Review of Contemporary Philosophy
ISSN: 1841-5261, e-ISSN: 2471-089X
Vol 22 (1), 2023
Pp 5403 - 5410

Alarm Fatigue in Intensive Care Units: Strategies for Enhancing Patient Safety and Nursing Efficiency through Effective Alarm Management Practices

[1]-Tahani Aeed Khatem Alotaibi,[2]-Kholoud Saud Abbas Al-Enezi,[3]-Moath Sami Alshammari ,[4]-Adel Nkhelan Alenzi,[5]-Gassim Ali Doshi,[6]- Yahya Ibrahim Bakry,[7]-Jomah Mohmed Khobrani ,[8]- Rogaya Yahya Qassim Debsh,[9]- Elaf Rajeh Abdou Kodam ,[10]-Fatema Ibrahim Aqeeli ,[11]-Waeel Ali Ahead Hakami,[12]-Mohammed Abdu Naship Sharahil,[13]-Fahad Abdu Aziz Asiri Hadadi

[1] KSA, Ministry Of Health, Healthy Mansoura
[2] KSA, Ministry Of Health, General Medical Authority In Riyadh
[3] KSA, Ministry Of Health, Alrass General Hospital
[4] KSA, Ministry Of Health, King Salamn Specialist Hospital -Hail Health Cluster
[5] KSA, Ministry Of Health, Alardah General Hospital
[6] KSA, Ministry Of Health, Alardah General Hospital
[7] KSA, Ministry Of Health, Alardah General Hospital
[8] KSA, Ministry Of Health, Alardah General Hospital
[9] KSA, Ministry Of Health, Sabya General Hospital
[10]KSA, Ministry Of Health, Jeddah Health Cluster 2 Administration - Al-Wafa Health Center In Jeddah
[11]KSA, Ministry Of Health, Eradh Mental Health Hospital Jazan
[12]KSA, Ministry Of Health, Ahaad Almasariha
[13]KSA, Ministry Of Health, AL Ardah

Abstract

Background: Alarm fatigue is a prevalent issue in intensive care units (ICUs), where the incessant barrage of auditory alerts can lead to desensitization among nursing staff. With 85-99% of alarms being false or clinically irrelevant, this phenomenon poses significant risks to patient safety and care quality.

Methods: This literature review synthesizes current research on alarm fatigue among ICU nurses, focusing on the causes, consequences, and management strategies associated with clinical alarms. A systematic evaluation of qualitative and quantitative studies was conducted to assess nurses' perceptions and experiences regarding alarm systems.

Results: The findings reveal that alarm fatigue is predominantly driven by excessive false alarms, inadequate alarm configurations, and overwhelming workloads. Approximately 93% of nurses reported that alarm fatigue could lead to muted or disregarded alerts, compromising patient safety. Additionally, effective training and standardized protocols are identified as crucial factors in mitigating alarm fatigue and improving response times.

Conclusion: To enhance patient safety and care quality in ICUs, it is essential to implement comprehensive alarm management strategies. These should include standardized alarm settings, continuous education for nursing staff, and the incorporation of advanced technologies to reduce false alarms. Addressing alarm fatigue is vital for ensuring that critical alerts are appropriately heeded, ultimately improving outcomes in acute care nursing.

Keywords: Alarm Fatigue, Intensive Care Units, Patient Safety, Nursing Workload, Alarm Management

Received: 10 October 2023 **Revised**: 24 November 2023 **Accepted**: 08 December 2023

1. Introduction

In the intensive care unit (ICU), where patients are in severe condition, alarms are ubiquitous. Their objective is to notify medical staff of changes in vital parameters and any device malfunctions. Auditory signals may be produced by monitors, respirators, injection pumps, and several other apparatuses. However, it seems that such signals are consistently incorrect or clinically inconsequential, constituting 85–99% of all alarms [2]. Although alarms are a crucial component of treatment and theoretically intended to ensure patient safety, their incessant presence may be overpowering. Nursing personnel, who dedicate the majority of their time to patient care and continuous status monitoring, are especially susceptible to alarm fatigue. The mean number of alerts triggered per patient, to which a nurse responds while on duty, ranges from 150 to 400 [4]. Responding to alarms accounts for 35% of a nurse's working time in an ICU [5]. The sensory overload resulting from an excessive number of sirens may result in delayed responses or full disregard for them [6].

