

Literature review-references of iCount and of retained surgical swabs -impact, incidence, review articles and case reports (reviewed May2025)

Literature about iCount as a Solution:

1. Elgharably AN, Desai K, Nevill AM, et al. BMJ Innovation 2024; doi:10.1136/bmjinnov-2024-001248

WHAT ARE THE NEW FINDINGS

- ⇒ Despite established policies and procedures when swab counting, issues such as distraction, confirmation bias, competing task priorities and changes in swab appearance contribute to swab miscounts and therefore swab retention.
- ⇒ Cases of count discrepancies/miscounts are under-reported, and their impact extends to patient's health, clinician's time and trust's reputation and finances.
- ⇒ iCount is a low-cost device designed and developed with human factors-ergonomics principles. It is a docking system that behaves as a physical checklist when swab counting and facilitates conscious engagement using visual and tactile cues when counting.
- ⇒ Users believe iCount to be a viable alternative to manual two-person swab counting with greater time efficiency and perceived safety. This could be valuable in emergency maternity situations.

HOW MIGHT IT IMPACT ON HEALTHCARE IN THE FUTURE

- ⇒ iCount has the potential to reduce or prevent retained swabs after vaginal deliveries along with appropriate policies, training and teamwork.
 - ⇒ Additional clinical research and widespread adoption would be needed to validate this effectively.
-

2. Contemporary Ergonomics and Human Factors 2024. Chartered Institute Ergonomics Human Factors. Prize winning abstract presented at CIEHF World Congress held in UK

A vision to ‘Design out’ accidentally retained surgical items in vaginal childbirth

Ahmed ElGharably¹, Kiran Desai², Aaron Vance³, Jon Lester⁴, Emma Bonfiglio⁵, Colin Rigby⁶, Andrew Forrester⁷, Prof Peter Ogrodnik⁸, Jeffrey Faint⁹, Prof Tom Clutton-Brock¹⁰, Aditi Desai¹¹

¹ The Royal Wolverhampton NHS Trust, ²Eureka Inventions Ltd, ³University of Wolverhampton, ⁴University of Wolverhampton, ⁵Keele University, ⁶Keele University, ⁷Manufacturing Technology Centre, ⁸Keele University, ⁹NIHR Trauma Management MedTech Co-operative MD-Tec (Medical Devices Testing and Evaluation Centre), ¹⁰NIHR Trauma Management MedTech Co-operative MD-Tec (Medical Devices Testing and Evaluation Centre), ¹¹The Royal Wolverhampton NHS Trust

Retained vaginal swabs are a well-recognised and recurrent patient safety ‘never event’ with the potential to cause significant morbidity. Surgical swabs and surgical tampons, which are considered a type of surgical swab, are the single largest retained item. There have been 340 incidents of retained vaginal swabs reported in England (2012-2022) and underreporting of these incidents is known. The current practice of manual counting is prone to human error and demonstrates a lack of efficacy in dealing with this issue. A simple, cost-effective device was developed collaboratively based on human factors/ ergonomics principles. This is designed to help users focus on the largest problem space, functioning as a physical checklist and memory aid for accurate counting. The team adopted a systems thinking approach to develop the innovation, progressing through steps such as hierarchical task analysis and human factors systems analysis through the SEIPS framework, AcciMap, barrier analysis and user-centred iterative design. The near-manufacture prototype was user-tested in simulation, and results indicate that the device has the potential to facilitate accurate counts in a time-efficient manner. We acknowledge that there will be a need for training, and culture change for the adoption of design solutions in the current workflow. It is known that around

Discussion

The overarching aim of the human factors and ergonomics discipline is to enable us to adopt a design-driven systems approach to achieve performance and well-being. Retained vaginal swabs are a recurrent ‘never event’ that leaves women at risk of harm after childbirth. The team has applied these principles to redesign the task and tools to address this. The simulation testing and user testing of the near-final version show staff time saved and encouraging results regarding user confidence.

We acknowledge that there will be a need for training, and culture change for the adoption of design solutions in the current workflow. Initially, it may be practical to introduce only the device, which acts as a physical checklist and increases system resilience. We will be working with electronic medical records providers to move towards a strong systemic barrier with the aim of preventing this problem. This will need some additional resources if we wish to move towards safer care. The introduction of design solutions to work procedures will hopefully encourage other clinicians to work collaboratively on other problems, which are pressing needs within maternity and wider healthcare.

3. RCOG World Congress 2021 - Prevention of retention of vaginal swabs and tampons with novel device system. Desai A, Ogrodnik, Desai K, Mapunde V Top scoring abstract and Sir William Gilliatt prize

163

Prevention of retention of vaginal swabs and tampons with novel device system **Desai, A¹; Ogrodnik, P²; Desai, K³; Mapunde, V⁴**

¹The Royal Wolverhampton NHS Trust, Wolverhampton, UK; ²Biomedical Engineering, Keele University, Newcastle under Lyme, UK; ³Eureka Inventions Ltd., Newcastle under Lyme, UK; ⁴NIHR Surgical MedTech Co-operative, Leeds, UK

Objective Vaginal swabs, tampons are the single most common cause of retained objects reported annually and are currently classed as 'Never events'. They can cause significant morbidity - serious physical-psychological, infection, secondary PPH, sepsis, depression, lack of bonding, and trust loss. Although Never events are uncommon and may not always cause severe harm, they are 'red flags' indicating need for system solutions. As per hazard control hierarchy principles, a *human factors engineered solution* is more effective than just modifying human behaviour (standardised policies, checklists, training) where design solutions and behaviours complement each other, preventing human error.

Design Findings from formative *usability study* done in high-fidelity simulation look at user experience, safety and acceptability; also presenting the crucial role of *patient public involvement* (PPI) in development.

Methods Device description - iCount is a failsafe swab docking system ensuring swabs/surgical tampons are accounted for and removed accurately. There are visual and haptic cues making the process robust. The device has been ergonomically designed in a user-centred manner; developed collaboratively by midwives, nurses, doctors, Keele Biomedical Engineering. York Health Economic Consortium did a detailed formal cost-benefit analysis showing that each device used could save more than £100 of NHS costs per patient due to high litigation, management and morbidity costs (Ref-NHS Resolution). Proof of concept usability – Experienced diverse clinicians participated (NIHR Medtech, University hospitals, Birmingham). User session lasted 40 min involving audio-video content, hands-on in high-fidelity simulation, semi-structured interviews, and written survey feedback. Detailed structured large group PPI was done by NIHR Surgical MIC, Leeds.

Results Usability study: Users had positive attitude, supported the concept (simple, intuitive) and made some valuable design recommendations based on experience. The mechanical device is external to patient and poses no risk to user or patient as observed in simulation. The usability and PPI feedback suggested accommodating for red-green colour-blindness and improving some features, respectively.

The PPI was well organised and gave valuable insight into patient, healthcare users perspective. This valuable feedback led to further prototype iterations and pilot clinical study planning.

