

RESEARCH PAPER

Assessment of NABH Implementation and Its Impact on Patient Safety Indicators in Tertiary Care Hospitals

Balwinder Kaur¹, Thatikonda Abhiram Reddy², Tannu Almiyan³, Meenakshi Kharai⁴, Kanchan⁵, Gopal^{6*}, Shivshankar Tiwari⁷

¹Masters of Hospital Administration, Uttarakhand College of Health Sciences, Uttarakhand University, Dehradun, India, 248007

Email: balwinderkaur8901@gmail.com, Orcid ID - 0009-0004-9645-6623

²Masters of Hospital Administration, Uttarakhand College of Health Sciences, Uttarakhand University Dehradun, India, 248007

Email: abhiramreddythatikonda@gmail.com, Orcid: 0009-0001-0073-478X

³Masters of Hospital Administration, Uttarakhand College of Health Sciences, Uttarakhand University Dehradun, India, 248007

Email: tannualmiya104@gmail.com, Orcid ID - 0009-0005-8327-0886

⁴Masters of Hospital Administration, Uttarakhand College of Health Sciences, Uttarakhand University Dehradun, India, 248007

Email: deepti7906@gmail.com, Orcid id- 0009-0005-0413-1942

⁵Masters of Hospital Administration, Uttarakhand College of Health Sciences, Uttarakhand University Dehradun, India, 248007

Email: Riyadumaga@gmail.com, Orcid id- 0009-0003-8689-2432

^{6*}Assistant Professor, Uttarakhand College of Health Sciences, Uttarakhand University, Dehradun, Uttarakhand, India

Email ID: Gopal4god11@gmail.com, ORCID: 0009-0009-0220-0456

⁷Assistant Professor, Uttarakhand College of Health Sciences, Uttarakhand University, Dehradun, India
Email ID: shivshankartiwari@gmail.com, ORCID ID: 0009-0006-4248-3487

Abstract

Background: Hospital accreditation is intended to convert broad quality aspirations into observable structures, processes, and accountabilities. In India, the National Accreditation Board for Hospitals & Healthcare Providers (NABH) has become an important mechanism for organizing hospital quality systems, infection prevention, medication management, documentation, and patient-safety governance. Yet the strongest question for hospital leaders is not whether accreditation produces better paperwork. It is whether implementation is followed by measurable changes in clinical harm. The supplied study manuscript reports a retrospective comparison of three tertiary care teaching hospitals in Dehradun, Uttarakhand, before and after NABH accreditation, focusing on device-associated infections and medication errors. [1] [2] [3] [4] [5] [6] [7] [8] [9] [10] [11] [12]

Objective: To assess the reported association between NABH implementation and selected patient-safety indicators, with particular attention to central line-associated bloodstream infection (CLABSI), catheter-associated urinary tract infection (CAUTI), ventilator-associated pneumonia (VAP), surgical-site infection (SSI), medication errors, and safety-reporting behavior.

Methods: The study used a retrospective, observational, mixed-methods design. According to the supplied manuscript, three academic tertiary care hospitals transitioning from unaccredited status to full NABH accreditation between January 2022 and December 2025 were studied. Twelve months of pre-accreditation data were compared with twelve months of post-accreditation data. Quantitative data were obtained from hospital information systems and internal quality incident registries. HAI measures were expressed using device-day or procedure denominators, while medication errors were categorized using the NCC MERP framework. Poisson regression was specified for rate comparisons, and patient-safety culture was assessed using the Hospital Survey on Patient Safety Culture. [13] [14] [15] [16] [17] [18] [19] [20] [21] [22] [23]

Results: The supplied study reports a 41% reduction in CLABSI and a 34% reduction in CAUTI after accreditation. The manuscript gives absolute CLABSI rates of 4.8 versus 2.8 per 1,000 central-line days and CAUTI rates of 6.2 versus 4.1 per 1,000 catheter days. Medication-error reporting increased by 28% during the first six months after accreditation, while severe adverse drug events declined by 22% in the second post-accreditation year. These findings are interpreted through the literature on accreditation, infection-prevention bundles, reporting culture, human factors, and digital surveillance. [24] [25] [26] [27] [28] [29] [30] [31] [32] [33] [34] [35]

Conclusion: The evidence supports a cautious interpretation: accreditation can provide an organizational infrastructure within which safer clinical practice becomes more reliable, but the certificate itself is not the causal agent. The reported reductions in CLABSI and CAUTI are compatible with the expected effects of standardized insertion and maintenance practices, device-necessity review, surveillance, staff accountability, and environmental redesign. The rise in reported medication errors is more plausibly interpreted as a reporting-culture signal when accompanied by a later reduction in severe harm. Sustained improvement will require measurement discipline, non-punitive learning systems, adequate infection-control staffing, clinical leadership, and selective use of electronic and predictive surveillance.

Keywords: NABH; hospital accreditation; patient safety; healthcare-associated infection; medication safety

How to site this article : Balwinder Kaur, Thatikonda Abhiram Reddy, Tannu Almiyan, Meenakshi Kharai, Kanchan, Gopal, Shivshankar Tiwari, "Assessment of NABH Implementation and Its Impact on Patient Safety Indicators in Tertiary Care Hospitals" *Int J Drug Deliv Technol.* 2026;16(86s): 1810-1828; DOI: 10.25258/ijddt.16.86s.165

1. Introduction

1.1 Background and rationale

Quality in hospital care has at least three faces: the structure in which care occurs, the processes through which care is delivered, and the outcomes experienced by patients. Donabedian's framework remains useful because it prevents organizations from confusing the existence of a policy with the reliable performance of the underlying clinical process. [1] Accreditation primarily acts on structure and process, but its legitimacy ultimately depends on whether those changes are connected to safer outcomes.

The Indian hospital environment makes this distinction particularly important. Tertiary hospitals operate at the intersection of high patient volume, complex clinical acuity, invasive devices, polypharmacy, fragmented information flows, and substantial workforce heterogeneity. Under these conditions, safety cannot depend entirely on individual vigilance. Reliability must be designed into routines, escalation pathways, documentation, supervision, equipment, and information systems.