2. Emerging Technologies—Emerging Challenges for Nursing Personnel

The Emergency Care Research Institute (ECRI) is a worldwide organization that annually releases a rating of the most significant dangers associated with medical technology. For several years, their list included the topic of alarm risks. This danger is characterized by an insufficient response to alerts and inadequate management of alarm systems or their configurations [7]. Nonetheless, the issue of alarm fatigue was addressed just in 2020. Currently, nursing staff must allocate their focus between patient care and responding to alerts from various medical equipment [8]. Approximately 40 years ago, the frequency of alerts per critically ill patient was less than six. Currently, there are over forty such alerts [9,10]. Contemporary technology, with the proliferation of more sophisticated equipment, amplifies the noise inside medical settings, while the illusion of security that technology is ostensibly meant to provide proves to be false [11].

3. Nursing Staff Overload: Causes and Consequences

Fatigue is characterized by an absence of energy to do actions. It may be acute, subsiding after a period of rest, or persistent, marked by irreparable physical and mental fatigue [12]. Alarm fatigue is characterized by excessive exposure to stimuli produced by the monitoring device [13]. Researchers emphasize the need of distinguishing between acute and chronic tiredness; nevertheless, the existing literature does not explicitly classify alarm fatigue under either category [12]. Cognitive labor overload pertains to the need for rapid information processing of nurses, whereas physical overload refers to the actual physical exertion involved in their duties [14]. Alarms induce an excess of effort in terms of quantity, quality, cognitive, and physical domains [15]. A significant component leading to weariness and alarm desensitization is noise.

The World Health Organization rules stipulate that hospital noise levels must not surpass 35 dB. Noise disrupts communication and increases stress levels among staff [16]. Regrettably, such criteria are often surpassed. Konkani et al. demonstrated in their study that the noise levels measured in an ICU ranged from 47 to 77 dB, with false alarms identified as one of the primary causes of noise [10]. The predominant and most well researched subjective response to noise is annoyance, which may also include anxiety and mild rage, stemming from the belief that one is being deliberately disrupted [17]. An excessively noisy workplace might impede cooperation, exacerbate hostility, and obstruct the ability to interpret social cues [17]. Noise may lead to feelings of dread and tension in a ward. Conversely, workers perform more effectively in an atmosphere that offers a feeling of security, tranquility, and space [18]. Extended exposure to this sensory component leads to stress, a key contributor to occupational burnout among critical care nurses [19]. Research indicates that individuals acclimate to loud work settings, exhibit less interpersonal and introspective engagement, and have diminished care for patients and their surroundings [14].

The reasons of weariness resulting from monitoring device alerts are many. The need to identify the warning and evaluate and verify its origin is onerous [20]. In ICU settings, several monitoring equipment produce alerts of varying priority levels. Alarms induce cognitive stress in workers, mostly due to interruptions in their tasks, distractions, and the need to prioritize the importance of the alert [20].

Intensive care nurses experience frustration from incessant and erroneous alerts daily, prompting a natural response of silencing or disabling them entirely. Consequently, critical signals requiring action may be overlooked [21]. Malfunction, abuse, or improper alarm configuration of the monitoring equipment may pose a risk to the patient [22]. From January 2009 to June 2012, 98 adverse events were documented in the United States resulting from inaccurate or delayed responses to alarms, with 80 of these incidents resulting in patient fatalities [2]. Alarm weariness poses a threat to patient safety. A scenario is presented in which medical staff failed to react to the low-heart-rate alert, ultimately leading to the patient's death. The examination subsequent to this occurrence revealed that the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services stated: "Nurses not recalling low-heart-rate alarms indicated alarm fatigue, which contributed to the patient's death" [23]. Efforts to reduce alarm exposure from monitoring equipment result in the suppression of alerts at the monitoring center, without directly assessing the patient's condition [23].

The existing research on alarm fatigue has three significant problems that need attention. Primarily, ensuring a secure hospital environment for both patients and staff. Secondly, the rapid advancement of technology. The rapidly evolving conditions of the critical care unit. The objective of the research is to examine the existing literature about the perception of clinical alarms by nursing personnel in the critical care unit. This report presents a contemporary synthesis of scientific research about alarm fatigue among ICU nurses.