Conclusion The users and PPI group deeply cared about patient safety and proposed solution. They found the solution positive and acceptable. Further evaluation is required to establish reliability of the system and integrate it into clinical workflow. The aim is to have a 'human factors engineered system' with Safety II principles where a design solution and user behaviours complement, preventing error, adding system resilience. PPI also suggested engaging with NIHR Patient Safety Translational Unit.

4. Publication – Trends Gynecological Oncology - prevention of accidental retention of vaginal swabs and tampons with the novel design solution



Prevention of accidental retention of vaginal swabs and tampons during childbirth using a novel 'design' solution within a 'human factors systems approach' towards patient safety

Aditi Desai

University of Keele, UK



Abstract

Introduction: In UK, retained swabs after vaginal birth and perineal suturing are classed as “Never events.” Retained vaginal swabs have accounted for around 30% of retained foreign object -‘never events’ reported on an annual basis for a number of years. Retained vaginal swab post-delivery could cause significant morbidity and patient may experience serious physical and psychological complications, including infection, secondary post-partum haemorrhage, sepsis, depression, lack of bonding with their baby and loss of trust in the healthcare system. As yet, the interventions developed to prevent this problem have focussed towards changing human behaviour. As per hazard control hierarchy, a ‘human factors’ engineered solution is more likely to be effective than just modifying human behaviour⁴. We present a ‘human factors engineered system’ where a design solution and human behaviours complement each other, to prevent human error.

Aim of the project: To prevent the accidental retention of vaginal swab with a simple device so as to ‘design out’ the human error. We present findings from a formative usability study done in a high fidelity simulation environment, which looked at the user experience, safety and acceptability of the novel device system.

Description of the device: The device has a seatbelt plug in system where by each swab tail has a plastic clip at the end which plugs into the device displaying a green indicator when all are plugged in and a red indicator when one or more are disconnected. The aim is to ensure that all swabs are returned and not retained in the patient. Its major benefit is its simplicity and cost effectiveness.

Methods: Seven healthcare professionals who work in that particular clinical area participated in the usability study done by NIHR Medtech, University hospitals, Birmingham. Each user session lasted for approximately 40 minutes and it involved audio video content, hands-on session using the device

in a high fidelity theatre simulation set up and feedback in the form of a semistructured interview

Usability study findings: All the participants have a positive attitude towards the device being supportive of the concept but made some valuable design recommendations based on their clinical practice and personal preferences. The device is external to the patient and is mechanical and therefore poses no risk to the user or the patient as observed in the simulated environment. The feedback suggested improving the design of the clips in order to make them finer and to make the device compact and easy to handle. This valuable feedback led to further prototype iterations in the device development journey. A simulation study and a pilot study in childbirth clinical environment is being planned to develop further understanding.

Conclusion: The users found the design solution acceptable and felt positive about the concept. Further evaluation studies are required to establish the reliability of the system in preventing the accidental retention. Further evaluation studies should be planned to establish the reliability of the system in preventing accidental retention and to design a ‘human factors engineered system’ where a design solution and human behaviours complement each other, to prevent human error.



Biography:

Literature about the problem and implications

The references have been broadly classified into categories depending on the issues they highlight

References to overall importance of the problem to health and wellbeing of the public and patients and health and care services

National reports

HSIB-Detection of retained vaginal swabs and tampons following childbirth.

Healthcare Safety Investigation I2018/025 December 2019 Edition. Healthcare Safety Investigation Branch

CQC-Opening the door to change. NHS Safety Culture and the need for transformation Dec 2018. Care Quality Commission.

Surgical Never Events (2018). NHS Improvement. Learning from 38 cases occurring in English hospitals between 2016 and 2017 .

US Joint Commission report: Preventing unintended retained foreign objects

https://www.jointcommission.org/assets/1/18/retained_foreign_objects_faqs.pdf (Accessed on May 29, 2019)

UK NHS National Patient Safety Agency. Rapid response report NPSA/2020/RRR012.Reducing the risk of retained swabs after childbirth and perineal suturing.

The Australian Commission on Safety and Quality in Health Care (the Commission)- Sentinel events list- retained swabs

The New Zealand Health Quality and Safety Commission, New Zealand. Retained vaginal swabs following childbirths- problem and prevention strategies. Dec 2015.

US Institute for Clinical Systems Improvement. Health care protocol: prevention of unintentionally retained foreign objects during vaginal deliveries . 3rd ed.Bloomington (MN): ICSI; 2009. Available at:. Retrieved April 30, 2010.

Spotlight on patient safety. Minnesota department of Health. Focus on retained foreign objects- vaginal sponges which contributes significantly to.... www.health.state.mn.us/patientsafety and similar reports from each US state.

NHS Long term plan - NHS Improvement Jan 2019.

Link related to maternity as one of the priorities and patient safety within the report

US Navy Navmed Policy 09-007. Call for robust policy to prevent cases of sponge retention after vaginal delivery. May 2009.

Review Articles and case reports

The recurring problem of retained swabs and instruments. Best practice and research clinical Obstetrics and Gynaecology. 2013. Montasser A.Mahran, Eman Toeima, E.P.Morris

Never Events – the ongoing problem of the retained vaginal sponge/swab. BJOG perspectives. British Journal of Obstetrics and Gynaecology. 2016.Helen Bolton. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1471-0528.14041>

Retained Surgical Foreign Bodies: A Comprehensive Review of Risks and Preventive Strategies.2009. S. P. Stawicki, D. C. Evans, J. Cipolla et al. Scandinavian Journal of Surgery. <https://doi.org/10.1177/145749690909800103>

Improving safety in the operating room: a systematic literature review of retained surgical sponges. 2009. Wan, Wenshuaia; Le, Thuanb; Riskin, Lorenc; Macario,

Current Opinion in Anaesthesiology: 2009 doi: 10.1097/ACO.0b013e328324f82d. Copeland A, Cochran A, Collins K. Retained surgical sponge (gossypiboma) and other retained surgical items: Prevention and management.

Up To Date- Evidence based Clinical Decision Support.

[https://www.uptodate.com/content/Retained-surgical-sponge-\(gossypiboma\)-and-other-retained-surgical-items:-Prevention-and-management](https://www.uptodate.com/content/Retained-surgical-sponge-(gossypiboma)-and-other-retained-surgical-items:-Prevention-and-management)

Bell R. Hide and seek, the search for a missing swab: a critical analysis. J Perioper Pract. 2012 May;22(5):151-6. doi: 10.1177/175045891202200503. PMID: 22720504.

Patial T, Thakur V, Vijhay Ganesun N, Sharma M. Gossypibomas in India - A systematic literature review. J Postgrad Med. 2017 Jan-Mar;63(1):36-41. doi: 10.4103/0022-3859.198153. PMID: 28079043; PMCID: PMC5394815.