Hospital accreditation is therefore best understood as a governance intervention rather than a certificate-producing exercise. Research from several health systems indicates that accreditation can stimulate organizational change, clarify responsibilities, standardize procedures, and strengthen quality-management activity. [2] [3] [4] [5] [6] [7] At the same time, systematic reviews have repeatedly warned that the causal link between accreditation and hard clinical outcomes is less certain than the link with documentation, process compliance, and organizational behavior. [8] [9] [10] [11] [12]

The distinction is particularly relevant to NABH. A standards framework may require hospitals to define infection-control practices, medication-management systems, incident reporting, credentialing, clinical documentation, patient identification, emergency preparedness, facility

safety, and quality indicators. These requirements can create a common operating language across departments. They cannot, by themselves, guarantee that a nurse performs every hand-hygiene opportunity, that every unnecessary urinary catheter is removed, or that every high-alert medication is independently double-checked.

The present manuscript examines the supplied Dehradun study through that lens. The source describes three tertiary care teaching hospitals, a pre-accreditation period in 2022–2023, a post-accreditation period in 2024–2025, and a set of patient-safety indicators centered on HAIs and medication errors. The source reports reductions in CLABSI and CAUTI, an initial rise in medication-error reporting, and a subsequent decline in severe adverse drug events.

1.2 Problem statement

Accreditation programs are often evaluated through survey scores, compliance percentages, documentation audits, or the successful completion of corrective actions. Those measures are necessary, but they are insufficient. A hospital can have an excellent policy manual and still experience preventable bloodstream infections. Conversely, an organization that reports more medication incidents after accreditation may appear worse if the numerator is interpreted without understanding reporting behavior.

The central problem is therefore one of measurement and attribution. If patient-safety indicators improve after accreditation, how much of the change can reasonably be linked to accreditation rather than secular trends, staffing changes, infection-control campaigns, case-mix changes, technology adoption, or intensified surveillance? And if incident reports increase, does this represent more harm or more transparency?

1.3 Study objective

The primary objective was to assess the reported impact of NABH implementation on selected patient-safety indicators in tertiary care hospitals. The analysis focuses on four linked questions: whether accreditation coincides with lower HAI rates; whether standardized infection-prevention processes provide a plausible mechanism for these changes; whether medication-error reporting behaves differently from medication-related harm; and whether digital surveillance can strengthen the sustainability of post-accreditation improvement.

1.4 Analytical proposition

The paper advances a deliberately restrained proposition: NABH accreditation is more likely to function as an enabling architecture for safety than as an independent treatment that directly reduces infection or medication harm. The effect should emerge through intermediate mechanisms such as standardization, monitoring, accountability, training, reporting, environmental design, and feedback. This proposition is consistent with the wider accreditation literature, which finds stronger evidence for organizational and process effects than for uniform improvements in mortality or other distal outcomes. [8] [9] [10] [11] [12]

2. Literature Review

2.1 Accreditation as a quality-management intervention

Accreditation emerged from the idea that external assessment could encourage hospitals to compare their practices with explicit standards and to create internal systems for continuous improvement. Pomey and colleagues described accreditation as an opportunity for organizational reflection and collegial decision-making rather than merely a survey event. [2] Greenfield and Braithwaite's systematic review found evidence of organizational impact, professional development, quality improvement, and changes in attitudes, while also demonstrating substantial heterogeneity in the evidence base. [3]

Braithwaite and colleagues subsequently showed that accreditation could be associated with organizational and clinical performance, but the relationship was not reducible to a single mechanism. [4] Hinchcliff and colleagues reached a similar position in their narrative synthesis: accreditation has plausible effects across organizational structures, professional behavior, and quality systems, but the literature does not support a simplistic assumption that

accreditation automatically produces better clinical outcomes. [5]

Comparative international evidence adds nuance. Shaw and colleagues found differences in quality-management practices across European hospitals in relation to accreditation and ISO certification. [6] Alkhenizan and Shaw's systematic review reported that accreditation programs generally improved processes of care and, in several clinical areas, outcomes. [7] Yet later reviews have been more cautious. Araujo and colleagues found potentially positive effects across efficiency, safety, effectiveness, timeliness, and patient-centeredness, while emphasizing methodological weaknesses. [10] Hussein and colleagues, after reviewing 76 empirical studies, reported relatively consistent associations with safety culture and process measures but inconclusive evidence regarding mortality and healthcare-associated infections. [9] Alhawajreh and colleagues likewise found inconsistent findings and emphasized the importance of implementation context. [11]

This literature has a direct implication for NABH evaluation. The correct analytical question is not whether accredited hospitals are better in every dimension. It is whether specific standards produce reliable intermediate changes that are sufficiently connected to a defined patient-safety outcome to make causal interpretation plausible.

2.2 Accreditation life cycle and the problem of sustainability

Accreditation may also alter behavior unevenly over time. Devkaran and O'Farrell's interrupted time-series analysis described a life-cycle pattern in which compliance can improve before survey, dip after accreditation, and later stabilize. [12] This is important because a single post-accreditation audit may overestimate sustainability. A hospital may perform exceptionally during a survey period because managerial attention, training intensity, and audit frequency are temporarily elevated.

The practical test of NABH is therefore what happens after the surveyors leave. Sustained performance requires routine measurement, ownership at unit level, leadership review, and rapid feedback. Accreditation should become embedded in daily clinical work rather than remain an episodic quality campaign.

2.3 Healthcare-associated infections as patient-safety indicators

Healthcare-associated infections are especially suitable for evaluating whether quality systems translate into clinical outcomes because they are influenced by observable processes. Device

insertion, device maintenance, hand hygiene, environmental cleaning, antimicrobial practice, isolation, staffing, and surveillance all contribute to infection risk. HAIs are also clinically consequential, increasing length of stay, resource use, antimicrobial exposure, and the risk of severe outcomes. [13] [14]

The burden is particularly relevant in resource-variable settings. Rosenthal and colleagues' multinational surveillance report demonstrated substantially higher device-associated infection rates in many developing-country intensive care settings than in comparable US surveillance data. [15] Such differences cannot be attributed to a single factor. They reflect infrastructure, staffing, device utilization, surveillance capacity, adherence to prevention bundles, and local epidemiology.

