods to identify studies included following up on  
130 citations via Scopus, scanning the reference lists of relevant papers and included articles,  
131 and checking for relevant studies in clinical trials.[24]

### 132 **Eligibility criteria**

133 Considering the aim of the review, the main inclusion criterion was that the study, using  
134 empirical quantitative methods, addressed the effectiveness of PACs. Specific study  
135 eligibility criteria were: (a) published in English or Scandinavian language, (b) scientific  
136 publication of original research, (c) reporting the outcomes of PAC, (d) PAC consultation with  
137 the patient present, (e) randomised or non-randomised prospective controlled studies, and  
138 (f) newly established PAC. We excluded: (a) editorials, discussion papers, and conference  
139 abstracts, (b) reviews, (c) instrument testing, (d) studies with children, and (e) retrospective  
140 studies.

### 141 **Study selection**

142 All references identified in the search were transferred to EndNoteX9, where the duplicates  
143 were removed. Next, all unique references were transferred to the Covidence screening  
144 tool.[26] Study eligibility was ascertained independently by two authors, first at the title and  
145 abstract level, and subsequently at the full text. Inclusion was determined by consensus, and  
146 disagreements were resolved by consulting a third author.

### 147 **Quality assessment**

148 We used design-specific checklists to assess the studies' risk of bias. Given the  
149 methodological similarity of the included studies, only the Joanna Briggs Institute Critical  
150 appraisal checklist for quasi-experimental studies was used.[27] One author performed the  
151 risk of bias assessment, and the other checked the accuracy of the assessment.

152 Disagreements were resolved through discussion with a third author. Each of the nine  
153 checklist questions was answered no, yes, unclear (or not applicable).

#### 154 **Data extraction and analysis**

155 One author extracted data from each included study onto a pre-designed Excel spreadsheet,  
156 and another checked the extracted data for accuracy, consistency, and completeness.

157 Extracted information included publication details, study design, setting, and characteristics  
158 of the patients, interventions, comparisons, and outcome (PICO). We requested information  
159 on the missing data; however, received no response from the author. If the PICO elements  
160 were sufficiently similar and statistical data were available, we had planned to conduct  
161 meta-analyses. However, the extracted data revealed substantial heterogeneity among the  
162 studies, and there were no randomised controlled trials (RCTs). Therefore, we performed a  
163 narrative synthesis, describing and comparing the main findings from the included studies,  
164 and discussing their methodological strengths and weaknesses.

#### 165 **RESULTS**

166 Figure 1. provides details of the study selection process. A total of 2250 records were  
167 identified in the first search and 742 in the second search. After removing duplicates, we  
168 screened 2372 records based on the title and abstract; of these, 179 records passed the full-  
169 text screening. We included seven studies that met the inclusion criteria.

#### 170 **Overall characteristics of the studies**

171 The seven included studies are listed in Table 1. They were all in English and published in  
172 2000–2017, with data collected in the years 1997–2015 (one did not provide this data  
173 collection information).[28] Based on our inclusion criteria, all were prospective controlled  
174 studies, but we found no RCTs. There was one controlled before-after study.[34] The other  
175 six studies had control groups but no baseline assessments, only assessments following PAC

176 implementation. There were three 2-group non-parallel after-only studies,[29,30,32] and  
177 three 2-group parallel after-only studies [28], where one had a matched control group[31]  
178 and one had three follow-up assessments of one arm.[33] In total, the studies included  
179 77411 patients.



180 **Table 1: Description of included studies**

<b>Author, Year, Country</b>	<b>Study design</b>	<b>Sampling time</b>	<b>Population</b>	<b>Intervention</b>	<b>Comparison</b>	<b>Outcomes</b>
Farasatkish, 2009[1] Iran	2-group after study	May 2007 through August 2007	N=1716, open-heart surgery, ASA class III-IV	Pre-anaesthesia consultation clinic (3-10 days before surgery)	Usual care (within 24 h of surgery)	Cancellations
Kamal, 2011[2] England	2-group after study	April 2005 through April 2009	N=1445, complex elective orthopaedic surgery, ASA class III-IV	Preoperative anaesthetic assessment clinic (timing not stated)	Usual care (day of surgery)	Admissions, length of stay, mortality, cost
Kamau, 2017[3] Kenya	CBA	August 2000, April 2001, November 2001	N=51, elective non-cardiac surgery, ASA class III	Pre-anaesthesia clinic consultation ( $\geq 48$ h before surgery)	Usual care (day before surgery)	Anxiety (STAI score)
Klopfenstein, 2000[4] Switzerland	2-group after study (parallel)	No data	N=40, elective endoscopic urological surgery, ASA class I-III	Pre-anaesthetic consultation (1-2 weeks before surgery)	Usual care (the evening before surgery)	Anxiety (MAACL, VAS)
Lee, 2012[5] China	2-group after study (parallel)	March 2007 through November 2009	N=352, elective surgery, ASA class I-IV	Anaesthesia consultation clinic ( $\leq 3$ months before surgery)	Usual care (the evening before surgery)	Quality of recovery score), cost, cancellations, length of stay, satisfaction, anxiety (VAS), willingness to pay (WTP)
Mendes,	2-group	April 2007	N=52254,	Preoperative	Usual care (timing	Cancellations,