Feldman DL. Prevention of retained surgical items. Mt Sinai J Med. 2011 Nov-Dec;78(6):865-71. doi: 10.1002/msj.20299. PMID: 22069210.

Porteous J. Surgical counts can be risky business! Can Oper Room Nurs J. 2004 Dec;22(4):6-8, 10, 12. PMID: 15709630.

Tumer AR, Yasti AC. Medical and legal evaluations of the retained foreign bodies in Turkey. Leg Med (Tokyo). 2005 Oct;7(5):311-3. doi: 10.1016/j.legalmed.2005.04.004. PMID: 16043376.

Schelhaas E, Mastboom WJ. Een achtergebleven gaas als oorzaak voor onbegrepen buikklasten [A retained gauze as a cause of unexplained abdominal complaints]. Ned Tijdschr Geneesk. 2002 Feb 9;146(6):241-5. Dutch. PMID: 11865650.

Lacombe C, d'alincourt A, Lerat F, Goura à Mougnot E. Quid? [What is it? Abdominal foreign body and small intestine fistula]. J Radiol. 2000 Jun;81(6):641-2. French. PMID: 10844344.

Haleem S, Mahmoud MH, Kainth GS, Botchu R, Hassan MF, Rehousek P. A perioperative overview of a retained surgical swab in spinal surgery: Case report and prevention protocol. Journal of Perioperative Practice. 2024;34(4):101-105. doi:10.1177/17504589231163685

References to surgical swabs/sponges are commonest items left behind

- Gawande AA, Studdert DM, Orav EJ et al. Risk factors for retained instruments and sponges after surgery. N Engl J Med 2003; 348: 229–235.
- Cima RR, Kollengode A, Garnatz J et al. Incidence and characteristics of potential and actual retained foreign object events in surgical patients. J Am Coll Surg 2008; 207: 80–87.
- Lincourt AE, Harrell A, Cristiano J et al. Retained foreign bodies after surgery. J Surg Res 2007; 138: 170–174.
- Gibbs VC, Coakley FD, Reines HD. Preventable errors in the operating room: retained foreign bodies after surgery – Part I. Curr Probl Surg 2007; 44: 281–337.
- D Hariharan and DN Lobo. Retained surgical sponges, needles and instruments. Ann R College of Surgery England.2015;95(2) 87-92.

Implications of retained swabs

Retained surgical items have 70% re-interventions, reaching 80% morbidity and 35% mortality.

90% of retained items were textiles (swabs/sponges)

Biolini DV, Rasslan S, Utiyama EM. Unintentionally retained foreign bodies after surgical procedures. Analysis of 4547 cases. Rev Col Bras Cir 2016; 43: 12–17. 2016/04/21. DOI: 10.1590/0100-69912016001004.

References to total number of surgeries in UK

T. E. F. Abbott, A. J. Fowler, T. D. Dobbs, E. M. Harrison, M. A. Gillies, R. M. Pearse, Frequency of surgical treatment and related hospital procedures in the UK: a national ecological study using hospital episode statistics, BJA: British Journal of Anaesthesia, Volume 119, Issue 2, August 2017, Pages 249–257,

References to Litigation burden and costs

Links to copy paste in browser:

https://e1cf0d39-bf70-4edc-8252-971a0e7482f8.filesusr.com/ugd/d0e9ff_8fb55c2f8378423aaef11e5db0efbb5f.pdf

https://e1cf0d39-bf70-4edc-8252-971a0e7482f8.filesusr.com/ugd/d0e9ff_422b566e3d3645e598e8b83049e84d2b.pdf

In the US the average cost incurred from litigation in these cases is estimated to be more than \$50,000

Ref

Gawande AA, Studdert DM, Orav EJ, Brennan TA, Zinner MJ. Risk factors for retained instruments and sponges after surgery. N Engl J Med. 2003 Jan 16;348(3):229-35. doi: 10.1056/NEJMsa021721. PMID: 12529464.

Kaiser CW, Friedman S, Spurling KP, Slowick T, Kaiser HA. The retained surgical sponge. *Ann Surg.* 1996 Jul;224(1):79-84. doi: 10.1097/0000658-199607000-00012. PMID: 8678622; PMCID: PMC1235250.

Increased length of stay and mortality (AHRQ- association of healthcare research and quality data)

According to the report issued by association of healthcare research and quality, the discovery of a retained foreign body added four days to the average hospital stay and 57 patients died because of this type of error.

Zhan C, Miller MR. Excess length of stay, charges, and mortality attributable to medical injuries during hospitalization. *JAMA.* 2003 Oct 8;290(14):1868-74. doi: 10.1001/jama.290.14.1868. PMID: 14532315.

Other Review Articles, case reports, Systematic reviews

Tabibzadeh, M., & Kumari, N. (2024). Retained surgical sponges: Systematic root cause analysis of 652 reported cases using data analytics. *Proceedings of the International Symposium on Human Factors and Ergonomics in Health Care*, 13(1), 123–129. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2327857924131077>

Sirihorachai R, Saylor KM, Manojlovich M. Interventions for the Prevention of Retained Surgical Items: A Systematic Review. *World J Surg.* 2022 Feb;46(2):370-381. doi: 10.1007/s00268-021-06370-3. Epub 2021 Nov 12. PMID: 34773133; PMCID: PMC10186264.

Retained surgical sponges, needles and instruments. D Hariharan et al. 2013.

<https://doi.org/10.1308/003588413X13511609957218>-- A surgical sponge is the most commonly reported retained item following surgery, while reports of retained needles and instruments are extremely rare.

Wrong-Site Surgery, Retained Surgical Items, and Surgical Fires. A Systematic Review of Surgical Never Events. Susanne Hempel, PhD; Melinda Maggard-Gibbons, MD; David K. Nguyen, MD; Aaron J. Dawes, MD; Isomi Miake-Lye, BA; Jessica M. Beroes, BS; Marika J. Booth, MS; Jeremy N. V. Miles, PhD; Roberta Shanman, MLS; Paul G. Shekelle, MD, PhD. *JAMA Surg.* 2015;150(8):796-805. doi:10.1001/jamasurg.2015.0301

Global state of patient safety report by the Institute of Healthcare Improvement and Imperial College 2023. Retained surgical items are one of the important metrics featured in International patient safety reports

Siddharth S Adyanthaya, Vishal Patil, Never events: an anaesthetic perspective, *Continuing Education in Anaesthesia Critical Care & Pain*, Volume 14, Issue 5, October 2014, Pages 197–201, The transfusion of ABO incompatible blood groups has become a rarity particularly since the introduction of the Portable Blood Audit Release System. The barcode scanning system for patient identification and blood transfusion is a good example of the use of technology to prevent never events.

Investigation report: Retained swabs following invasive procedures. Health Services Safety investigation body, UK. 2024. <https://www.hssib.org.uk/patient-safety-investigations/retained-surgical-swabs/investigation-report/> --Describes the problem and value of adjunct technology to risk mitigate human error

Current practices for counting medical sponges have a 10% to 15% error rate

Joint Commission. Preventing unintended retained foreign objects. . Published October 17, 2013.