Hand hygiene remains a foundational intervention. Pittet and colleagues summarized the WHO recommendations and the evidence supporting hand hygiene as a principal measure for reducing transmission. [16] Indian critical-care guidance similarly emphasizes hand hygiene, environmental control, device management, surveillance, and infection-control organization. [17]

2.4 CLABSI and CAUTI: why standardized processes matter

Central-line infection prevention illustrates the relationship between accreditation and frontline reliability. Pronovost and colleagues demonstrated that a structured intervention incorporating evidence-based practices and checklist-supported implementation produced large reductions in catheter-related bloodstream infection in intensive care units. [19] Their later observational work examined whether these gains could be sustained, reinforcing the point that the durability of an intervention depends on continuing measurement and implementation support. [20]

The relevance to accreditation is not that NABH reproduces the Michigan intervention. It does not. The relevance is mechanistic: accreditation can require hospitals to define who inserts devices, how insertion is performed, how maintenance is documented, when necessity is reviewed, how infection events are investigated, and which indicators are reported to leadership. When these processes are reliable, the clinical pathway resembles a safety barrier system rather than a collection of individual intentions.

CAUTI prevention provides a parallel example. Unnecessary catheterization and prolonged catheter duration are modifiable risk factors. Meddings and colleagues summarized interventions that reduce unnecessary catheter use, while reminder and stop-order systems have

also been studied as methods for reducing catheter exposure. [21] [22] Thus, a post-accreditation decline in CAUTI is biologically and operationally plausible when accreditation leads to device-necessity review, standardized insertion, maintenance bundles, nursing documentation, and timely removal.

2.5 VAP and SSI: outcomes that require broader systems

Ventilator-associated pneumonia is more complex because diagnostic definitions, patient severity, ventilation practices, aspiration risk, oral care, sedation management, mobility, and device exposure interact. Klompas and colleagues synthesized prevention strategies for acute-care hospitals and emphasized a bundle of practices rather than a single intervention. [23] Consequently, a moderate change in VAP should not automatically be interpreted as failure of accreditation. It may reflect the greater biological and diagnostic complexity of the outcome.

Surgical-site infection is similarly dependent on multiple perioperative processes. Antibiotic timing, skin preparation, operating-room discipline, temperature management, glycemic control, wound classification, surgical technique, traffic, and post-operative care all contribute. Accreditation may improve coordination among these components, but attribution requires careful adjustment for procedure mix and patient risk.

2.6 Hospital planning and the physical environment

Patient safety is partly architectural. Ulrich and colleagues reviewed evidence linking healthcare design with infection control, patient outcomes, staff performance, ventilation, room configuration, and other environmental features. [24] The physical layout of an intensive care unit can affect observation, staff movement, equipment placement, crowding, isolation, and opportunities for cross-transmission.

This matters because accreditation standards can bring physical design into the quality conversation. Adequate isolation capacity, appropriate hand-hygiene access, clean and dirty workflow separation, medication storage, safe electrical and oxygen infrastructure, and logical patient-staff circulation are not decorative features. They are components of the safety system.

2.7 Medication errors and the reporting paradox

Medication safety presents a different analytical problem. Leape and colleagues demonstrated

that adverse events related to medical management were not rare in hospitalized patients. [25] Bates and colleagues subsequently documented the incidence of adverse drug events and potential adverse drug events, establishing medication-related harm as a major target for prevention. [26]

Reason's systems perspective is especially useful here. Errors should not be reduced to the moral failure of a frontline worker. They can arise from latent conditions, poorly designed processes, inadequate information, workload, communication failures, and weak barriers. [27] A hospital that responds to every error with individual punishment may create the appearance of control while driving future errors underground.

Incident reporting therefore has a paradoxical property. A safer organization may initially report more incidents because staff are more willing to disclose near misses. Evans and colleagues identified fear, uncertainty about what happens after a report, and perceptions about reporting usefulness as important barriers. [28] The Safety Attitudes Questionnaire literature similarly demonstrates that organizational climate can be measured and that safety attitudes vary across clinical settings. [29] This framework makes the reported 28% increase in medication-error reporting after accreditation analytically interesting. It should not be interpreted as evidence that accreditation caused more medication harm. If reporting increased while severe adverse drug events later fell, the more coherent interpretation is that detection and transparency improved before downstream harm declined. The inference remains provisional because reporting data are vulnerable to changes in case finding and documentation.

2.8 Digital systems, medication safety and surveillance

Digital systems can strengthen the connection between accreditation and continuous safety. Bates and colleagues demonstrated that computerized physician order entry with decision support can reduce medication errors. [30] Barcode-assisted medication administration has also been associated with improved medication-administration safety. [31] Computerized surveillance can identify adverse drug events through combinations of medication orders, laboratory results, antidote use, and other electronic signals that are difficult to capture through voluntary reporting alone. [32]

The broader value of analytics lies in moving from retrospective counting to prospective risk detection. Bates and colleagues described applications of big data analytics to high-risk

patients, readmissions, deterioration, adverse events, and treatment optimization. [33] Wiens and Shenoy argued that machine learning has particular relevance to healthcare epidemiology because electronic clinical data can support prediction and earlier recognition of risk. [34]

The caution is equally important. A predictive model does not become safe simply because it is accurate in a development dataset. Data quality, missingness, workflow fit, false alarms, model drift, inequity, clinician trust, and accountability all matter. The correct role of AI in an accreditation environment is therefore to augment surveillance and decision-making, not to replace clinical judgment or infection-control governance.

3. Methodology

3.1 Study design

The study was designed as a retrospective, observational, mixed-methods evaluation of patient-safety indicators before and after NABH accreditation. The supplied manuscript describes three tertiary care teaching hospitals in Dehradun, Uttarakhand, that transitioned from unaccredited status to full NABH accreditation during January 2022 to December 2025. The comparison covered 12 months before accreditation and 12 months after accreditation. The source explicitly describes the setting, period, data sources, outcomes, and analytic approach.

A before-and-after design is practical for hospital quality research, but it is weaker than a controlled interrupted time series or a difference-in-differences design. The principal threat is confounding by time. Infection rates can fall because of unrelated infection-control campaigns, changes in staffing, seasonal variation, antibiotic policies, equipment changes, patient mix, or wider infection-prevention initiatives.

3.2 Study setting

The setting comprised three academic tertiary care hospitals in Dehradun. The source manuscript characterizes the hospitals as undergoing rapid infrastructure expansion and increasing patient volumes. The regional focus is useful because emerging tertiary hospitals may experience simultaneous changes in accreditation, workforce, digital systems, clinical capacity, and physical infrastructure. These changes can interact, making attribution challenging but also making the study relevant to hospital-development policy.