2005[6] Brazil	after study (parallel)	through June 2007	surgery, ASA class not stated	outpatient evaluation clinic (timing not stated)	not stated)	length of stay
van Klei, 2002[7] The Netherlands	2-group after study	November 2012	N=21553, elective surgery, ASA class mainly I-II	Preoperative outpatient evaluation clinic (average 3 weeks before surgery)	Usual care (day before surgery)	Cancellations, same- day admissions, length of stay

181

182 ASA: American Society of Anesthesiology; CBA: controlled before-after; MAACL: Multiple Affect Adjective Check List; STAI: State-Trait Anxiety  
 183 Inventory; VAS: visual analogue scale;  
 184 WTP: willingness to pay

Considering the intervention, PACs in all studies consisted of an outpatient service whereby patients were checked for medical conditions that are important for anaesthesia and informed regarding what to expect on the day of surgery. However, the terminology used for PACs varied; they served different surgical specialities, and the pre-anaesthesia consultation was conducted from  $\geq 48$  h to  $\leq 3$  months before the surgery. Three were implemented in a university hospital,[31,33,34] one in a teaching hospital,[30] one in a medical centre,[32] and one in a general hospital[29] (one study did not specify the context).[28] The person conducting the pre-anaesthesia consultation also varied: in five studies, it was the anaesthesiologists,[28-31,33] in the other studies it was (also) the orthopaedic senior house officer,[29] the consultant or resident,[34] or the physician.[32] In three studies, nurses were part of the team assessing the patients.[29-31] The comparison group in all studies was usual care, which generally involved performing a preoperative anaesthetic evaluation the day before the surgery on the admitted patients.

Of the 77411 patients in the studies, 9626 and 15531 patients were in the intervention and control groups, respectively. One study did not specify the number of patients in the intervention and control groups, but only the total number of surgeries performed.[33] Five studies reported data for sex, showing that 51% of the patients were women and 49% were men (12129 vs. 11583).[28,30-32,34] There were more females than males both in the intervention (4345 vs. 4134) and the control groups (7784 vs. 7449). Five studies reported data for age showing that all the patients were over 20 years old and grouped within the American Society of Anesthesiology (ASA) category.[28,30-32,34]

The patients were scheduled to undergo a variety of surgeries, including orthopaedic,[29-31,34] urology,[28,30,31,34] general,[30,31,34] heart,[32] gynaecology/obstetrics,[30,31,34] vascular surgery,[30] ophthalmology,[30] maxillofacial/dental surgery,[30,34]neurological surgery,[30] and one did not specify the type of surgery.[33] In five studies, the type of anaesthesia was not specified,[29,30,32-34] and two studies reported patients for general and/or regional supplement.[28,31]

The patients included had previous anaesthetic experience in one study,[28] previous and no previous anaesthetic experience in another,[34] and five studies did not report this data.[29-33] Limited background characteristics of the patients were reported in two studies.[29,33] One stated that the patients included had ASA 3 or 4 and a body mass index of more than 40. However, no ASA number, sex, or age was reported in the article.[29] Mendes *et al.* did not report any background characteristics of the included patients.[33]

### **Description of the studies' risk of bias**

Figure 2. shows the results of the risk of bias assessment. In all seven included studies, the cause and effect were clear. The majority of the studies measured outcomes in the same way and used appropriate statistical analyses. Several studies had limitations of follow-up and similarity in care and participants. None of the patients had multiple pre-and post-measurements.

### **Outcomes of the included studies**

The outcomes of the included studies are described separately below.

#### *Satisfaction*

One study reported satisfaction as an outcome.[31] The summarised patient satisfaction with the anaesthetic consultation score out of 100 showed that patients in the PAC group

were more satisfied (mean difference, 2.10%; 95% confidence interval [CI], 0.51–3.70%;  $p=0.01$ ).[31] There was no statistically significant difference between the two groups in the mean patient satisfaction with perioperative anaesthesia care score out of 5 after surgery (mean difference 0.01%,  $p=0.94$ ).[31] The mean quality of recovery (QoR) score (range, 0–18) following anaesthesia on the first day of surgery was similar between the intervention ( $13.17\pm 2.73$ ) and control ( $13.31\pm 2.65$ ) groups ( $p=0.67$ ).[31] The QoR measure is the patients' health-related quality of life.[35]