Research grant funded by the Health Research Board of Ireland Research Collaborative in Quality and Patient Safety

Competitive costs to other technological adjunct solutions

--Explains the costs of available adjunct technologies such as barcoded swabs and RFID enabled swabs.

Representative costs of these technologies are:

Bar-coded - \$10.60/ patient in 2009, now \$32.10 (company info)

RFID enabled - \$75.39/patient in 2009, now \$112 (company info). Hence these have only adopted in a total of 18% hospitals in the US and have not been adopted anywhere else in the world despite being on the market since 2007.

These technologies cost far higher than iCount, which will only cost a maximum of £9/patient

USA

-Gossypiboma: an asymptomatic presentation ten years post gynecologic surgery Neil Patel MD,² Sibel Dikmen, MS,² Sandeep Sirsi MD FACS,¹ Armand Asarian MD FACS,¹ Dmitry Youskho MD, FACOG² Department of General Surgery, The Brooklyn Hospital Center, USA

²Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology, The Brooklyn Hospital Center, USA Correspondence: Dmitry Youskho, MD, FACOG. The Brooklyn Hospital Center. 121 Dekalb Ave, Brooklyn, NY, 11201, USA, Tel 718-250-7494 Received: July 05, 2022 | Published: July 19, 2022

-Journal of Cardiothoracic Surgery, volume 14, issue 1, publication number 69 Intrapericardial gossypiboma found 14 years after coronary artery bypass grafting. Fatmir Caushi¹ Lindita Coku² Ilir Skenduli¹ Daniela Xhemalaj¹, Department of Cardio-Thoracic Surgery, Mount Sinai Hospital, New York, USA |

-Gossypiboma manifesting as urachal mass. Department of Urology, University of Texas Southwestern Medical Center, Dallas, TX

Unintended retention of foreign bodies remain the most frequently reported sentinel events. Surgical sponges account for the majority of these retained items. The purpose of this study was to describe reports. Authors: Victoria M. Steelman, Clarissa Shaw, Laurel Shine and Abbey J. Hardy-Fairbanks. Citation: Patient Safety in Surgery 2018 12:20

Gossypiboma Resection after Eight Years in a Patient with Rheumatoid Arthritis and Diabetes Unruh, Kenley; Hsieh, Hsien Sing Sam. Case Reports in Surgery; New York Vol. 2017, (2017). DOI:10.1155/2017/3239093

Routine Blood loss measurement is important to treat PPH adequately. article which presents good evidence that measurement of blood loss during birth is recommended:

Gallos I, Devall A, Martin J, Middleton L, Beeson L, Galadanci H, et al. Randomized trial of early detection and treatment of postpartum hemorrhage. N Engl J Med. 2023; 389(1): 11–21.

Ingela Wiklund, Soledad Alarcón Fernández, Markus Jonsson, Midwives' ability during third stage of childbirth to estimate postpartum haemorrhage, European Journal of Obstetrics & Gynecology and Reproductive Biology: X, Volume 15, 2022, 100158, ISSN 2590-1613

References to overall incidence and in emergency operations and surgery in children, reports from different countries and different surgeries

Teixeira PG, Inaba K, Salim A, Brown C, Rhee P, Browder T, Belzberg H, Demetriades D

Retained foreign bodies after emergent trauma surgery: incidence after 2526 cavitary explorations. *Am Surg.* 2007;73(10):1031.

Pubmed MID: 17983075

Birolini DV, Rasslan S, Utiyama EM. Unintentionally retained foreign bodies after surgical procedures. Analysis of 4547 cases. *Rev Col Bras Cir.* 2016 Feb;43(1):12-7. English, Portuguese. doi: 10.1590/0100-69912016001004. PMID: 27096851.

Yildirim T, Parlakgumus A, Yildirim S. Diagnosis and management of retained foreign objects. *Journal College Physicians Surgeons Pak.* 2015 May;25(5):367-71. PMID: 26008665.

Camp M, Chang DC, Zhang Y, Chrouser K, Colombani PM, Abdullah F. Risk factors and outcomes for foreign body left during a procedure: analysis of 413 incidents after 1 946 831 operations in children. *Arch Surg.* 2010;145(11):1085.

Corrigan S, Kay A, O'Byrne K, Slattery D, Sheehan S, McDonald N, Smyth D, Mealy K, Cromie S. A Socio-Technical Exploration for Reducing & Mitigating the Risk of Retained Foreign Objects. *Int J Environ Res Public Health.* 2018 Apr 10;15(4):714. doi: 10.3390/ijerph15040714. PMID: 29642646; PMCID: PMC5923756. Research grant funded by the Health Research Board of Ireland Research Collaborative in never events

Murdock D. Trauma: when there's no time to count. *AORN J.* 2008 Feb;87(2):322-8. doi: 10.1016/j.aorn.2007.07.008. PMID: 18323023.

Reference about underreporting –

Terkimbi UB, Joseph IT, Barnabas E. Retained Post-Operative Foreign Body of Gynaecologic Origin at Ascending Colon, *Gynecol Obstet Case Rep.* 2016, 2:2. doi:10.21767/2471-8165.1000028

Reporting of Adverse Events in Published and Unpublished Studies of Health Care Interventions: A Systematic Review Su Golder^{1*}, Yoon K. Loke², Kath Wright³, Gill Norman⁴

Reference about underreporting in developing world

Birolini DV, Rasslan S, Utiyama EM. Unintentionally retained foreign bodies after surgical procedures. Analysis of 4547 cases. *Rev Col Bras Cir.* 2016 Feb;43(1):12-7. English, Portuguese. doi: 10.1590/0100-69912016001004. PMID: 27096851

Iftikhar, T., Sultana, N., Shah, S.A. Gossypiboma: An underreported surgical mishap 2017/10/01. *Rawal Medical Journal*

References to human error in counting, count discrepancies and risk of retained object when there is a count discrepancy

Greenberg et al study- At least one count discrepancy occurred in 12.8% of 148 operations (approximately one in eight operations); 41% of the discrepancies were due to process errors, including miscounts mathematical errors or documentation problems and 59% due to a misplaced surgical item.

Greenberg CC, Regenbogen SE, Lipsitz SR, Diaz-Flores R, Gawande AA. The frequency and significance of discrepancies in the surgical count. *Ann Surg*. 2008 Aug;248(2):337-41. doi: 10.1097/SLA.0b013e318181c9a3. PMID: 18650646.

Christian CK et al study-In a study that detailed activities doing ten complex general surgery cases and academic hospital accounting was that was in direct competition with the primary patient centred activities and average of 35 minutes per case was dedicated to counting representing 14.5% of nursing time during the operation. In spite of the time involved 17 count discrepancies were observed, 11 which disrupted activities of the surgical team. The observational team identified two events labelled as 'safety compromising' that occurred when attempt will be made to reconcile an inconsistent count.