4. Onerous and Deceptive Alerts

In research conducted by Christensen et al., 59% of surveyed nurses said that the discomfort of alerts stems from improperly configured alarm levels [24,25]. Moreover, 95% of nurses reported often experiencing the burden of alerts [26]. The disruption caused by alarms interferes with patient care [9,11,26,27]. The annoyance and inaccuracy of alerts lead to diminished faith in monitoring systems [11]. The high frequency of false alarms impedes nursing workers from responding appropriately to them [27]. The surveyed nurses said that contemporary technology are very complex, and that false alarms occur too often, diverting their focus [26].

5. Alarm Fatigue

Ninety-three percent of nurses indicate that alarm fatigue may lead to alarms being overly muted or disregarded. In the same survey, 81% of respondents said that alarm fatigue is caused by an excessive number of false alarms [25]. It is significant that 52% of nurses are unaware of how to avoid alarm fatigue. Some assert that the only method is to adjust the alerts of equipment displaying patients' vital signs to align with their health status [27].

The research provide inconclusive data about the primary hurdle to alarm handling. Sowan et al. indicate that nurses see the challenge of identifying the source and priority of an alert as the primary obstacle [26], with the synthesized data yielding an average weighted value of x̄.

Equals 3.55. A further obstacle is the inadequate staffing, which hinders appropriate responses to alerts [11]. Respondents identified the following as minor impediments to responding to alerts: lack of training in alarm system use, challenges in correctly configuring alarms, and interference from non-clinical noises, a conclusion not entirely substantiated by the data synthesis.

Christensen et al. conducted a 10-item questionnaire among Australian nurses. Over 50% of respondents said that irritating alarms stem from the accuracy and improper configurations of devices. Furthermore, nurses indicate that over fifty percent of alerts are triggered by the lack of nurses present at a patient's bedside. This elicited resentment and ignorance among some nurses; conversely, others exhibited a feeling of professional co-responsibility and responded to the warning signals of a colleague's patient [25].

Nurses demonstrate a feeling of accountability for the accurate and personalized configuration of alarms in quality studies [28,29]. Nevertheless, an overwhelming amount of responsibilities often relegates alarm management to a low priority duty. American nurses see their workload as excessive and are reluctant to assume sole responsibility for responding to alarms, anticipating assistance from other team members [28].

German nurses, receptive to the integration of mobile technology, express challenges with modern technology and several apprehensions over its deployment [29].

The study included two qualitative investigations and five quantitative studies. The findings of the quality studies represent the perspectives of healthcare professionals evaluating alarm fatigue. They are an essential component for articulating the ultimate outcomes; nonetheless, they may introduce bias, differing in form from other articles.

6. Discussion

This literature study focuses on articles that articulate nurses' perspectives and sentiments around clinical alarms. Following the examination of findings from research using the HTF questionnaire, a straightforward conclusion may be reached. Nurses globally concur that excessive alerts are too frequent, disrupt patient care, and diminish their confidence in alarm systems [9,11,26,27]. During a nurse's shift, the number of alerts per patient may range from 150 to 400 or more, with a substantial proportion being false or clinically irrelevant alarms [25]. In the research by Cho et al., an ICU produced 2,184 alarms for 48 hours, of which 36.2% were significant and 63.8% were erroneous.

The Healthcare Technology Foundation (HTF) is an organization dedicated to advocating for the safe use of technology in the healthcare sector. In 2005–2006, a nationwide online survey was conducted to assess medical personnel's perceptions of clinical alarms. The same investigation was conducted again in 2011 and 2016. The latter illustrates the frequency of such burdensome alerts, which are correlated with a rising incidence of negative occurrences attributable to clinical alarms. In 2006, 81% of nurses perceived bothersome alerts as too frequent, followed by 76% in 2011, and 87% in 2016 [28,30]. According to the findings of research conducted by Ruppel et al., nurses' express apprehension over the use of new technology, fearing an increase in workload due to their constrained time and resources. Overwhelmed by several responsibilities in patient care, they are reluctant to assume primary accountability for responding to alarms. The engagement of a whole team in the management of clinical alarms may facilitate the diminution of excessive and burdensome alerts. Nurses express dissatisfaction that physicians disregard alerts and that nursing staff are only depended upon to validate the significance of an alarm [31].