### *Anxiety*

Three studies reported anxiety.[28,31,34] Two studies reported the visual analogue scale (VAS), one rated from zero (no anxiety) to ten (very high anxiety),[28] another used a 100 mm horizontal line with “not anxious at all” to “extremely anxious”[31] In one study, the median VAS anxiety score was 3 (0–5) in the intervention group and 5 (2–8) in the control group ( $p=0.0038$ ).[28] In another study, there were no significant differences between the control and intervention groups for levels of anxiety (VAS), surgery (26 vs. 25, respectively,  $p=0.12$ ), and anaesthesia (20 vs. 19, respectively,  $p=0.60$ ).[31] The median Multiple Affect Adjective Check List (MAACL) score with possible range scores from 0 to 21 (higher scores indicating greater levels of anxiety) was 3 (0–9) in the intervention group and 6.5 (2–12) in the control group ( $p=0.0053$ ).[28] The differences in the State-Trait Anxiety Index (STAI) score, which is composed of 40 questions rated on a 4-point Likert scale, was 1.51, 95% CI: 1.02–2.02%,  $p=0.0051$ ).[34] The results on anxiety in these two studies were significant. However, Kamau *et al.* [34] found no differences when they examined anxiety and the influences of sex, duration of hospital stay, and prior anaesthesia experience.

### *Mortality*

One study reported the mortality rates.[29] Patients attending the High Dependency Unit (HDU), Intensive Care Unit (ICU), and Post-anaesthesia Care Unit (PACU) following complex orthopaedic surgery had a significant reduction in mortality rate after being assessed in the PAC, from 18 (6.1%) of 298 patients before to 14 (1.2%) of 1147 patients after  $p=0.001$ . [29]

#### *Cancellation rate*

Three studies reported a reduced cancellation rate following the establishment of a PAC.[30,32,33] One of the included studies had 316 (2.0%) cancellations for medical reasons before the introduction of PAC, and 79 (0.9%) after, and a difference of 1.02% (95% CI, 0.31–1.31%). After adjustment, the odds ratio was 0.7 (95% CI, 0.5–0.9%). [30] The overall cancellation of surgery was reduced from 1027 (6.3%) to 393 (4.6%) following surgery, and a difference of 0.9% (95% CI, 0.3–1.0%) when patients were assessed in PAC. [30] Mendes *et al.* [33] found a decrease in overall cancellations from year 1 (39.3%) to year 4 (15.9%),  $p \leq 0.05$ . There were 469 (number of cancellations)/10639 (number of surgeries performed) due to medical reasons in the first year of this study. The following year, a considerable increase above the baseline values in the intervention group was observed, followed by a progressive decrease in the last year with 391 (number of cancellations)/10397 (number of surgeries performed). [33] Farasatkish *et al.* reported that of the 1716 patients studied, 15.1 % of cases cancelled in the two groups. The cancellation rates in the control group were 146/866 (16.8%), and the cancellation rate in the intervention group was 113/850 (13.29%)  $p=0.046$ . The most common reason for cancellation was incomplete medical work-up 51/146 (35%) in the control group and 32/113 (28%) in the intervention group,  $p=0.03$ . [32] Lee *et al.* found similar rates for surgery being cancelled on the scheduled date for the intervention group compared to the control group (2.3% vs. 3.4%,  $p=0.75$ ). [31]

### *Costs and willingness to pay*

Two studies reported the costs.[29,31] One study reported a total saving of £ 486.62 per patient after establishing a PAC.[29] Another study reported a significantly lower preoperative cost per patient in the intervention group compared to the control group (mean difference, \$ 463; 95% CI, -\$648 to -\$278 per patient,  $p < 0.01$ ).[31] However, the mean difference in the total perioperative treatment cost was not significant, even after adjusting for cancellation on the day of surgery costs.[31] The intervention group patients were willing to pay (WTP) significantly more than the median WTP (US \$13) for a clinic consultation at the PAC than the control group.[31]

### *Length of stay*

The length of stay was reported in four studies.[29-31,33] Mendes *et al.*[33] found a significant decrease in mean hospital stay for patients from 6.2 to 5.0 days ( $p \leq 0.001$ ) during the four years of this study. Van Klein *et al.*[30] found that the total admission time significantly decreased from a mean of 8.8 days (before) and a mean of 8.1 days (after) and 0.92 (0.90–0.94). After adjusting for age, sex, and introduction date of PAC this difference was 0.92 (0.90–0.94).[30] Kamal *et al.*[29] found a significant reduction in the length of stay in the high dependency unit from 2.1 days to 1.6 d ( $p=0.01$ ), and in the intensive care unit from 2.3 days to 1.9 days ( $p=0.01$ ). In the last study, no significant changes were found in the median duration of postoperative stay between the intervention and control groups.[31]