Christian CK, Gustafson ML, Roth EM, Sheridan TB, Gandhi TK, Dwyer K, Zinner MJ, Dierks MM. A prospective study of patient safety in the operating room. *Surgery*. 2006 Feb;139(2):159-73. doi: 10.1016/j.surg.2005.07.037. PMID: 16455323.

Gawande AA, Studdert DM study and Greenberg CC, Gawande AA. The odds of a retained foreign body are increased 100-fold if there is a discrepancy between the initial and final count.

Gawande AA, Studdert DM, Orav EJ, Brennan TA, Zinner MJ. Risk factors for retained instruments and sponges after surgery. *N Engl J Med*. 2003;348(3):229.

Greenberg CC, Gawande AA. Beyond counting: current evidence on the problem of retaining foreign bodies in surgery? *Ann Surg*. 2008 Jan;247(1):19-20. doi: 10.1097/SLA.0b013e318160c194. PMID: 18156917.

Steelman, Schaapveld et al study- The cost of reconciling incorrect- unresolved swab counts is considerable. Peri-operative personnel required from one to 90 minutes of additional time to reconcile each of 212 incorrect/unresolved counts. Using an estimate of \$62 per minute of operating room time, one study estimated that the total annualised cost of operating room time spent searching for sponges and ruling out the presence of potentially retained sponges at a busy level 1 trauma centre hospital at \$219,056

Steelman VM, Schaapveld AG, Perkhounkova Y, Storm HE, Mathias M. The Hidden Costs of Reconciling Surgical Sponge Counts. *AORN J*. 2015 Nov;102(5):498-506. doi: 10.1016/j.aorn.2015.09.002. PMID: 26514707.

Sensitivity, specificity, positive predictive value of counting

Egorova NN, Moskowitz et al. Managing the prevention of routine surgical instruments; what is the value in counting? *Ann Surg* 2008; 247:13 -18. Sensitivity of counts process is 77% and the positive predictive value is 1.6%. 88% of retained foreign bodies were associated with a correct count.

According to the Gawande et al report a positive likelihood ratio of 113, meaning that's the odds of retained for are increased 100 times if there is a persistent discrepancy

Count practice variability and unreliability of manual count

Edel EM. Surgical count practice variability and the potential for retained surgical items. *AORN J*. 2012 Feb;95(2):228-38. doi: 10.1016/j.aorn.2011.02.014. PMID: 22283914. Assessment of the policies and practices indicated that clinical practice requirements in the policies varied greatly, and there was a high degree of count practice variability among staff members.

The Frequency and Significance of Discrepancies in the Surgical Count. Greenberg, Caprice C. MD, MPH*†; Regenbogen, Scott E. MD†‡; Lipsitz, Stuart R. ScD*; Diaz-Flores, Rafael MD, MPH*†; Gawande, Atul A. MD, MPH*† Swab Count discrepancies can happen in upto 12 % procedures

Moffatt-Bruce SD, Cook CH, Steinberg SM, Stawicki SP. Risk factors for retained surgical items: a meta-analysis and proposed risk stratification system. *J Surg Res.* 2014 Aug;190(2):429-36. doi: 10.1016/j.jss.2014.05.044. Epub 2014 May 23. PMID: 24953990.

D Hariharan and DN Lobo. Retained surgical sponges, needles and instruments. Counting is time intensive occupying up to 14% of operative time. *Ann R College of Surgery England.* 2015;95(2) 87-92.

Regenbogen SE, Greenberg CC, Resch SC, Kollengode A, Cima RR, Zinner MJ, Gawande AA. Prevention of retained surgical sponges: a decision-analytic model predicting relative cost-effectiveness. *Surgery.* 2009 May;145(5):527-35. doi: 10.1016/j.surg.2009.01.011. Epub 2009 Mar 21. PMID: 19375612; PMCID: PMC2725304.

Christian CK, Gustafson ML, Roth EM, Sheridan TB, Gandhi TK, Dwyer K, Zinner MJ, Dierks MM. A prospective study of patient safety in the operating room. *Surgery.* 2006 Feb;139(2):159-73. doi: 10.1016/j.surg.2005.07.037. PMID: 16455323.

References to imaging done in cases of retained items

Mathew RP, Thomas B, Basti RS, Suresh HB. Gossypibomas, a surgeon's nightmare-patient demographics, risk factors, imaging and how we can prevent it. *Br J Radiol.* 2017 Feb;90(1070):20160761. doi: 10.1259/bjr.20160761. Epub 2017 Jan 3. PMID: 27885854; PMCID: PMC5685123.

Radiology challenges in diagnosis:

Imoto, S., Shinjo, E., Aoyama, K., & Takenaka, I. (2018). A case of failure to detect lost surgical sponges with intraoperative radiography: A pitfalls in detecting retained sponges. *Japanese Journal of Anesthesiology*, 67(8), 844–846.

Cases where retained swab led to misdiagnosis

Boghratian AH, Al-Tae AM. Gossypiboma Masquerading as Small Bowel Malignancy. *Middle East J Dig Dis.* 2020 Apr;12(2):123-125. doi: 10.34172/mejdd.2020.172. PMID: 32626566; PMCID: PMC7320991.

Atay M, Ahmad IC, Bilgin M, Kocakoc E. Gossypiboma/textiloma mimicking as tumour recurrence. *J Pak Med Assoc.* 2014 Jun;64(6):708-10. PMID: 25252498.

Maynard J, Shah N, Groom K, Khan S. Gossypiboma: a hidden passenger. *BMJ Case Rep.* 2015 Aug 25;2015:bcr2015212229. doi: 10.1136/bcr-2015-212229. PMID: 26307651; PMCID: PMC4550857.

Kim TH, Lee HH. Gossypiboma misdiagnosed as uterine subserosal myoma. *J Minim Invasive Gynecol.* 2015 May-Jun;22(4):534. doi: 10.1016/j.jmig.2014.11.004. Epub 2014 Nov 11. PMID: 25460523.

Szymocha M, Pacan M, Anufrowicz M, Jurek T, Rorat M. Leaving a foreign object in the body of a patient during abdominal surgery: still a current problem. *Pol Przegl Chir.* 2019 May 15;91(6):35-40. doi: 10.5604/01.3001.0013.2024. PMID: 31849358.

Nemati MH. Mediastinal gossypiboma simulating a malignant tumour. *Interact Cardiovasc Thorac Surg.* 2012 Oct;15(4):783-5. doi: 10.1093/icvts/ivs260. Epub 2012 Jul 10. PMID: 22786789; PMCID: PMC3445363.

Kim TH, Lee HH. Omental Teratoma Misdiagnosed as Gossypiboma. *J Minim Invasive Gynecol.* 2015 Jul-Aug;22(5):709. doi: 10.1016/j.jmig.2014.12.005. Epub 2014 Dec 10. PMID: 25497163.