Conversely, in the quality research conducted by Poncette et al. in Germany, nurses believed that the use of supplementary technology, such as tablets or mobile phones, may enhance patient safety. The capacity to annul clinically irrelevant warnings from any place may diminish tension and enhance job satisfaction [29]. Nurses from a TCICU in the U.S. (Sowan et al.), who are already using mobile technology like as cell phones and pagers, have a contrary viewpoint. They see mobile devices as unstable, perhaps encountering delays or signal loss [26]. According to the research conducted by Ruppel et al. in the United States, the use of contemporary technology may provide challenges for senior nurses. Nurses with extensive clinical knowledge and experience often exhibited higher ease in changing alarms, resulting in a reduced noise level throughout their tasks. This pertained to an enhanced understanding of physiological alterations, the identification of certain patient categories, and the capacity to anticipate various scenarios [28]. Research conducted in Ireland (Casey et al.) yielded further insights. The extensive experience and education of nurses had little influence on their understanding of alert fatigue prevention [27].

In 2013, the American Association of Critical-Care Nurses (AACN) issued recommendations for alert handling. One proposal was the implementation of induction and ongoing training [32]. The education of nurses and the execution of personalized nursing internships should play a crucial role in alarm management. This rapidly evolving technology requires training. Additional critical recommendations from the AACN include the proper preparation of the skin for daily electrode (ECG) exchanges, the replacement of pulse oximeter sensors as needed, monitoring exclusively those patients with clinical indications, and establishing a team accountable for the alarm system [6,32]. In 2018, the group released a new protocol grounded on research and established ways to address issues pertaining to alert management. Following these recommendations, Turmell et al. conducted research to evaluate the efficacy of techniques used at an American hospital. The quantity of clinical alerts decreased by 30%. Nursing professionals and monitoring technicians evaluated clinical alerts using the HTF questionnaire both before to and after the

implementation of the approach. Following the implementation of the management plan, 12% fewer staff believed that disruptive alarms happened too often. The responders exhibited increased awareness of alert management protocols and engaged in more frequent discussions about patient monitoring with their colleagues [33].

Assessing a patient's state is a fundamental responsibility of nursing staff. The findings of the quality studies indicate that nurses recognize this obligation and see themselves as accountable for the appropriate calibration of alarms. Regrettably, factors such as an excessive workload, inadequate nursing staff, apprehension stemming from prior adverse experiences, deficiencies in knowledge and skills, and a general lack of technological proficiency profoundly impact the proper configuration and management of alarms [26,27,28]. In 2017, Sown et al. conducted research that established a list of competencies related to the operation of monitors in an ICU and evaluated the abilities of nursing staff in this area. It has been shown that 3–40% of nurses said they were unfamiliar with 27 fundamental monitoring tasks and did not use them. The overall number of competencies included 54 basic and 5 advanced functions. The author asserts that consistent training ensures the safe and appropriate use of monitoring while mitigating alarm fatigue. Training must be thorough and include both fundamental and advanced functions [7].

The aforementioned literature analysis does not indicate the extent of alarm weariness but provides insight into the perception of alerts by nursing staff and their impact on daily patient care. Only the research conducted by Cho et al. developed a straightforward seven-element instrument tailored to the project's requirements, independent of the HTF questionnaire, to evaluate alarm fatigue. The data indicate that 69.4% of Korean nurses had moderate to severe levels of weariness. Nonetheless, the tool lacked perfect reliability [9]. A questionnaire was developed to evaluate alarm fatigue among nurses in an ICU in Iran. The instrument demonstrated validity and reliability on this occasion. Notwithstanding favorable outcomes, researchers emphasize the need for more investigations using a greater sample size. Alarm tiredness, posing a significant risk to both patients and nurses, necessitates investigation and evaluation, requiring a dependable instrument for this objective [34].

