E-ISSN: 3123-8696
P-ISSN: 3124-484X

DIAN MEDICAL JOURNAL
FAKULTAS KEDOKTERAN
UNIVERSITAS DIAN NUSWANTORO
Volume. 1 No.2, 2026

Clinical Pathway–Based Quality and Cost Control in Type D Hospitals: A Practical Ethical Governance Framework

Hendriani Selina[1*]
[1]Faculty of Medicine, Universitas Dian Nuswantoro, Semarang, Indonesia

ARTICLE INFO

Article History
Received: 22/05/2026
Revised: 11/06/2026
Accepted: 23/06/2026

Keywords: clinical pathway, quality control, cost efficiency, patient safety, hospital administration

Correspondence:
Hendriani Selina
(hendriani@dsn.dinus.ac.id)

ABSTRACT

Hospitals operating under universal health coverage face increasing pressure to balance quality of care, patient safety, and cost efficiency. This pressure is particularly relevant for Type D hospitals, which often operate with limited specialist availability, constrained infrastructure, and dependence on case-based reimbursement mechanisms. This article proposes a practical and ethical governance framework for integrating quality improvement and cost control in Type D hospitals through the implementation of clinical pathways. A conceptual policy-and-practice framework approach was used, drawing on hospital clinical governance principles, patient safety concepts, health financing considerations, and professional experience in hospital management within resource-limited settings. The proposed framework positions clinical pathways as the core operational instrument for standardizing care, reducing unnecessary clinical variation, supporting rational use of medicines and diagnostics, guiding length of stay, strengthening audit systems, and protecting ethical clinical decision-making. Operational indicators are proposed to support future evaluation, including pathway adherence, cost variance, length of stay, patient safety incidents, rational medicine use, and audit follow-up. Clinical pathway-based quality and cost control may provide a feasible and ethically grounded governance approach for Type D hospitals, provided that patient safety remains the non-negotiable boundary of efficiency. Future empirical studies are needed to test the framework in real hospital settings.

INTRODUCTION

Health systems worldwide continue to face the challenge of maintaining quality, patient safety, and equitable access while controlling rising healthcare costs. Universal health coverage requires health services to be accessible and financially sustainable, but cost containment that is poorly designed may create unintended risks to clinical autonomy, quality of care, and patient safety. Patient safety has therefore become a central policy and governance priority, with global recommendations emphasizing system-based prevention of avoidable harm and the integration of safety into daily care processes.[1]

In Indonesia and similar health systems using case-based reimbursement, hospitals are

required to deliver clinically appropriate care within defined payment structures. This creates pressure for hospitals to reduce unnecessary variation, avoid duplication, improve documentation, and align clinical decisions with evidence-based standards. The challenge is not simply how to reduce costs, but how to ensure that efficiency is achieved without reducing necessary care. This distinction is especially important in smaller hospitals with limited resources.

Type D hospitals represent an important yet often under-discussed segment of hospital services. These hospitals serve essential community needs and often become the first inpatient referral facility for local populations. However, they may operate with limited specialist availability, modest diagnostic capacity, limited managerial systems, and restricted financial flexibility. Without a clear governance instrument, efforts to control cost may be perceived as managerial pressure rather than as a shared professional responsibility.

Clinical pathways offer a potential bridge between clinical quality and financial stewardship. Previous reviews have suggested that clinical pathways may improve documentation, reduce complications, support adherence to recommended practice, and potentially reduce length of stay and hospital costs, although implementation quality and local context remain important determinants of impact.[2,3] In this article, clinical pathways are positioned not merely as administrative documents, but as practical governance tools that can align clinical practice, patient safety, ethical boundaries, and cost control.

This article aims to develop a practical and ethical governance framework for integrating quality improvement and cost control in Type D hospitals through the implementation of clinical pathways. The central question addressed is: how can Type D hospitals use clinical pathways to standardize care, reduce unnecessary variation, support patient safety, and promote cost efficiency without compromising professional judgment or ethical standards?

Methods: Framework Development Approach

This article adopts a conceptual policy-and-practice framework approach rather than an empirical study design. The purpose is not to test an intervention statistically, but to formulate a practical governance framework that can be used by hospital leaders, clinicians, and policymakers as a basis for implementation and future evaluation.

The framework was developed through synthesis of four knowledge sources: hospital clinical governance principles, quality and patient safety concepts, health financing and reimbursement considerations, and professional experience in hospital management within resource-limited settings. Relevant concepts were organized around the relationship between standardization of care, variation reduction, ethical decision-making, patient safety, and cost efficiency.

The development process consisted of four steps. First, key challenges faced by Type D hospitals were identified, including limited specialist availability, constrained diagnostic and infrastructure capacity, dependence on case-based reimbursement, and variability in clinical practice. Second, the role of clinical pathways was analyzed as an operational instrument to integrate clinical quality, patient safety, ethical decision-making, and cost control. Third, core domains of pathway-

based governance were formulated, including standardization of care, rational use of diagnostics and medicines, length-of-stay control, audit, and managerial accountability. Fourth, practical indicators and ethical boundaries were proposed to support implementation and future empirical evaluation.

No individual patient data, hospital financial records, or identifiable institutional data were used in this article. Therefore, statistical analysis and ethical approval for human subject research were not applicable. The proposed framework is intended to serve as a practical model that can be tested through prospective, retrospective, or mixed-method studies in Type D hospitals.