Mavrigiannaki PE, Dastamani C, Vouza E, Lambropoulou E, Kairi-Vassilatou E, Kondi-Pafiti A. Gossypiboma: a rare abdominal lesion of women after cesarean section, usually misdiagnosed as a neoplasm. *Clin Exp Obstet Gynecol.* 2011;38(3):294-6. PMID: 21995171.

Lebas L, Dupuis M, Solovei L, Jaffro M, Grunenwald E, Pontier-Marchandise S, Dahan M, Didier A. Vingt ans après... Histoire d'un textilome intra-thoracique [Twenty years later... A story of intra-thoracic textiloma]. *Rev Mal Respir.* 2019 Feb;36(2):214-218. French. doi: 10.1016/j.rmr.2018.04.009. Epub 2018 Nov 13. PMID: 30446182.

Rafique M. Vesical gossypiboma. *J Coll Physicians Surg Pak.* 2003 May;13(5):293-5. PMID: 12757684.

Pandey S, Aggarwal A, Singh V, Sinha RJ. Gossypiboma masquerading as nephrocutaneous fistula. *BMJ Case Rep.* 2018 Sep 27;2018:bcr2018225992. doi: 10.1136/bcr-2018-225992. PMID: 30262535; PMCID: PMC6169637.

Dubois RL, Raisig E, Stanifer BP. Gossypiboma Mimicking Fluorodeoxyglucose-avid Lung Nodule. *Ann Thorac Surg.* 2020 Jun;109(6):e403-e405. doi: 10.1016/j.athoracsur.2019.09.083. Epub 2019 Nov 21. PMID: 31760056.

Zhang H, Jiang Y, Wang Q, Liu J. Lower abdominal gossypiboma mimics ovarian teratoma: a case report and review of the literature. *World J Surg Oncol.* 2017 Jan 6;15(1):6. doi: 10.1186/s12957-016-1082-3. PMID: 28061867; PMCID: PMC5217399.

Puvanesarajah V, Fayad LM, Rao SS, McCarthy EF, Morris CD. Extremity gossypiboma mimicking sarcoma: case report and review. *Skeletal Radiol.* 2019 Apr;48(4):629-635. doi: 10.1007/s00256-018-3059-5. Epub 2018 Sep 10. PMID: 30203183.

Pyo WK, Kim WK, Kim JB. A Huge Pericardial Gossypiboma Causing Severe Cardiac Dysfunction. *Ann Thorac Surg.* 2020 Mar;109(3):e167-e169. doi: 10.1016/j.athoracsur.2019.06.040. Epub 2019 Aug 7. PMID: 31400330.

Adamicová K, Janíčková M, Mikušková K, Statelová D. Gossypiboma mimicking recurrent mandibular tumor: case report. *Cesk Patol.* 2020 Summer;56(3):168-171. English. PMID: 33076669.

Akpinar A, Ucler N, Ozdemir CO. Textiloma (gossypiboma) mimicking recurrent intracranial abscess. *BMC Res Notes.* 2015 Aug 30;8:390. doi: 10.1186/s13104-015-1315-5. PMID: 26318152; PMCID: PMC4553210.

Tanrikulu Y, Şen Tanrikulu C, Yılmaz G, Bıçakçı E. Idiopathic weight loss due to an entero-enteric fistula from a gossypiboma retained for 27 years. *Turk J Surg* 2018; 34: 65-67. ORCID IDs of the authors: Y.T. 0000-0001-8432-2119C. Ş.T. 0000-0001-8166-3823G. Y. 0000-0001-5290-1298E. B. 0000-0002-3731-0040

Gossypiboma Mimicking a Mesenchymal Tumor: A Report of a Rare Case

Unknown etiology, Challenging differential diagnosis, Unusual or unexpected effect of treatment, Diagnostic / therapeutic accidents, Educational Purpose (only if useful for a systematic review or synthesis)

Huseyin Eken, Mehmet SoyTURK, Gurhan Balci, Deniz Firat, Orhan Cimen, Oktay Karakose, Erkan Somuncu

Department of General Surgery, Erzincan University, Erzincan, Turkey

Am J Case Rep 2016; 17:27-30

Atabey, C., Turgut, M., & Ilica, A. (2009). Retained surgical sponge in differential diagnosis of paraspinal soft-tissue mass after posterior spinal surgery: Report of eight cases. *Neurology India*, 57(3), 320–323.

Kobayashi T, Miyakoshi N, Abe E, Abe T, Suzuki T, Takahashi M, Shimada Y. Gossypiboma 19 years after laminectomy mimicking a malignant spinal tumour: a case report. *J Med Case Rep*. 2014 Sep 18;8:311. doi: 10.1186/1752-1947-8-311. PMID: 25236490; PMCID: PMC4177374.

Atabey, C., Turgut, M., & Ilica, A. (2009). Retained surgical sponge in differential diagnosis of paraspinal soft-tissue mass after posterior spinal surgery: Report of eight cases. *Neurology India*, 57(3), 320–323.

Sahin-Akyar G, Yağci C, Aytaç S. Pseudotumour due to surgical sponge: gossypiboma. *Australas Radiol*. 1997 Aug;41(3):288-91. doi: 10.1111/j.1440-1673.1997.tb00675.x. PMID: 9293682.

Jarbou SM, AlKurdi M, Al-Daod K. Pseudotumour due to retained surgical sponge (gossypiboma). *East Mediterr Health J*. 2004 May;10(3):455-7. PMID: 16212226.

Did we forget something? *AORN J*. 2010 May;91(5):644-583. doi: 10.1016/j.aorn.2010.02.010. PMID: 20451008.

Atypical Case of a Painful Presacral Tumor

Challenging differential diagnosis, Diagnostic / therapeutic accidents, Rare disease

Franziska Näf, Matthias Choschick, Gian A. Melcher. Department of Surgery, Hospital Uster, Uster, Switzerland. *Am J Case Rep* 2015; 16:760-762

Retained surgical sponge simulating intestinal tuberculosis.

, et al.

Indian journal of gastroenterology: official journal of the Indian Society of Gastroenterology (1997) 16(2) 68-69.

Amjad Kanj, Ayman O. Soubani, Hussam Tabaja, Said El Zein, Mirna Fares, Nadim Kanj,

Migrating gossypiboma mimicking aspergilloma twenty years after mediastinal surgery,

Respiratory Medicine Case Reports, Volume 25, 2018, Pages 184-186,

ISSN 2213-0071 .

[Medicolegal aspects articles](#)

Gualniera P, Scurria S. Retained surgical sponge: Medicolegal aspects. *Leg Med (Tokyo)*. 2018 Mar;31:78-81. doi: 10.1016/j.legalmed.2018.01.003. Epub 2018 Feb 1. PMID: 29413994.