3.3 Study periods

The supplied study compares pre-accreditation and post-accreditation periods. The manuscript describes 2022–2023 as the pre-accreditation phase and 2024–2025 as the post-accreditation phase. It should be clarified in the final submission whether the 12-month pre-period and 12-month post-period were identical across all three hospitals and whether accreditation dates differed by hospital. If accreditation occurred on different dates, a hospital-specific index date should be used.

3.4 Data sources

The study extracted quantitative information from electronic hospital information systems and internal quality incident registries. This is a reasonable combination because infection denominators often reside in clinical information systems, while incident reports and near misses may be stored separately. The source manuscript identifies the principal indicators as CAUTI per 1,000 catheter days, CLABSI per 1,000 central-line days, VAP per 1,000 ventilator days, and SSI per 100 surgeries. Medication errors were classified into prescribing, dispensing, administration, and near-miss categories.

3.5 Outcome definitions

The primary clinical outcomes were device-associated infections and medication safety. Device-associated infection rates should be reported using standardized definitions and denominators that remain unchanged across the comparison period. For CAUTI and CLABSI, device-days are preferable to crude patient counts because exposure to the device is the principal opportunity for infection. For SSI, the denominator should be the number of eligible surgical procedures, with stratification by procedure type where feasible. Medication safety should be separated into at least three concepts: errors detected, errors reported, and harmful events. These are not interchangeable. A rise in reports can coexist with a fall in harm. The NCC MERP framework can support categorization by the degree of patient impact, but the final manuscript should provide the exact version and operational definitions used at each hospital.

3.6 Patient-safety culture

The source manuscript specifies the Hospital Survey on Patient Safety Culture as the qualitative component. HSOPSC is designed to measure organizational perceptions of safety, communication, teamwork, management support, event reporting, and related domains.

Psychometric evaluation has shown useful reliability and validity across several domains, although individual subscales should be interpreted with attention to their limitations. [29]

3.7 Statistical analysis

The supplied manuscript states that quantitative data were analyzed using SPSS version 28.0, with continuous variables summarized as means and standard deviations and categorical variables as percentages. Poisson regression was specified for HAI rates because the outcomes are counts observed over exposure denominators such as device-days. The manuscript also states that $p < 0.05$ was considered statistically significant and that safety-culture assessments were evaluated with paired t-tests.

For a journal submission, the statistical model should be strengthened by explicitly reporting incidence-rate ratios, 95% confidence intervals, the offset term used for device-days or procedure volume, and assessment of overdispersion. If overdispersion is present, negative binomial regression may be more appropriate. Monthly data would permit segmented regression and adjustment for secular trend. Hospital-level clustering should also be considered.

3.8 Ethical and data-governance considerations

The supplied manuscript does not state an institutional ethics committee approval number, waiver of consent, data-protection procedure, or protocol registration. These details should be obtained from the investigators and inserted before submission. Because the present paper is an expanded scholarly manuscript based on the supplied study summary, no ethics approval number or participant count has been invented.

3.9 Methodological quality safeguards recommended for final submission

- Report hospital-specific accreditation dates and define the index date for each facility.
- Provide monthly or quarterly numerators and denominators for each HAI indicator.
- Report incidence-rate ratios with 95% confidence intervals rather than p-values alone.
- Adjust for device utilization ratios where possible because changes in device exposure can influence infection rates.
- Stratify SSI by procedure type and risk class where sufficient data exist.
- Distinguish voluntary reporting from active surveillance for medication errors.
- Report staff-response rates and missing data for the safety-culture survey.

- Describe concurrent interventions, including staffing changes, antimicrobial stewardship, digitalization, infection-control campaigns, and infrastructure changes.
- Provide ethics approval or waiver documentation and describe data-security safeguards.
- Use a sensitivity analysis excluding the immediate accreditation-survey period to assess whether effects persist.

4. Results

4.1 Overall pattern

The supplied manuscript reports an overall improvement in the tracked patient-safety profile after NABH accreditation. The strongest numerical changes occurred in device-associated infection rates. CLABSI decreased from 4.8 to 2.8 per 1,000 central-line days, while CAUTI

decreased from 6.2 to 4.1 per 1,000 catheter days. The source reports $p<0.01$ for CLABSI and $p<0.05$ for CAUTI.

The reported percentage reductions can be reconstructed directly from the supplied rates. The CLABSI change corresponds to a reduction of approximately 41.7%, while the CAUTI change corresponds to approximately 33.9%. These figures align closely with the manuscript's stated reductions of 41% and 34%, respectively. The source manuscript also reports a 28% increase in medication-error reporting during the first six months after accreditation. It then reports a 22% reduction in severe adverse drug events by the second post-accreditation year. These measures should be interpreted as separate outcomes because reporting frequency and clinical harm capture different stages of the safety system.

4.2 Summary of reported indicators

Indicator	Pre-accreditation	Post-accreditation / follow-up	Reported change	Interpretation
CLABSI	4.8/1,000 central-line days	2.8/1,000 central-line days	41% reduction; $p<0.01$	Large improvement in device-associated infection rate
CAUTI	6.2/1,000 catheter days	4.1/1,000 catheter days	34% reduction; $p<0.05$	Meaningful reduction compatible with device-management improvement
Medication-error reports	Baseline not supplied	First 6 months post-accreditation	28% increase	Likely reflects increased detection/reporting; cannot by itself indicate more harm
Severe adverse drug events	Baseline not supplied	Second post-accreditation year	22% reduction	Suggests possible reduction in clinically consequential medication harm
VAP	Numerical baseline not supplied	Moderate decline reported	Not quantified in supplied manuscript	Multifactorial outcome requiring cautious interpretation
SSI	Indicator tracked	Indicator tracked	Numerical result not supplied	Insufficient information for quantitative inference

The table deliberately does not create values for VAP or SSI that were not present in the supplied manuscript. The source states that VAP showed a moderate decline but does not provide the numerical rates. This distinction is important in a publication manuscript because precision should come from data, not from editorial completion.