### *Organisation planning and efficiency*

Organisation planning and efficiency have been reported in two studies.[29,33] One study found statistically significant changes in the reduction of unplanned admissions to the PACU (65/298 [22%], 111/1147 [10%],  $p=0.001$ ), ICU (4/298 [1.3%], 4/1147 [0.4%],  $p=0.01$ ), and HDU (4/298 [1.34%], 20/1147 [1.7%],  $p=0.01$ ) after implementing a PAC.[29] The planned

admissions in the ICU (4/298 [1.3%], 18/1147 [1.6%],  $p=0.01$ ), and HDU (14/298 [4.7%], 85/1147 [7.4%],  $p=0.1$ ) increased after implementing a PAC.[29] The number of PAC evaluations increased from year 1, 4704 to year 4, 13990 ( $p\leq 0.001$ ).[33] The number of outpatient procedures increased from 2170 (year 1) to 1943 (year 4) ( $p\leq 0.001$ ), and the inpatient procedures decreased from 9556 (year 1) to 8449 (year 4), ( $p\leq 0.001$ ).[33]

## DISCUSSION

This systematic review summarises the effectiveness of PACs in improving quality and patient safety in general hospitals and determines the gaps in existing knowledge for future research. Seven studies that met the inclusion criteria were included. We present the main results and infer the implications for research and practice in the following text.

Cancellation on the day of surgery has undesirable effects on both the patients and the hospital system.[14] Thus, studies have found that late patient-related cancellations could totally or partially be prevented,[36] if they were addressed during preoperative evaluations.[14,15] This is confirmed by several studies in this systematic review that found a reduction in surgery cancellation after implementing a PAC.[30,32,33] However, Lee *et al.* found no significant changes between the intervention and control groups.[31] Mendes and colleagues found that the number of cancellations for medical reasons after PAC implementation decreased in the first year of implementation. In the second and third years, they were higher before the number dropped to below baseline.[33] These conflicting findings might show that hospitals operate in a specific context, with unique populations, processes, and microsystems, which may encounter unique obstacles making implementation difficult. Patient-focused interventions need to consider barriers,



facilitators, and interrelationships between systems, staff, and interventions to increase the likelihood of sustainable success.[37] In addition, Kamau *et al.* also indicated that PACs lead to more planned admissions to the ICU, HDU, and PACU, which is more predictable for patients, staff, and administrations.[34]

Another main finding of this systematic review was a significant reduction in the length of hospital stay following patients' examination in a PAC; however, a small number of studies with low quality were considered. Nevertheless, similar results were found in another systematic review claiming that perioperative systems support hospitals to address the expected growth in the number and complexity of surgical procedures being performed.[15] However, Lee *et al.* indicated that the reason for the reduced length of hospital stay was the mean duration of stay before surgery in the intervention group.[31] This indicates that when patients are examined in the PAC and well prepared with information, consultations, and tests, they do not need to be hospitalised until the day of surgery. A survey focusing on patients operated showed that if they had a choice, 75% do not wish to be admitted to the hospital until the same day of operation. One of the main reasons was to spend less time in the hospital.[38] However, an updated systematic review on the effectiveness of nurse-led preoperative assessment services for elective surgery found that the included articles had a reduced length of stay. The included studies had low methodological quality, and therefore, the authors could not conclude that this service leads to reduced length of hospital stay.[16]

The evidence from this systematic review is insufficient to conclude whether patients have reduced anxiety when assessed using PAC. The included studies used different instruments to measure the levels of anxiety, and the results could not be pooled. In addition, previous

studies have shown that anxiety levels were higher in women.[39] Seventy-eight per cent of the participants were women in one of the included studies in this systematic review and might result in a bias in this study.[34] Anxiety was also statistically higher in patients who underwent general anaesthesia than in those who underwent regional anaesthesia.[40] The included studies on anxiety included both patients with general and regional anaesthesia, which might also be biased. Furthermore, the patients included in this review had both former surgical experience and no experience with surgery. However, studies have shown that former experience with anaesthesia and surgery reduces the risk of preoperative anxiety.[41]

Assessment of PAC was significantly associated with reduced mortality following complex orthopaedic surgery.[29] Previously published retrospective studies found similar results, but with other types of surgery.[42,43] A Danish study found that deaths attributed to anaesthesia were associated with insufficient or inadequate preoperative evaluation.[7] Furthermore, a previous study pointed out that the risk factors are not only patient-related but also organisation-related,[8] and that some hospitals have perioperative care and teams that are better at identifying and rescuing perioperative complications.[44,45] However, Blitz *et al.* argued that PAC should focus on early patient engagement strategies, interdisciplinary team communication, detailed perioperative care plans, and patient documentation in the electronic health record. This record should be open for review by the perioperative team to preserve patient information and safety. The value of a PAC lies in its ability to improve the quality of the perioperative process by designing a more robust system for preoperative assessment and preparation.[42] The importance of safety in

anaesthesia is a vital component in anaesthesia practice, and the use of PACs contributes to this critical area.