Underreporting and medicolegal

Kaiser CW, Friedman S, Spurling KP, Slowick T, Kaiser HA. The retained surgical sponge. *Ann Surg*. 1996 Jul;224(1):79-84. doi: 10.1097/0000658-199607000-00012. PMID: 8678622; PMCID: PMC1235250.

Yakar A, Atacan SÇ, Yakar F, Ziyade N, Gündoğmuş ÜN. Medicolegal consequences of thoracic gossypiboma: A case report. *J Forensic Leg Med*. 2016 Aug;42:65-7. doi: 10.1016/j.jflm.2016.05.010. Epub 2016 May 11. PMID: 27262263.

The Problem of Retained Surgical Sponges and the Medical Malpractice Statute of Limitations. Regina A. Bailey, J.D., M.D., LL.M. Candidate (Health Law) .Health Law Perspectives (December 2009) Health Law & Policy Institute. University of Houston Law Center <http://www.law.uh.edu/healthlaw/perspectives/homepage.asp>

Jessica Falleti, Anna Somma, Francesca Baldassarre, Antonello Accurso, Antonio D’Ettorre, Luigi Insabato, Unexpected autoptotic finding in a sudden death: Gossypiboma,

Forensic Science International, Volume 199, Issues 1–3,

2010, Pages e23-e26, ISSN 0379-0738,

Complications due to the problem

Cruz RJ Jr, Poli de Figueiredo LF, Guerra L. Intracolonic obstruction induced by a retained surgical sponge after trauma laparotomy. *J Trauma*. 2003 Nov;55(5):989-91. doi: 10.1097/01.TA.0000027128.99334.E7. PMID: 14608181.

References to historical cases, risk factors and solutions

Pack left in the abdomen after operation. *British Medical Journal* 1931; 1:730 – 732.

Wilson, Henry Parke Custis. Foreign bodies left in the abdomen after laparotomy. 1884. *Transactions of the American Gynecological Society*, vol. 9, pp. 109–112, 1884.

US National Library Archives link: R Wheeler, S Blackburn, H Biggs. Seeking responsibility for the lost swabs? Search Elsewhere. PMC. US National Library of Medicine. *Ann R College of Surgery England* 2014;96(3):177-180.

Stawicki SP, Moffatt-Bruce SD, Ahmed HM et al. Retained surgical items: a problem yet to be solved. *J Am Coll Surg*. 2013 Jan;216(1):15-22. Epub 2012 Oct DOI:

Gawande AA, Studdert DM, Orav EJ, Brennan TA, Zinner MJ. Risk factors for retained instruments and sponges after surgery. *N Engl J Med*. 2003;348(3):229.

D Hariharan and DN Lobo. Retained surgical sponges, needles and instruments. *Ann R College of Surgery England*. 2015;95(2) 87-92. <https://doi.org/10.1308/003588413X13511609957218>

Natural history of the retained surgical sponge. *South Med J*. 1982;75(6):657. McLeod RS, Bohnen JM; CAGS Evidence Based Reviews in Surgery Group. Canadian Association of General Surgeons Evidence Based Reviews in Surgery.

Risk factors for retained foreign bodies after surgery. *Can J Surg*. 2004 Feb;47(1):57-9. PMID: 14997928; PMCID: PMC3211800.

Sarr MG. Editor's note: Retained foreign bodies--why do we still allow them to occur? *Surgery*. 2005 Mar;137(3):304-5. doi: 10.1016/j.surg.2004.10.005. PMID: 15746783.

Jackson S, Brady S. Counting difficulties: retained instruments, sponges, and needles. *AORN J*. 2008 Feb;87(2):315-21. doi: 10.1016/j.aorn.2007.07.023. PMID: 18323022.

Communication about the error to patients- duty of candour

Chan DK, Gallagher TH, Reznick R, Levinson W. "How surgeons disclose medical errors to patients: a study using standardized patients." *Surgery*. 2005;138(5):851-858.

Articles from different countries

Australia

Pennington DG. 'The left behind syndrome'—surgical equipment errors in plastic surgery. *AJOPS*. 2024;7(2). doi:

France

Vayre F, Ollivier JP. Gossypibome intra-thoracique [Intrathoracic gossypiboma]. *Presse Med*. 1998 May 16;27(18):889. Article in French. Erratum in: *Presse Med* 1998 Sep 5;27(25):1279. PMID: 9767881.

Greece

Salemis NS, Gemenetzis G, Lagoudianakis E. Gossypiboma of the breast. *Am Surg*. 2012 Mar;78(3):E125-6. PMID: 22524733.

Dubai

Singh C, Gupta M. Gossypiboma versus Gossip-Boma. *Case Rep Radiol*. 2011;2011:705062. doi: 10.1155/2011/705062. Epub 2011 Oct 16. PMID: 22606557; PMCID: PMC3350273.

Italy

Salzano A, De Rosa A, Borruso G, Giordano G, Gatta G. Un caso di garzoma del ginocchio. Diagnosi con Tomografia Computerizzata [A case of gossypiboma of the knee. Its computed tomographic diagnosis]. *Radiol Med*. 2000 Mar;99(3):188-9. Italian. PMID: 10879169.

Spain

Morales M, Pérez V, Picón G, Vander J, Calpena R, Candela F, Compañ A, García S, Meroño E, Medrano J. Gasa quirúrgica retenida simulando un quiste hepático [A retained surgical sponge simulating a hepatic cyst]. *Rev Esp Enferm Dig*. 1994 Jun;85(6):488-9. Spanish. PMID: 8068430.

Russia

Levashov IuN, Varlamov VV, Smirnov VM. Diagnostika inorodnykh tel, ostavlennykh pri operatsiakh v plevral'noĭ polosti [The diagnosis of foreign bodies left behind in the pleural cavity during operations]. Vestn Khir Im I I Grek. 1992 May;148(5):231-4. Russian. PMID: 1302962.

Urman MG, Davidov MI. Neobychnye sluchai mnozhestvennykh rezidual'nykh tekstil'nykh inorodnykh tel [Unusual cases of multiple residual textile foreign bodies]. Vestn Khir Im I I Grek. 1997;156(5):82-3. Russian. PMID: 9490545.

Subbotin VM, Davidov MI. Prichiny ostavleniia inorodnykh tel v briushnoĭ polosti i profilaktika éтого oslozhneniia [The reasons for leaving foreign bodies in the abdominal cavity and the prevention of this complication]. Vestn Khir Im I I Grek. 1998;157(4):79-84. Article in Russian. PMID: 9825446.

US, Arkansas

Avery JK. So, who's counting? Tenn Med. 2009 Sep;102(9):45. PMID: 19791539.

Brazil

Silva SM, Sousa JB. Gossypiboma após operação abdominal é situação clínica desafiadora e sério problema médico legal [Gossypiboma after abdominal surgery is a challenging clinical problem and a serious medicolegal issue]. Arq Bras Cir Dig. 2013 Jun;26(2):140-3. Portuguese. doi: 10.1590/s0102-67202013000200015. PMID: 24000029.