5. Discussion and Analysis

5.1 Principal interpretation

The most defensible interpretation of the study is that NABH implementation was associated with a measurable improvement in selected patient-

safety indicators, particularly CLABSI and CAUTI. The strength of this conclusion lies in the coherence between the observed direction of change and the known mechanisms of infection prevention. It should not, however, be expressed as proof that accreditation alone caused the reduction.

This distinction matters. Accreditation changes many variables at once. Hospitals preparing for accreditation may intensify hand-hygiene campaigns, recruit or retrain infection-control staff, improve documentation, purchase equipment, redesign medication storage, strengthen audit meetings, introduce dashboards, and revise clinical protocols. If infection rates fall during the same period, all of these changes become potential explanatory variables.

The study therefore provides evidence of an association within a real-world implementation environment. That is clinically valuable. Health systems rarely introduce accreditation in a sterile experimental setting. The practical question is whether accreditation can act as a platform around which multiple safety mechanisms become organized. The findings suggest that it can.

5.2 CLABSI reduction: the strongest signal

The decline in CLABSI from 4.8 to 2.8 per 1,000 central-line days is the clearest quantitative signal in the study. The magnitude is substantial, and the reported p value is below 0.01. The result is also biologically plausible. Central-line infections respond to insertion technique, skin antisepsis, barrier precautions, catheter selection, maintenance practices, hub disinfection, dressing management, and timely removal.

The literature demonstrates that standardized interventions can produce dramatic reductions in catheter-related bloodstream infections. Pronovost and colleagues' multicenter intervention used a bundle of evidence-based practices and implementation strategies and produced a marked reduction in infection rates. [19] Their subsequent observational study showed that reductions could be sustained when the intervention became part of routine practice. [20]

The important analytical point is that accreditation does not need to contain a single magic intervention to produce benefit. It can create the conditions under which evidence-based interventions become organizationally mandatory. The difference is between telling clinicians that a bundle exists and building a system that measures whether it is performed.

5.3 CAUTI reduction: process reliability and device necessity

The fall in CAUTI from 6.2 to 4.1 per 1,000 catheter days represents approximately one-third lower infection incidence. CAUTI prevention depends heavily on avoiding unnecessary catheterization and removing catheters promptly. Meddings and colleagues have shown that strategies targeting catheter use can reduce exposure and infection risk. [21] [22]

This makes daily device-necessity assessment particularly important. A catheter that is no longer clinically necessary is not a neutral object. It is a continuing exposure. In an accreditation environment, the transformation occurs when the removal decision becomes visible, assigned, documented, audited, and reviewed rather than dependent on memory.

Nursing leadership has a particularly important role in this pathway. Nurses are often the clinicians who maintain the device continuously and can identify when the original indication has disappeared. An accreditation program that includes nursing participation in device review can therefore convert a technical standard into a recurring bedside decision.

5.4 VAP: why moderate improvement is not a weak result

The source manuscript reports a moderate decline in VAP. It is tempting to rank this below CLABSI and CAUTI because the numerical change is not supplied. That would be misleading. VAP prevention is influenced by a broader bundle of clinical practices and diagnostic uncertainty. Klompas and colleagues emphasize a multidimensional prevention strategy rather than a single control point. [23]

A moderate reduction may therefore reflect partial implementation across a complex pathway. It may also indicate that accreditation improves some processes while leaving others constrained by patient acuity, staffing, sedation practices, ventilator exposure, or diagnostic variability. The appropriate response is not to dismiss the finding but to disaggregate the bundle and identify which components have the weakest reliability.

5.5 Hospital design as an under-recognized mediator

The source manuscript links accreditation-related hospital planning with ICU bed spacing and isolation management. That mechanism is plausible but should be tested more directly. Evidence-based design research indicates that room configuration, ventilation, spatial organization, and environmental characteristics

can affect infection prevention and staff performance. [24]

A hospital quality program that evaluates clinical standards while ignoring physical workflow is incomplete. Consider hand hygiene. Compliance is partly behavioral, but the probability of compliance also depends on whether alcohol-based hand rub is available at the point of care, whether sinks are conveniently located, whether equipment obstructs access, and whether patient flow produces unnecessary contact.

The implication for NABH is that facility management and patient-care standards should not operate as separate silos. Environmental design is a clinical intervention when it changes the probability of contamination or the reliability of infection-control behavior.

5.6 Medication reporting: the 28% increase should not be misread

The initial 28% rise in reported medication errors is one of the most analytically interesting findings. A superficial interpretation would label it deterioration. A systems interpretation asks a different question: did the number of errors increase, or did the number of detected and reported events increase?

Those are different denominators. If staff previously reported only events that caused harm and later began reporting near misses, the numerator rises while the underlying risk may be unchanged or falling. Evans and colleagues demonstrated that incident reporting is influenced by staff attitudes, perceived usefulness, fear, and organizational context. [28] A reporting system therefore measures both safety events and the organization's willingness to see them.

The subsequent 22% reduction in severe adverse drug events strengthens the hypothesis that the reporting increase represented greater visibility rather than deteriorating care. The evidence remains indirect because the supplied manuscript does not provide the absolute number of reports, exposure denominator, severity distribution by month, or medication-use volume.

A stronger publication analysis should therefore report medication errors per 1,000 medication orders or administrations, not only absolute counts. It should also separate near misses, no-harm events, temporary-harm events, permanent-harm events, and deaths. Without those distinctions, an institution can be penalized statistically for becoming more honest.

5.7 Just culture and accountability

A non-punitive reporting environment does not mean an environment without accountability.

The distinction is between human error, at-risk behavior, and reckless behavior. Reason's model supports system-level analysis of error pathways, while still allowing organizations to examine individual conduct where appropriate. [27]

The practical leadership task is to make reporting useful. A report that disappears into a committee file will eventually lose credibility. Staff need evidence that incidents generate feedback, redesign, education, equipment changes, policy revision, or workflow modification. The reporting system must produce learning, not merely a larger spreadsheet.

5.8 Accreditation and the measurement problem

The study illustrates a wider issue in accreditation research: what should count as evidence of success? Compliance measures are easier to collect than outcomes. Outcomes are more meaningful but noisier. A robust accreditation dashboard should therefore contain a hierarchy.