### **Strengths and limitations of the study**

Most review steps were performed in duplicate or independently by two researchers, and agreement was reached in a consensus meeting. However, grey literature, such as government and institutional documents, was not included and might be a limitation to this study. Since countries have different organisational structures in their healthcare systems, we did not set inclusion criteria concerning who performed the patient's preoperative assessment. However, the European Society of Anaesthesiology guidelines recommend that anaesthesiologists complete the preoperative assessment, while trained nurses or anaesthesia trainees perform the screening.[8] A preoperative evaluation performed by an internist has been associated with increased length of stay and increased postoperative mortality.[46] This systematic review's results were possibly affected by the heterogeneity in the types of staff performing the preoperative assessment.

We opted to include only the studies with the highest internal validity. Thus, we excluded several retrospective studies. Nonetheless, the remaining studies' risk of bias was fairly high, and they were heterogeneous. As a result, meta-analyses were not statistically appropriate.[25] The included studies' designs could not rule out selection bias and confounding, and the strength of the evidence should be assessed cautiously. Many studies did not make adjustments for several confounders, which could be responsible for the observed effects. Several studies lacked descriptions of the methods used and the patients included, which lowered the transparency. It is not very reassuring that many such studies were unable to deliver more thorough evidence to guide practice and should be assessed

cautiously. The results are relevant to health care services, which should focus on the well-being and safety of the patients.

### **Implications for future research and practice**

This systematic review identified the ambiguity in the PAC interventions offered to the intervention group. In many studies, it was evident that the methods used in these studies were not always clearly described, and high-quality research is needed in this field. The included studies in this review did not contain any results of reduced preoperative tests, such as blood tests, on patients before surgery when patients attended the PAC, [47,48] and earlier surgical room entry time for patients assessed in PACs, [49,50] similar to previous retrospective studies. Other implications for future research might be the organisation structure of different PACs and their functioning. The use of technology, such as streaming services, facilitates different types of patient groups and might be more important with the appearance of Covid-19 in reducing human contact and spread of the virus.

### **CONCLUSION**

This systematic review suggests that PAC use reduces the length of hospital stay, and the majority of the studies had reduced the cancellation rate in hospitals. These findings are an essential contribution to the current evidence in this field. In addition to further research in this field, the demand for increased high-quality studies to capture robust data describing the quality of care and clinical outcomes for patients requiring anaesthesia. This step demands increased focus and funding for this specific area of health services research and could, therefore, lead to new implementations of PAC's in health care services and further develop patient safety in perioperative care.

## **Acknowledgement**

We thank the librarian Ellen Sejerstedt, University of Agder, Kristiansand, for helping with the search strategy and removal of duplicates.

## **Competing Interests**

The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.

## **Data sharing statement**

All data relevant to the study are included within the article or have been uploaded within supplemental files.

## **Funding**

This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial or not-for-profit sectors.

## **Author statement**

EWK, MF, AO and TOT: Study design

EWK, MF: Search and screening of the articles

EWK: Data extraction

MF, AO, RB and TOT: Control of data extraction

EWK, MF, AO and RB: Quality assessment of the included articles

EWK: Drafting of the manuscript

MF, AO, RB, and TOT: Contribution to and review of the final version of the manuscript

MF, AO, RB and TOT: Supervised the study

## References

- 1 Braz LG, Braz DG, Da Cruz DS, et al. Mortality in anesthesia: a systematic review. *Clinics (Sao Paulo)* 2009;**64**:999–1006. doi: [10.1590/S1807-59322009001000011](https://doi.org/10.1590/S1807-59322009001000011).
- 2 Santos ML, Novaes CO, Iglesias AC. Epidemiological profile of patients seen in the pre-anesthetic assessment clinic of a university hospital. *Braz J of Anesthesiol* 2017;**67**:457–67. doi: [doi.org/10.1016/j.bjane.2017.04.006](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bjane.2017.04.006).
- 3 Amaya F, Shimamoto S, Matsuda M, et al. Preoperative anesthesia clinic in Japan: a nationwide survey of the current practice of preoperative anesthesia assessment. *J Anesth* 2015;**29**:175–9. doi: [10.1007/s00540-014-1918-3](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00540-014-1918-3) [Published online first: 2014/09/30].
- 4 Whitaker DK, Brattebø G, Smith AF et al. The Helsinki Declaration on Patient Safety in Anaesthesiology: putting words into practice. *Best Pract Res Clin Anaesthesiol* 2011;**25**:277–90. doi: [10.1016/j.bpa.2011.02.001](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bpa.2011.02.001).
- 5 Bainbridge D, Martin J, Arango M, et al. Perioperative and anaesthetic-related mortality in developed and developing countries: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Lancet* 2012;**380**:1075–81. doi: [10.1016/S0140-6736\(12\)60990-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(12)60990-8).
- 6 Kluger MT, Tham EJ, Coleman NA, et al. Inadequate pre-operative evaluation and preparation: a review of 197 reports from the Australian Incident Monitoring Study. *Anaesthesia* 2000;**55**:1173–78. doi: [10.1046/j.1365-2044.2000.01725.x](https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1365-2044.2000.01725.x).
- 7 Hove LD, Steinmetz J, Christoffersen JK, et al. Analysis of deaths related to anesthesia in the period 1996–2004 from closed claims registered by the Danish Patient Insurance Association. *Anesthesiology* 2007;**106**:675–80. doi: [10.1097/01.anes.0000264749.86145.e5](https://doi.org/10.1097/01.anes.0000264749.86145.e5) [Published online first: 2007/04/07].