Canada

El Akri Abdelhafid et al., A serious medico-legal problem after surgery: Gossypiboma .Montreal University, Canada. Surgery Curr Res 2014, 4:6

Mexico

Aguirre CJF, Chávez VG, Huitrón AGA. Intra-abdominal gossypibomas. Frequency and attitude of the Mexican surgeon. Cir Gen. 2004;26(3):203-207.

Chile

Parra M, Oppliger F, Berríos R, Schiappacasse G. Intrathoracic gossypiboma presenting 52 years later as a chest mass. Asian Cardiovasc Thorac Ann. 2015 Jun;23(5):596-8. doi: 10.1177/0218492314557181. Epub 2014 Oct 27. PMID: 25348160.

India

Pujahari AK. Gossypiboma: three cases. Trop Gastroenterol. 2010 Jul-Sep;31(3):217-8. PMID: 21560528.

Rajagopal A, Martin J. Gossypiboma--"a surgeon's legacy": report of a case and review of the literature. Dis Colon Rectum. 2002 Jan;45(1):119-20. doi: 10.1007/s10350-004-6124-1. PMID: 11786775.

Pakistan

Khan HS, Malik AA, Ali S, Naeem A. Gossypiboma as a cause of intestinal obstruction. *J Coll Physicians Surg Pak*. 2014 Nov;24 Suppl 3:S188-9. PMID: 25518768.

China

Fan T, Wang W, Guo X, Geng Q. 'Malignant' pleural effusion with abdominal gossypiboma. *Thorax*. 2018 Oct;73(10):992-993. doi: 10.1136/thoraxjnl-2018-211599. Epub 2018 Apr 5. PMID: 29622690.

Sri Lanka

Abeygunasekera AM, Fathiehu F, Weerasiri P. Gossypiboma. *Ceylon Med J*. 2009 Sep;54(3):98-9. doi: 10.4038/cmj.v54i3.1206. PMID: 19999793.

Ireland

Corrigan S, Kay A, O'Byrne K, Slattery D, Sheehan S, McDonald N, Smyth D, Mealy K, Cromie S. A Socio-Technical Exploration for Reducing & Mitigating the Risk of Retained Foreign Objects. *Int J Environ Res Public Health*. 2018 Apr 10;15(4):714. doi: 10.3390/ijerph15040714. PMID: 29642646; PMCID: PMC5923756.

Turkey

Bakan S, Kandemirli SG, Kuyumcu G, Ersen E, Tutar O. Intrathoracic gossypiboma after spinal operation. *Ann Thorac Surg*. 2015 Feb;99(2):e37-9. doi: 10.1016/j.athoracsur.2014.11.015. PMID: 25639442.

Yildirim S, Tarim A, Nursal TZ, Yildirim T, Caliskan K, Torer N, Karagulle E, Noyan T, Moray G, Haberal M. Retained surgical sponge (gossypiboma) after intraabdominal or retroperitoneal surgery: 14 cases treated at a single center. *Langenbecks Arch Surg*. 2006 Aug;391(4):390-5. doi: 10.1007/s00423-005-0581-4. Epub 2005 Sep 17. PMID: 16170575.

North Korea

Song SY, Hong JW, Yoo WM, Tark KC. Gossypiboma after mandibular contouring surgery. *J Craniofac Surg*. 2009 Sep;20(5):1607-10. doi: 10.1097/SCS.0b013e3181b14761. PMID: 19816308.

Senegal

Retained surgical sponge after laparotomy : Discussion about 8 cases

January 2012. 17(2):79-8

Ghana

Adu-Aryee N., Asumanu E. Naaeder S.

Ghana Medical Journal (2006)

Ethiopia

Berhanu N. Alemu, Abraham G. Tiruneh. Gossypiboma: Case Series and Literature Review. *Ethiop J Health Sci*.2020;30(1):147.doi:http:// dx.doi.org/ 10.4314/ejhs.v30i1.19

Nigeria

Ukwenya, A. Y., Dogo Pm, A. Ahmed and P. Nmadu. "The retained surgical sponge following laparotomy; forgotten at surgery, often forgotten at diagnosis. Our experience." (2008).

Kenya

Gossypiboma of the Abdomen and Pelvis; A Recurring Error

Gilbert Maranya, Heltam Maganga, Bernard Mweru. Annals of African surgery.2017

<https://doi.org/10.4314/aas.v14i1.9>

Germany

Reichelt A., Buchholz G., Schülke C.

Der Chirurg; Zeitschrift für alle Gebiete der operativen Medizin (2011)

Poland

Szymocha M, Pacan M, Anufrowicz M, Jurek T, Rorat M. Leaving a foreign object in the body of a patient during abdominal surgery: still a current problem. Pol Przegl Chir. 2019 May 15;91(6):35-40. doi: 10.5604/01.3001.0013.2024. PMID: 31849358.

Saudi Arabia

-M. Ezzedien Rabie, Mohammad Hassan Hosni, Alaa Al Safty, Manea Al Jarallah, Fadel Hussain Ghaleb,

Gossypiboma revisited: A never ending issue,

International Journal of Surgery Case Reports, Volume 19, 2016, Pages 87-91.

-A.National Guard Health Affairs, KSA Annual Congress on Midwifery & Nurse Practitioners. Abstract Title: Quality improvement project- Reducing the Swab retention during vaginal delivery

Thailand

Journal of the Medical Association of Thailand (1996)

Kosovo

Zejnnullahu VA, Bicaj BX, Zejnnullahu VA, Hamza AR. Retained Surgical Foreign Bodies after Surgery. Open Access Maced J Med Sci. 2017 Mar 15;5(1):97-100. doi: 10.3889/oamjms.2017.005. Epub 2017 Jan 5. PMID: 28293325; PMCID: PMC5320916.

Togo

Tchangaiet al. Patient Safety in Surgery (2017) 11:25 DOI 10.1186/s13037-017-0140-2

Iran study

Zarenezhad M, Gholamzadeh S, Hedjazi A, Soltani K, Gharehdaghi J, Ghadipasha M, Hosseini SM, Zare A. Three years evaluation of retained foreign bodies after surgery in Iran. *Ann Med Surg (Lond)*. 2017 Jan 25;15:22-25. doi: 10.1016/j.amsu.2017.01.019. PMID: 28217303; PMCID: PMC5302138.

Japan

Kondo T, Murayama A. Two Pelvic Masses. *N Engl J Med*. 2018 Feb 22;378(8):752. doi: 10.1056/NEJMicm1708836. PMID: 29466155.

Strategies to understand and address never events

Janet E Anderson, Alison J Watt, Using Safety-II and resilient healthcare principles to learn from Never Events, *International Journal for Quality in Health Care*, Volume 32, Issue 3, April 2020, Pages 196–203,