- Structure indicators: staffing, equipment, isolation capacity, medication-storage design, information-system availability.
- Process indicators: hand-hygiene compliance, central-line bundle compliance, device-necessity review, medication reconciliation, double-check compliance.
- Outcome indicators: CLABSI, CAUTI, VAP, SSI, severe medication-related harm, falls, pressure injuries, mortality where appropriate.
- Balancing indicators: staff workload, alert fatigue, reporting burden, antibiotic use, device utilization, and unintended consequences.
- Learning indicators: near-miss reporting, time to investigation, closure of corrective actions, recurrence rate, and feedback to frontline staff.

This layered approach prevents the hospital from declaring victory because a checklist completion rate reached 98%. A process can be highly compliant while producing little clinical benefit, and a good outcome can sometimes occur despite poor process reliability. The strongest evidence arises when structure, process, and outcome indicators move coherently.

5.9 Digital surveillance and the transition from audit to early warning

Manual quality audits are valuable but inherently episodic. They provide snapshots. Electronic surveillance can provide a moving picture. Classen and colleagues demonstrated the potential of computerized surveillance to

identify adverse drug events through electronic signals that voluntary reporting alone missed. [32]

Modern analytics can extend this principle to infection control. Electronic data can combine device exposure, laboratory results, antibiotic escalation, microbiology, temperature, white blood-cell counts, and clinical deterioration signals. The resulting system can flag patients who merit review. Bates and colleagues described broader uses of analytics for deterioration and adverse events, while Wiens and Shenoy highlighted machine learning's potential in healthcare epidemiology. [33] [34] The study manuscript suggests that the hospitals with stronger retention of quality standards integrated predictive analytics. This is a promising observation, but it is not quantitatively demonstrated in the supplied data. It should therefore be presented as an implementation hypothesis rather than a measured causal result.

5.10 What AI should and should not do in NABH quality systems

AI is most useful when it reduces the distance between a safety signal and a human response. It can identify unusual clusters, prioritize charts for review, detect deviations from expected pathways, and reduce the manual burden of surveillance. It should not be used to generate a false sense of certainty.

For infection prevention, a predictive model could flag patients with rising risk of bloodstream infection. The infection-control nurse or physician would then review the case. For medication safety, an algorithm could identify high-risk combinations, duplicate therapy, abnormal laboratory values, or patterns associated with adverse drug events. The clinical team remains responsible for the decision.

The safest digital architecture is therefore a closed loop: data capture, signal detection, human review, intervention, documentation, outcome measurement, and model reassessment. Without the final stages, prediction becomes dashboard theatre.

5.11 Relationship to international accreditation evidence

The study findings sit within a broader literature that is supportive but not uniform. Accreditation has repeatedly been associated with improved processes, safety culture, and organizational quality systems. [3] [4] [5] [6] [7] [8] [9] [10] [11] However, systematic reviews also identify contradictory findings and methodological limitations. [9] [10] [11]

This apparent contradiction is not necessarily a weakness of the accreditation concept. Accreditation is a complex intervention delivered within complex organizations. Its effect depends on leadership commitment, staff engagement, pre-existing quality maturity, survey incentives, resources, implementation intensity, and the degree to which standards are incorporated into routine work.

A hospital with strong baseline quality systems may obtain a smaller marginal benefit from accreditation than a hospital with fragmented processes. Conversely, a poorly resourced organization may struggle to convert standards into practice even when the standards themselves are appropriate. The implementation context is therefore part of the intervention.

5.12 Implications for hospital administrators

Hospital administrators should resist the temptation to manage accreditation as a project with a fixed completion date. The post-survey period is where the real test begins. Leadership dashboards should focus on trends, not isolated monthly values. Unit managers should own the indicators. Infection-control teams should have protected authority and adequate staffing. Pharmacy and nursing leadership should jointly review medication incidents.

Accreditation committees should also distinguish between compliance fatigue and safety work. Repeatedly asking staff to sign forms without reducing clinical friction can produce ritual compliance. The better approach is to redesign work so that the safe action becomes the easiest action.

5.13 Implications for nursing leadership

Nursing has a distinctive position in patient safety because nurses continuously interact with patients, devices, medications, documentation systems, and multidisciplinary teams. The reported CAUTI and medication findings therefore have direct implications for nursing governance.

Nursing leaders should use accreditation standards to establish unit-level reliability measures: device necessity review, catheter-care documentation, central-line maintenance audits, medication double-check compliance, high-alert medication storage, hand-hygiene observation, and escalation of near misses. These indicators should be discussed in clinical huddles rather than reserved for monthly quality meetings.

The nursing superintendent or senior nursing administrator can serve as an integrator between bedside practice and executive governance. That role is particularly important in large tertiary hospitals where policy decisions made at

committee level may otherwise arrive at ward level as disconnected instructions.

5.14 Implications for quality and accreditation teams

Quality departments should move from document stewardship toward measurement stewardship. Their work should include denominator validation, data definitions, trend analysis, audit reliability, feedback loops, and investigation of unexpected variation.

A high-quality accreditation dashboard should also make under-reporting visible. If medication reports suddenly fall to near zero after a change in reporting policy, the dashboard should not automatically interpret this as success. It may represent fear, fatigue, reporting-system failure, or staff disengagement.

5.15 Policy implications for India

The Indian hospital sector is heterogeneous, and accreditation should not be evaluated solely through the experience of large private tertiary hospitals. Public hospitals, district hospitals, smaller secondary facilities, teaching hospitals, and rural institutions face different constraints. A national quality strategy should therefore preserve common safety principles while allowing implementation pathways to reflect local capacity.

The most transferable elements are measurement discipline, infection-control systems, medication safety, patient identification, clinical governance, staff training, incident learning, and leadership accountability. Technology should be layered onto these foundations rather than used as a substitute for them.

5.16 Alternative explanations and causal caution

Several alternative explanations could account for some of the observed improvement. First, the hospitals may have introduced infection-control interventions independently of accreditation. Second, device utilization may have changed. Third, patient case-mix may have shifted. Fourth, surveillance intensity may have changed. Fifth, staff turnover may have altered the composition of the workforce. Sixth, the COVID-19 period may have influenced infection-control behavior, although the precise temporal overlap with the study periods needs to be documented.

The source manuscript does not provide enough information to quantify these effects. Therefore, the appropriate language is 'associated with' rather than 'caused by'. The distinction should be preserved throughout the final submission.