In summary of the studied research, it can be said that nurses encounter an excessive number of false alarms. Nurses are inundated by the implementation of new technologies and a feeling of responsibility for monitoring systems in the absence of help from medical personnel. Third, the extensive expertise of the nursing staff enables the identification of hazardous circumstances involving patients; yet it does not mitigate alarm-related weariness. It is essential to prioritize continuous training for nurses to enhance their expertise of alert handling in ICU settings.

7. Pragmatic Consequences

Efforts should be undertaken to establish uniform rules for alert handling across all ICU facilities globally. Given the diverse array of technology, each ICU must establish unit-specific protocols, including mandatory training for novice nurses or anyone entering the field. At every educational level concerning the ICU, training programs must include information on the advancement of new technologies, therefore aligning with the worldwide demands of ICU sectors and current market requirements. This is particularly applicable to the younger generation of nurses entering the field, who must remember that ICUs include not just alarms but also patients, and that the alarms should not divert their attention from the patients' issues.

The primary weakness of the research was its failure to identify the specific sort of weariness induced by the alerts. No clear literature exists documenting acute and persistent weariness linked to warnings from monitoring devices. A further drawback was the limited number of papers that satisfied the criteria, necessitating the inclusion of both quantitative and qualitative studies in the evaluation. A proficient research team attempted to organize the facts systematically. Matching an acceptable technique to evaluate the quality of the research included in the evaluation was hard owing to their variety. Further investigation on alarm fatigue is necessary. The preceding study indicated several deficiencies in this regard. Only international study conducted by experts globally will facilitate the formulation of recommendations grounded in scientific facts.

8. Conclusions

Alarms are necessary in critical care units. The rapid advancement of technology significantly increases their quantity, a trend that will surely continue in the future. Consequently, it is essential to implement appropriate alarm management solutions without delay. Nursing staff have overwhelming workloads due to an excessive number of responsibilities and a constant influx of clinical alerts. Nurses often fail to recognize the need for education on alarms, a critical component of any alert management plan. In the future, it is essential to evaluate the extent of alarm fatigue. This will enhance safety for both patients and nursing staff while validating the efficacy of implemented techniques.

References

1. Simpson, K.R.; Lyndon, A. False alarms and overmonitoring: Major factors in alarm fatigue among labor nurses. J. Nurs. Care Qual. 2019, 34, 66–72.
2. Purbaugh, T. Alarm fatigue: A roadmap for mitigating the cacophony of beeps. Dimens. Crit. Care Nurs. 2014, 33, 4–7.
3. Sowan, A.K.; Gomez, T.M.; Tarriela, A.F.; Reed, C.C.; Paper, B.M. Changes in Default Alarm Settings and Standard In-Service are Insufficient to Improve Alarm Fatigue in an Intensive Care Unit: A Pilot Project. JMIR Hum. Factors 2016, 3.
4. Keller, J.P. Clinical alarm hazards: A top ten health technology safety concern. J. Electrocardiol. 2012, 45, 588–591.
5. Bitan, Y.; Meyer, J.; Shinar, D.; Zmora, E. Nurses reactions to alarms in a neonatal intensive care unit. Cogn. Technol. Work 2004, 6, 239–246.
6. Lewis, C.L.; Oster, C.A. Research Outcomes of Implementing CEASE: An Innovative, Nurse-Driven, Evidence-Based, Patient-Customized Monitoring Bundle to Decrease Alarm Fatigue in the Intensive Care Unit/Step-down Unit. Dimens. Crit. Care Nurs. 2019, 38, 160–173.
7. Sowan, A.K.; Vera, A.G.; Fonseca, E.I.; Reed, C.C.; Tarriela, A.F.; Berndt, A.E. Nurse Competence on Physiologic Monitors Use: Toward Eliminating Alarm Fatigue in Intensive Care Units. Open Med. Inform. J. 2017, 11, 1–11.
8. ECRI. Institute Top 10 health Technology Hazards for 2020. Health Devices. 2020. Available online: https://elautoclave.files.wordpress.com/2019/10/ecri-top-10-technology-hazards-2020.
9. Cho, O.M.; Kim, H.; Lee, Y.W.; Cho, I. Clinical alarms in intensive care units: Perceived obstacles of alarm management and alarm fatigue in nurses. Healthc. Inform. Res. 2016, 22, 46–53.
10. Vitoux, R.R.; Schuster, C.; Glover, K.R. Perceptions of infusion pump alarms: Insights gained from critical care nurses. J. Infus. Nurs. 2018, 41, 309–318.
11. Petersen, E.M.; Costanzo, C.L. Assessment of Clinical Alarms Influencing Nurses' Perceptions of Alarm Fatigue. Dimens. Crit. Care Nurs. 2017, 36, 36–44.
12. Winwood, P.C.; Winefield, A.H.; Dawson, D.; Lushington, K. Development and validation of a scale to measure work-related fatigue and recovery: The Occupational Fatigue Exhaustion/Recovery scale (OFER). J. Occup. Environ. Med. 2005, 4, 594–606.
13. Sendelbach, S. Alarm Fatigue. Nurs. Clin. N. Am. 2012, 47, 375–382.
14. Wung, S.F.; Malone, D.C.; Szalacha, L. Sensory Overload and Technology in Critical Care. Crit. Care Nurs. Clin. N. Am. 2018, 30, 179–190.
15. Carayon, P.; Alvarado, C.J. Workload and Patient Safety Among Critical Care Nurses. Crit. Care Nurs. Clin. N. Am. 2007, 19, 121–129.
16. Padmakumar, A.D.; Bhasin, V.; Wenham, T.N.; Bodenham, A.R. Evaluation of noise levels in intensive care units in two large teaching hospitals—A prospective observational study. J. Intensive Care Soc. 2013, 14, 205–210.
17. Stansfeld, S.A.; Matheson, M.P. Noise pollution: Non-auditory effects on health. Br. Med. Bull. 2003, 68, 243–257.
18. Health UKD of Health Building Note 03-01. Adult Acute Mental Health Units. 2013; pp. 6–11. Available online:

https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/147864/HBN_03-01_Final.
19. Epp, K. Burnout in critical care nurses: A literature review. Dynamics 2012, 23, 25–31.
20. Ruskin, K.J.; Hueske-Kraus, D. Alarm fatigue: Impacts on patient safety. Curr. Opin. Anaesthesiol. 2015, 28, 685–690.
21. Schmid, F.; Goepfert, M.S.; Reuter, D.A. Patient monitoring alarms in the ICU and in the operating room. Crit. Care 2013.
22. The Joint Commission Sentinel Event Alert—Radiation Risks of Diagnostic Imaging. Available online: http://www.jointcommission.org/assets/1/18/SEA_25.
23. Drew, B.J.; Harris, P.; Zègre-Hemsey, J.K.; Mammone, T.; Schindler, D.; Salas-Boni, R.; Bai, Y.; Tinoco, A.; Ding, Q.; Hu, X. Insights into the problem of alarm fatigue with physiologic monitor devices: A comprehensive observational study of consecutive intensive care unit patients. PLoS ONE 2014, 9.
24. OCEBM Levels of Evidence Working Group; Durieux, N.; Pasleau, F.; Howick, J. The Oxford 2011 Levels of Evidence. 2011.
25. Christensen, M.; Dodds, A.; Sauer, J.; Watts, N. Alarm setting for the critically ill patient: A descriptive pilot survey of nurses' perceptions of current practice in an Australian Regional Critical Care Unit. Intensive Crit. Care Nurs. 2014, 30, 204–210.
26. Sowan, A.K.; Tarriela, A.F.; Gomez, T.M.; Reed, C.C.; Rapp, K.M. Nurses' Perceptions and Practices Toward Clinical Alarms in a Transplant Cardiac Intensive Care Unit: Exploring Key Issues Leading to Alarm Fatigue. JMIR Hum. Factors 2015, 2, e3.
27. Casey, S.; Avalos, G.; Dowling, M. Critical care nurses' knowledge of alarm fatigue and practices towards alarms: A multicentre study. Intensive Crit. Care Nurs. 2018, 48, 36–41.
28. Ruppel, H.; Funk, M.; Whittemore, R.; Wung, S.F.; Bonafide, C.P.; Powell Kennedy, H. Critical care nurses' clinical reasoning about physiologic monitor alarm customisation: An interpretive descriptive study. J. Clin. Nurs. 2019, 28, 3033–3041.
29. Poncette, A.S.; Spies, C.; Mosch, L.; Schieler, M.; Weber-Carstens, S.; Krampe, H.; Balzer, F. Clinical requirements of future patient monitoring in the intensive care unit: Qualitative study. J. Med. Internet Res. 2019, 7, e13064.
30. Funk, M.; Clark, J.T.; Bauld, T.J.; Ott, J.C.; Coss, P. Attitudes and practices related to clinical alarms. Am. J. Crit. Care 2014, 23, e9–e18.
31. Ruppel, H.; Funk, M.; Tobey Clark, J.; Gieras, I.; David, Y.; Bauld, T.J.; Coss, P.; Holland, M.L. Attitudes and practices related to clinical alarms: A follow-up survey. Am. J. Crit. Care 2018, 27, 114–123.
32. AACN Practice Alert. Alarm Management. Crit. Care Nurse 2013, 33, 83–86. [Google Scholar]
33. Turmell, J.W.; Coke, L.; Catinella, R.; Hosford, T.; Majeski, A. Alarm Fatigue: Use of an Evidence-Based Alarm Management Strategy. J. Nurs. Care Qual. 2017, 32, 47–54.
34. Torabizadeh, C.; Yousefinya, A.; Zand, F.; Rakhshan, M.; Fararooei, M. A nurses' alarm fatigue questionnaire: Development and psychometric properties. J. Clin. Monit. Comput. 2017, 31, 1305–1312.