- 8 De Hert S, Imberger G, Carlisle J, et al. Preoperative evaluation of the adult patient undergoing non-cardiac surgery: guidelines from the European Society of Anaesthesiology. *Eur J Anaesthesiol* 2011;**28**:684–722. doi: [10.1097/EJA.0b013e3283499e3b](https://doi.org/10.1097/EJA.0b013e3283499e3b).
- 9 Haller G, Laroche T, Clergue F. Morbidity in anaesthesia: today and tomorrow. *Best Pract Res Clin Anaesthesiol* 2011;**25**:123–32. doi: [10.1016/j.bpa.2011.02.008](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bpa.2011.02.008)  
[Published online first: 2011/05/10].
- 10 Lee JA. The anaesthetic out-patient clinic. *Anaesthesia* 1949;**4**:169–74. doi: [10.1111/j.1365-2044.1949.tb05837.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2044.1949.tb05837.x).
- 11 Chan FW, Wong F, Cheung YS, et al. Utility of a preoperative assessment clinic in a tertiary care hospital. *Hong Kong Med J* 2011;**17**:441–5 [Published online first: 2011/12/08].
- 12 Hariharan S, Chen D, Merritt-Charles L. Evaluation of the utilization of the preanaesthetic clinics in a university teaching hospital. *BMC Health Serv Res* 2006;**6**:59. doi: [10.1186/1472-6963-6-59](https://doi.org/10.1186/1472-6963-6-59) [Published online first: 2006/05/25].
- 13 Schmiesing CA, Brodsky JB. The preoperative anesthesia evaluation. *Thorac Surg Clin.*2005;**15**:305–15. doi: [10.1016/j.thorsurg.2005.02.006](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.thorsurg.2005.02.006).
- 14 Lew E, Pavlin DJ, Amundsen L. Outpatient preanaesthesia evaluation clinics. *Singapore Med J* 2004;**45**:509–16.
- 15 Lee A, Kerridge RK, Chui PT, et al. Perioperative Systems as a quality model of perioperative medicine and surgical care. *Health Policy* 2011;**102**:214–22. doi: [10.1016/j.healthpol.2011.05.009](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.healthpol.2011.05.009) [Published online first: 2011/06/18].

- 16 Hines S, Munday J, Kynoch K. Effectiveness of nurse-led preoperative assessment services for elective surgery: a systematic review update. *JBIS Database Syst Rev Implement Rep* 2015;**13**:279–317. doi: [10.11124/jbisrir-2015-1996](https://doi.org/10.11124/jbisrir-2015-1996).
- 17 Delaney D, Bayley EW, Olszewsky P, et al. Parental satisfaction with pediatric preoperative assessment and education in a presurgical care center. *J Perianesth Nurs* 2015;**30**:290–300. doi: [10.1016/j.jopan.2014.04.004](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jopan.2014.04.004).
- 18 Davidson S, McKendrick D, French T. Preassessment clinic interview and patient anxiety. *Saudi J Anaesth* 2016;**10**:402–08. doi: [10.4103/1658-354X.177339](https://doi.org/10.4103/1658-354X.177339).
- 19 Turunen E, Miettinen M, Setälä L, et al. The impact of a structured preoperative protocol on day of surgery cancellations. *J Clin Nurs* 2018;**27**:288–305. doi: [10.1111/jocn.13896](https://doi.org/10.1111/jocn.13896).
- 20 Holt NF, Silverman DG, Prasad R, et al. Preanesthesia clinics, information management, and operating room delays: results of a survey of practicing anesthesiologists. *Anesth Analg* 2007;**104**:615–18. doi: [10.1213/01.ane.0000255253.62668.3a](https://doi.org/10.1213/01.ane.0000255253.62668.3a).
- 21 <http://www.training.cochrane.org/handbook> accessed 08.12.2018, 2019 updated July 2019.
- 22 Moher D, Liberati A, Tetzlaff J, et al. Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses: the PRISMA statement. *BMJ* 2009;**339**:b2535. doi: [10.1136/bmj.b2535](https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.b2535).
- 23 Kristoffersen EW, Opsal A, Tveit TO, et al. Pre-anaesthetic assessment clinic for elective surgery patients: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Prospero* 2019;CRD42019137724.



