Peer Review
Aims

• **Improve** the quality of ABR testing

• **Standardise** the quality of Audiological electrophysiological assessment within the region

• Provide practical **support** to practitioners

• **Identify** areas of difficulty faced by practitioners in the region

• Enable **reporting** to national and local bodies responsible for QA that diagnostic methods are carried out to a sufficiently high standard.
Benefits

• Reduction of interpretation errors
• Reduction of management errors
• Reviewing improves own clinical practice
• Provides support for challenging cases
• Fosters confidence in a good service
• Gives parents greater confidence in the service
Benefits

• Benefit has been verified
  – “Identify adverse events”  (Forster et al 2011)
  – “Sharpens event analysis”  (Hitchings et al 2008)
  – “Significant improvement in clinical ABR practice”  (NHSP 2011)
Potential Risks

• If too small a group, quality potentially limited

• Data security

• Clarification limits of reviewers' responsibilities

• Impact on working relationships
Model Considerations

- Transparency / Anonymity
- Internal / External
- Explicit / implicit training
- Time investment
- Patient Inclusion Criteria
- Reviewer Criteria
- Test Criteria
- Format Criteria
- Feedback Criteria
Documentation

• Evidence of Waveforms selection
• Waveforms sent
• Review Outcomes
• Information Governance Documentation
• Local Audit Registration
Process Audit

• Regular meetings of all sites involved to identify issues arising

• Evaluation of:
  – speed of turnaround
  – accuracy of reviews
  – impact on patient management
### ABR Peer Review

#### Relevant Sites

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Review number</th>
<th>AB123456</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test Stimulus</th>
<th>Original Threshold (dBHL)</th>
<th>Reviewer Threshold (dBHL)</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AC L 1kHz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AC R 1kHz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AC L 2kHz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AC R 2kHz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AC L 4kHz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AC R 4kHz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BC L 1kHz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BC R 1kHz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Outcome of Review

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of improvement indicators in each category</td>
<td>Parameters</td>
<td>Recording Quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvement</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvement</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvement</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvement</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvement</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvement</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvement</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvement</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Outcome measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Pass Rate</th>
<th>% Pass Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parameters</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recording</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Channels</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Channels</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Channels</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Channels</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Template**

Date of Test: 01/02/2021

**Test Stimulus:**

**AC L 1kHz**

**Original Threshold:**

**Reviewer Threshold:**

**Comments:**

- [Template](#)
Existing models

- Tea-and-biscuits model
  - Periodic meet up
  - Good for support and collaboration
  - Too slow for individual case management

- BSA model
  - Systematic send and receive
  - Training and moderation
Practice Guidance

Principles of external peer review of auditory brainstem response (ABR) testing in babies

Date: September 2019
Due for review: September 2022
BSA Recommendations

• People:
  • Rotating chair
  • Reviewers
    • Rotating
    • Practicing
    • Enough to cover sickness / leave
  • External moderation
BSA Recommendations

- Quick turnaround time <7 days
- Regular meetings between reviewers
- Process for mediation
- Annual report
- Anonymisation – with caveats
- Clarity of accountability
- Governance
  - Information governance
  - Clinical governance