الإرهاق الناتج عن التنبيهات في وحدات العناية المركزة: استراتيجيات لتعزيز سلامة المرضى وكفاءة التمريض من خلال ممارسات فعالة لإدارة التنبيهات

الملخص

الخلفية :يعد الإرهاق الناتج عن التنبيهات مشكلة شائعة في وحدات العناية المركزة، حيث يؤدي التدفق المستمر للتنبيهات الصوتية إلى حالة من التبلد الحسي بين طاقم التمريض. ومع كون 85-99% من التنبيهات كاذبة أو غير ذات صلة سريريًا، يشكل هذا الظاهرة خطرًا كبيرًا على سلامة المرضى وجودة الرعاية.

الطرق :تستعرض هذه المراجعة الأدبية الأبحاث الحالية حول الإرهاق الناتج عن التنبيهات بين ممرضات وحدات العناية المركزة، مع التركيز على الأسباب والعواقب واستراتيجيات الإدارة المرتبطة بالتنبيهات السريرية. تم إجراء تقييم منهجي للدراسات النوعية والكمية لتقييم تصورات وتجارب الممرضات بشأن أنظمة التنبيهات.

النتائج :أظهرت النتائج أن الإرهاق الناتج عن التنبيهات ينجم بشكل أساسي عن كثرة التنبيهات الكاذبة، إعدادات التنبيهات غير المناسبة، وأعباء العمل الكبيرة. أفاد حوالي 93% من الممرضات أن الإرهاق الناتج عن التنبيهات قد يؤدي إلى كتم أو تجاهل التنبيهات، مما يهدد سلامة المرضى. بالإضافة إلى ذلك، تم تحديد التدريب الفعال والبروتوكولات الموحدة كعوامل حاسمة لتخفيف الإرهاق الناتج عن التنبيهات وتحسين أوقات الاستجابة.

الاستنتاج :لتعزيز سلامة المرضى وجودة الرعاية في وحدات العناية المركزة، من الضروري تنفيذ استراتيجيات شاملة لإدارة التنبيهات. ينبغي أن تشمل هذه الاستراتيجيات إعدادات موحدة للتنبيهات، تعليم مستمر لطاقم التمريض، ودمج تقنيات متقدمة لتقليل التنبيهات الكاذبة. يعد التصدي للإرهاق الناتج عن التنبيهات أمرًا حيويًا لضمان الاستجابة المناسبة للتنبيهات الحرجة، مما يحسن في النهاية النتائج في رعاية التمريض الحاد.

الكلمات المفتاحية :الإرهاق الناتج عن التنبيهات، وحدات العناية المركزة، سلامة المرضى، أعباء العمل التمريضية، إدارة التنبيهات.