5.17 Strengths of the study

The study has several practical strengths. It addresses clinically meaningful outcomes rather than accreditation scores alone. It uses device-associated infection denominators rather than crude patient counts. It combines quantitative clinical indicators with patient-safety culture assessment. It examines medication reporting behavior rather than assuming that fewer reports always indicate safer care. Finally, it addresses the transition from accreditation compliance to digital surveillance, which is increasingly relevant to modern quality management.

5.18 Limitations

The study's retrospective before-and-after design limits causal inference. The sample is restricted to three tertiary teaching hospitals in one geographic region, limiting generalizability. Medication-error data are dependent on reporting behavior and may therefore underestimate true incidence. The supplied manuscript does not provide hospital-wise sample sizes, monthly numerators and denominators, confidence intervals, device-utilization ratios, case-mix adjustment, or detailed VAP and SSI values. The absence of these details limits independent assessment of effect size.

There is also a potential ecological problem. If the three hospitals differed substantially in baseline quality, staffing, infrastructure, or accreditation timing, pooled results could conceal important heterogeneity. A future analysis should present hospital-specific trajectories before producing a pooled estimate.

5.19 Recommended future research

A stronger multicenter study would use an interrupted time-series design with monthly data for at least 24 months before and 24 months after accreditation. A control group of comparable non-accredited hospitals would improve causal inference. Device utilization should be included, as should staffing ratios, patient acuity, antimicrobial consumption, hand-hygiene compliance, and bundle adherence.

Future studies should also distinguish the effect of accreditation from the effect of individual standards. For example, one analysis could examine whether CLABSI changes correlate more strongly with central-line bundle compliance than with overall accreditation score. Another could examine whether medication reporting rises immediately after training and then falls as severe events decline.

The next methodological step is to treat accreditation as a complex intervention. Implementation fidelity, leadership engagement,

staff acceptance, resource adequacy, and organizational maturity should be measured alongside clinical outcomes. This would move NABH research from 'before versus after' toward a more explanatory science of quality improvement.

6. Conclusion

The supplied study presents a coherent and clinically plausible association between NABH implementation and improved selected patient-safety indicators in three tertiary care teaching hospitals in Dehradun. The reported reduction in CLABSI from 4.8 to 2.8 per 1,000 central-line days and the reduction in CAUTI from 6.2 to 4.1 per 1,000 catheter days provide the strongest signals. The initial 28% rise in medication-error reporting, followed by a reported 22% decline in severe adverse drug events, illustrates why safety measurement must distinguish reporting activity from clinical harm.

The broader evidence supports the idea that accreditation can improve organizational processes, safety culture, and selected quality outcomes, while also warning that accreditation effects are heterogeneous and difficult to attribute. [2] [3] [4] [5] [6] [7] [8] [9] [10] [11] [12] NABH should therefore be understood as an enabling governance architecture. Its value is realized when standards become reliable clinical behavior.

For infection prevention, the priority is not the accreditation certificate but the chain of actions behind it: correct device selection, aseptic insertion, maintenance, daily necessity review, surveillance, feedback, and leadership response. For medication safety, the priority is not a low incident count but a mature learning system in which near misses are visible, harmful events are investigated, and high-risk processes are redesigned.

The most sustainable model is a hybrid one. Accreditation provides the framework; frontline professionals provide the clinical judgment; quality teams provide measurement discipline; nursing and medical leaders provide accountability; and digital systems provide continuous surveillance. AI can strengthen that architecture when it is used to detect risk, prioritize review, and accelerate feedback. It should remain subordinate to clinical governance. The central lesson is therefore straightforward: the success of NABH should be judged by what happens to patients, not only by what happens to documents. A hospital earns the meaning of accreditation every day at the bedside.

References

1. Donabedian A. The quality of care. How can it be assessed? *JAMA*. 1988;260(12):1743-1748. doi:10.1001/jama.260.12.1743.
2. Pomey MP, Contandriopoulos AP, François P, Bertrand D. Accreditation: a tool for organizational change in hospitals? *Int J Health Care Qual Assur Inc Leadersh Health Serv*. 2004;17(2-3):113-124. doi:10.1108/09526860410532757.
3. Greenfield D, Braithwaite J. Health sector accreditation research: a systematic review. *Int J Qual Health Care*. 2008;20(3):172-183. doi:10.1093/intqhc/mzn005.
4. Braithwaite J, Greenfield D, Westbrook J, Pawsey M, Westbrook M, Gibberd R, et al. Health service accreditation as a predictor of clinical and organisational performance: a blinded, random, stratified study. *Qual Saf Health Care*. 2010;19(1):14-21. doi:10.1136/qshc.2009.033928.
5. Hinchcliff R, Greenfield D, Moldovan M, Westbrook JI, Pawsey M, Mumford V, et al. Narrative synthesis of health service accreditation literature. *BMJ Qual Saf*. 2012;21(12):979-991. doi:10.1136/bmjqs-2012-000852.
6. Shaw CD, Groene O, Mora N, Sunol R. Accreditation and ISO certification: do they explain differences in quality management in European hospitals? *Int J Qual Health Care*. 2010;22(6):445-451. doi:10.1093/intqhc/mzq054.
7. Alkhenizan A, Shaw C. Impact of accreditation on the quality of healthcare services: a systematic review of the literature. *Ann Saudi Med*. 2011;31(4):407-416. doi:10.4103/0256-4947.83204.
8. Devkaran S, O'Farrell PN. The impact of hospital accreditation on quality measures: an interrupted time series analysis. *BMC Health Serv Res*. 2015;15:137. doi:10.1186/s12913-015-0784-5.
9. Hussein M, Pavlova M, Ghalwash M, Groot W. The impact of hospital accreditation on the quality of healthcare: a systematic literature review. *BMC Health Serv Res*. 2021;21(1):1057. doi:10.1186/s12913-021-07097-6.
10. Araujo CASA, Siqueira MM, Malik AM. Hospital accreditation impact on healthcare quality dimensions: a systematic review. *Int J Qual Health Care*. 2020;32(8):531-544. doi:10.1093/intqhc/mzaa090.
11. Alhawajreh MJ, Paterson AS, Jackson WJ. Impact of hospital accreditation on quality improvement in healthcare: a systematic review. *PLoS One*. 2023;18(12):e0294180. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0294180.
12. Devkaran S, O'Farrell PN. The impact of hospital accreditation on clinical documentation compliance: a life cycle explanation using interrupted time series analysis. *BMJ Open*.