- 24 Booth A, Sutton A, Papaioannou D. *Systematic approaches to a successful literature review*. Los Angeles California: Sage 2016.
- 25 Møller AM, Myles PS. What makes a good systematic review and meta-analysis? *Br J Anaesth* 2016;**117**:428–30. doi: [10.1093/bja/aew264](https://doi.org/10.1093/bja/aew264).
- 26 <https://www.covidence.org/reviews/active> accessed 29.09.2018
- 27 Tufanaru C, Munn Z, Aromataris E, et al. Systematic review of effectiveness. In: Aromataris E, Munn Z, eds. *JBIC Manual for evidence synthesis*. 2020.
- 28 Klopfenstein CE, Forster A, Van Gessel E. Anesthetic assessment in an outpatient consultation clinic reduces preoperative anxiety. *Can J Anaesth* 2000;**47**:511–5. doi: [10.1007/BF03018941](https://doi.org/10.1007/BF03018941) [Published online first: 2000/06/30].
- 29 Kamal T, Conway RM, Littlejohn I, et al. The role of a multidisciplinary pre-assessment clinic in reducing mortality after complex orthopaedic surgery. *Ann R Coll Surg Engl* 2011;**93**:149–51. doi: [10.1308/003588411X561026](https://doi.org/10.1308/003588411X561026).
- 30 van Klei WA, Moons KG, Rutten CL, et al. The effect of outpatient preoperative evaluation of hospital inpatients on cancellation of surgery and length of hospital stay. *Anesth Analg* 2002;**94**:644–9. doi:[10.1097/00000539-200203000-00030](https://doi.org/10.1097/00000539-200203000-00030). [Published online first: 2002/02/28].
- 31 Lee A, Chui PT, Chiu CH, et al. The cost-effectiveness of an outpatient anesthesia consultation clinic before surgery: a matched Hong Kong cohort study. *Perioper Med* 2012;**1**:3. doi: [10.1186/2047-0525-1-3](https://doi.org/10.1186/2047-0525-1-3) [Published online first: 2012/01/01].
- 32 Farasatkish R, Aghdaii N, Azarfarin R, et al. Can preoperative anesthesia consultation clinic help to reduce operating room cancellation rate on the day of surgery? *Rawal Med J* 2009;**34**:26–8.

- 33 Mendes FF, Mathias LA, Duval Neto GF, et al. Impact of preoperative outpatient evaluation clinic on performance indicators. *Rev Bras anesthesiol* 2005;**55**:175–87. doi: [10.1590/S0034-70942005000200004](https://doi.org/10.1590/S0034-70942005000200004).
- 34 Kamau A, Mung'ayi V, Yonga G. The effect of a preanaesthesia clinic consultation on adult patient anxiety at a tertiary hospital in Kenya: a cohort study. *Afr Health Sci* 2017;**17**:138–46. doi: [10.4314/ahs.v17i1.18](https://doi.org/10.4314/ahs.v17i1.18) [Published online first: 2017/10/14].
- 35 Myles PS, Hunt JO, Nightingale CE, et al. Development and psychometric testing of a quality of recovery score after general anesthesia and surgery in adults. *Anesth Analg* 1999;**88**:83–90. doi: [10.1097/0000539-199901000-00016](https://doi.org/10.1097/0000539-199901000-00016) [Published online first: 1999/01/23].
- 36 Hänninen-Khoda L, Koljonen V, Ylä-Kotola T. Patient-related reasons for late surgery cancellations in a plastic and reconstructive surgery department. *JPRAS Open* 2018;**18**:38–48. doi: [10.1016/j.jpra.2018.08.002](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jpra.2018.08.002).
- 37 Geerligs L, Rankin NM, Shepherd HL, et al. Hospital-based interventions: a systematic review of staff-reported barriers and facilitators to implementation processes. *Implement Sci* 2018;**13**:36. doi: [10.1186/s13012-018-0726-9](https://doi.org/10.1186/s13012-018-0726-9).
- 38 Harries RL, Bradshaw CA, Jones EA, et al. To admit or not to admit on the morning of surgery: patients' perspectives on day of surgery admission. *J Perioper Pract* 2013;**23**:56–8. doi: [10.1177/175045891302300304](https://doi.org/10.1177/175045891302300304).
- 39 Mitchell M. Anaesthesia type, gender and anxiety. *J Perioper Pract* 2013;**23**:41–7. doi: [10.1177/175045891302300301](https://doi.org/10.1177/175045891302300301) [Published online first: 2013/04/17].
- 40 Celik F, Edipoglu IS. Evaluation of preoperative anxiety and fear of anesthesia using APAIS score [Report]. *Eur J Med Res* 2018;**23**:41. doi: [10.1186/s40001-018-0339-4](https://doi.org/10.1186/s40001-018-0339-4).