- 2014;4(8):e005240. doi:10.1136/bmjopen-2014-005240.
13. Allegranzi B, Bagheri Nejad S, Combescure C, Graafmans W, Attar H, Donaldson L, et al. Burden of endemic health-care-associated infection in developing countries: systematic review and meta-analysis. *Lancet*. 2011;377(9761):228-241. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(10)61458-4.
14. Haque M, Sartelli M, McKimm J, Abu Bakar M. Health care-associated infections: an overview. *Infect Drug Resist*. 2018;11:2321-2333. doi:10.2147/IDR.S177247.
15. Rosenthal VD, Bijie H, Maki DG, Mehta Y, Apisarnthanarak A, Leblebicioglu H, et al. International Nosocomial Infection Control Consortium (INICC) report, data summary of 36 countries, for 2004-2009. *Am J Infect Control*. 2012;40(5):396-407. doi:10.1016/j.ajic.2011.05.020.
16. Pittet D, Allegranzi B, Boyce J; World Health Organization World Alliance for Patient Safety First Global Patient Safety Challenge Core Group of Experts. The World Health Organization Guidelines on Hand Hygiene in Health Care and their consensus recommendations. *Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol*. 2009;30(7):611-622. doi:10.1086/600379.
17. Mehta Y, Gupta A, Todi S, Myatra SN, Samaddar DP, Patil V, et al. Guidelines for prevention of hospital acquired infections. *Indian J Crit Care Med*. 2014;18(3):149-163. doi:10.4103/0972-5229.128705.
18. O'Grady NP, Alexander M, Burns LA, Dellinger EP, Garland J, Heard SO, et al. Guidelines for the prevention of intravascular catheter-related infections. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2011;52(9):e162-e193. doi:10.1093/cid/cir257.
19. Pronovost P, Needham D, Berenholtz S, Sinopoli D, Chu H, Cosgrove S, et al. An intervention to decrease catheter-related bloodstream infections in the ICU. *N Engl J Med*. 2006;355(26):2725-2732. doi:10.1056/NEJMoa061115.
20. Pronovost P, Goeschel C, Colantuoni E, Watson S, Lubomski LH, Berenholtz S, et al. Sustaining reductions in catheter related bloodstream infections in Michigan intensive care units: observational study. *BMJ*. 2010;340:c309. doi:10.1136/bmj.c309.
21. Meddings J, Rogers MAM, Krein SL, Fakih MG, Olmsted RN, Saint S. Reducing unnecessary urinary catheter use and other strategies to prevent catheter-associated urinary tract infection: an integrative review. *BMJ Qual Saf*. 2014;23(4):277-289. doi:10.1136/bmjqs-2012-001774.
22. Meddings J, Rogers MAM, Macy M, Saint S. Systematic review and meta-analysis: reminder systems to reduce catheter-associated urinary tract infections and urinary catheter use in hospitalized patients. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2010;51(5):550-560. doi:10.1086/655133.
23. Klompas M, Branson R, Eichenwald EC, Greene LR, Howell MD, Lee G, et al. Strategies to prevent ventilator-associated pneumonia in acute care hospitals: 2014 update. *Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol*. 2014;35(8):915-936. doi:10.1086/677144.
24. Ulrich RS, Zimring C, Zhu X, DuBose J, Seo HB, Choi YS, et al. A review of the research literature on evidence-based healthcare design. *HERD*. 2008;1(3):61-125. doi:10.1177/193758670800100306.
25. Leape LL, Brennan TA, Laird N, Lawthers AG, Localio AR, Barnes BA, et al. The nature of adverse events in hospitalized patients: results of the Harvard Medical Practice Study II. *N Engl J Med*. 1991;324(6):377-384. doi:10.1056/NEJM199102073240605.
26. Bates DW, Cullen DJ, Laird N, Petersen LA, Small SD, Servi D, et al. Incidence of adverse drug events and potential adverse drug events: implications for prevention. *JAMA*. 1995;274(1):29-34. doi:10.1001/jama.274.1.29.
27. Reason J. Human error: models and management. *BMJ*. 2000;320(7237):768-770. doi:10.1136/bmj.320.7237.768.
28. Evans SM, Berry JG, Smith BJ, Esterman A, Selim P, O'Shaughnessy J, et al. Attitudes and barriers to incident reporting: a collaborative hospital study. *Qual Saf Health Care*. 2006;15(1):39-43. doi:10.1136/qshc.2004.012559.
29. Sexton JB, Helmreich RL, Neilands TB, Rowan K, Vella K, Boyden J, et al. The Safety Attitudes Questionnaire: psychometric properties, benchmarking data, and emerging research. *BMC Health Serv Res*. 2006;6:44. doi:10.1186/1472-6963-6-44.
30. Bates DW, Leape LL, Cullen DJ, Laird N, Petersen LA, Teich JM, et al. Effect of computerized physician order entry and a team intervention on prevention of serious medication errors. *JAMA*. 1998;280(15):1311-1316. doi:10.1001/jama.280.15.1311.
31. Poon EG, Keohane CA, Yoon C, Ditmore M, Bane A, Levitzion-Korach O, et al. Effect of bar-code technology on the safety of medication administration. *N Engl J Med*. 2010;362(18):1698-1707. doi:10.1056/NEJMsa0907115.
32. Classen DC, Pestotnik SL, Evans RS, Burke JP. Computerized surveillance of adverse drug events in hospital patients. *JAMA*. 1991;266(20):2847-2851. doi:10.1001/jama.266.20.2847.
33. Bates DW, Saria S, Ohno-Machado L, Shah A, Escobar G. Big data in health care: using analytics to identify and manage high-risk and

- high-cost patients. *Health Aff (Millwood)*. 2014;33(7):1123-1131. doi:10.1377/hlthaff.2014.0041.
34. Wiens J, Shenoy ES. Machine learning for healthcare: on the verge of a major shift in healthcare epidemiology. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2018;66(1):149-153. doi:10.1093/cid/cix731.
35. Sabet C, Hammond A, Marzouk S. Healing Havens: how evidence-based design is transforming medical spaces into therapeutic environments. *HERD*. 2025;18(2):498-501. doi:10.1177/19375867241276123.