- 41 Caumo W, Schmidt AP, Schneider CN, et al. Risk factors for preoperative anxiety in adults. *Acta Anaesthesiol Scand* 2001;**45**:298–307. doi: [10.1034/j.1399-6576.2001.045003298.x](https://doi.org/10.1034/j.1399-6576.2001.045003298.x) [Published online first: 2001/02/24].
- 42 Blitz JD, Kendale SM, Jain SK, et al. Preoperative evaluation clinic visit is associated with decreased risk of in-hospital postoperative mortality. *Anesthesiology* 2016;**125**:280–94. doi: [10.1097/ALN.0000000000001193](https://doi.org/10.1097/ALN.0000000000001193) [Published online first: 2016/07/21].
- 43 Cantlay KL, Baker S, Parry A, et al. The impact of a consultant anaesthetist led pre-operative assessment clinic on patients undergoing major vascular surgery. *Anaesthesia* 2006;**61**:234–9. doi: [10.1111/j.1365-2044.2005.04514.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2044.2005.04514.x) [Published online first: 2006/02/17].
- 44 Savoldelli GL. Perioperative care is a hazardous business: let's make it safer! *Trends Anaesth Crit Care* 2016;**7–8**:3–4. doi: [10.1016/j.tacc.2016.05.003](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tacc.2016.05.003).
- 45 Pearse RM, Moreno RP, Bauer P, et al. Mortality after surgery in Europe: a 7 day cohort study. *Lancet* 2012;**380**:1059–65. doi: [10.1016/S0140-6736\(12\)61148-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(12)61148-9).
- 46 Wijeysondera DN, Austin PC, Beattie WS, et al. Outcomes and processes of care related to preoperative medical consultation. *Arch Intern Med* 2010;**170**:1365–74. doi: [10.1001/archinternmed.2010.204](https://doi.org/10.1001/archinternmed.2010.204).
- 47 Fischer SP. Development and effectiveness of an anesthesia preoperative evaluation clinic in a teaching hospital. *Anesthesiology* 1996;**85**:196–206. doi: [10.1097/00000542-199607000-00025](https://doi.org/10.1097/00000542-199607000-00025) [Published online first: 1996/07/01].
- 48 Power LM, Thackray NM. Reduction of preoperative investigations with the introduction of an anaesthetist-led preoperative assessment clinic. *Anaesth Intensive*

- Care* 1999;**27**:481–8. doi: [10.1177/0310057X9902700508](https://doi.org/10.1177/0310057X9902700508) [Published online first: 1999/10/16].
- 49 Ferschl MB, Tung A, Sweitzer BB, et al. Preoperative clinic visits reduce operating room cancellations and delays. *Anesthesiology* 2005;**103**:855–59. doi: [10.1097/00000542-200510000-00025](https://doi.org/10.1097/00000542-200510000-00025).
- 50 Correll DJ, Bader AM, Hull MW, et al. Value of preoperative clinic visits in identifying issues with potential impact on operating room efficiency. *Anesthesiology* 2006;**105**:1254–9; doi: [10.1097/00000542-200612000-00026](https://doi.org/10.1097/00000542-200612000-00026) [Published online first: 2006/11/24].





**Figure 1: PRISMA Flow Diagram**



From: Moher D, Liberati A, Tetzlaff J, Altman DG, The PRISMA Group (2009). Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses: The PRISMA Statement. PLoS Med 6(7): e1000097. doi:10.1371/journal.pmed1000097

For more information, visit [www.prisma-statement.org](http://www.prisma-statement.org).

**Figure 2**

	Are cause and effect clear?	Are comparison participants similar?	Did comparison participants have similar care?	Was there a control group?	Were there multiple pre post measurements?	Was follow-up complete?	Were outcomes measured the same way?	Were outcomes measured in reliable way?	Was appropriate stat analysis used?
Farasatkish 2009	+	+	?	+	-	?	+	+	+
Kamal 2011	+	?	?	+	-	?	?	?	?
Kamau 2017	+	+	-	+	-	+	+	+	+
Klopfenstein 2000	+	-	+	+	-	?	+	+	+
Lee 2012	+	+	-	+	-	?	+	+	+
Mendes 2005	+	?	?	+	-	?	?	?	+
van Klei 2002	+	+	-	+	-	?	+	+	+