Context of Type D Hospitals

Type D hospitals are generally characterized by limited specialist coverage, modest diagnostic capacity, and a need to provide essential hospital services close to the community. In the context of national health insurance and case-based reimbursement, these hospitals must maintain service quality while managing resource constraints. The Indonesian health system continues to operate within a legal and policy environment that emphasizes health service governance, access, and health insurance mechanisms.[4,5]

The operational difficulty faced by Type D hospitals is the gap between policy expectations and daily clinical realities. National reimbursement policies may define payment rules, but they do not automatically translate into safe and efficient clinical operations. Hospitals therefore need internal instruments that can convert policy into standardized care processes, measurable indicators, and accountable decision-making.

Clinical Pathways as a Core Governance Instrument

Clinical pathways are structured, multidisciplinary care plans that outline the essential steps in patient management for specific diagnoses or procedures. They clarify expected diagnostic, therapeutic, nursing, monitoring, discharge, and follow-up activities. In Type D hospitals, clinical pathways can serve as a shared reference between clinicians, nurses, pharmacists, managers, and finance teams.

The governance value of clinical pathways lies in their ability to reduce unwarranted variation while preserving clinical judgment. A pathway does not eliminate professional discretion; rather, it defines the expected standard of care and requires documentation when deviation is clinically justified. This distinction is essential because cost control should never be applied as a rigid restriction that overrides patient needs.

Table 1. Role of Clinical Pathways in Quality and Cost Control

Governance aspect	Role of clinical pathways
Clinical quality	Standardize evidence-based care and reduce unwarranted variation.
Patient safety	Clarify responsibilities, reduce omission, and prevent high-risk variation.
Cost control	Reduce duplicated diagnostics, unnecessary medicines, avoidable supplies, and inappropriate length of stay.
Ethics	Protect clinical judgment by defining acceptable standards of care.
Management accountability	Provide measurable indicators for audit, feedback, and improvement.

Operational Domains and Measurable Indicators

To respond to the need for operational clarity, the proposed framework translates conceptual domains into measurable indicators. These indicators are not intended to replace clinical judgment, but to support monitoring, audit, and quality improvement. Each hospital should adapt the indicators according to its service profile, data capacity, and priority clinical conditions.

Table 2. Framework of Evaluation Domains and Indicators for Clinical Pathway Performance Assessment

Domain	Operational definition	Example indicators
Clinical pathway adherence	Degree to which care follows the agreed clinical pathway, with justified variance when necessary.	Percentage of cases managed according to pathway; percentage of documented justified variance.
Patient safety	Prevention of avoidable harm related to clinical care, medication, procedure, infection, or system failure.	Patient safety incident rate; medication error; healthcare-associated infection; near-miss reporting.
Cost efficiency	Reduction of waste and unnecessary variation without reducing clinically necessary care.	Cost variance per case; duplicated tests; unnecessary consumables; claim-cost gap.
Rational medicine use	Use of medicines according to indication, formulary, safety, availability, and cost-effectiveness.	Percentage of formulary compliance; percentage of generic medicine use when clinically appropriate; antibiotic stewardship indicators.
Length of stay control	Alignment of hospital stay with clinical need, discharge readiness, and pathway standard.	Average length of stay by diagnosis; percentage of prolonged stay with documented reason.
Clinical governance	Structured supervision, audit, feedback, and improvement based on pathway implementation.	Frequency of pathway audit; percentage of audit recommendations followed up; multidisciplinary review meetings.

Operationalizing Quality and Cost Control

The implementation of pathway-based quality and cost control should begin with priority selection. Type D hospitals should not attempt to create pathways for all conditions simultaneously. Priority should be given to high-volume, high-cost, high-risk, or high-variation conditions, such as common obstetric cases, pediatric infections, appendicitis, hernia, dengue fever, pneumonia, hypertension-related admissions, or other locally dominant diagnoses.

For each selected condition, the pathway should define inclusion and exclusion criteria, expected clinical assessment, diagnostic tests, medicines, nursing care, procedure requirements, discharge criteria, follow-up plan, and variance documentation. Integration with hospital formularies and standardized medical consumables is important so that efficiency arises from rationalization rather than restriction.

Audit should focus on both quality and cost dimensions. For example, a case with low cost but poor documentation or unsafe deviation should not be considered successful. Conversely, a case with higher cost may be acceptable if the variance is

clinically justified. This approach prevents financial indicators from becoming the sole measure of performance.

Clinical Pathways, Cost Efficiency, and Patient Safety

Patient safety is the ethical boundary within which all efficiency measures must operate. Clinical pathways support safety by clarifying what should be done, when it should be done, who is responsible, and when deviation must be documented. In this sense, pathway-based governance is consistent with global patient safety principles that emphasize system reliability, learning, transparency, and reduction of avoidable harm.[1]

Cost efficiency should be understood as elimination of waste, not reduction of necessary care. Examples include avoiding duplicated laboratory tests, reducing inappropriate antibiotic use, preventing unnecessary imaging, standardizing consumables, improving discharge planning, and preventing prolonged hospitalization without clinical indication. These measures may improve both safety and financial sustainability.

The use of generic medicines or locally available products can support efficiency when they are clinically appropriate, quality-assured, and included within a rational formulary system. However, cost considerations should not override clinical indications, allergy history, drug availability, contraindications, or patient safety concerns. Clinical pathways should therefore include explicit space for justified variance

Table 3. Relationship Between Clinical Pathway–Based Efficiency and Patient Safety

Implementation step	Practical activity	Expected governance output
Prioritization	Select high-volume, high-cost, or high-variation diagnoses	Focused pathway development.
Pathway design	Develop multidisciplinary pathway with clinicians, nurses, pharmacy, finance, and management	Shared standard of care.
Formulary alignment	Align medicines and consumables with clinical indication and procurement capacity	Rational resource use
Implementation	Use pathway in daily care, documentation, and discharge planning	Reduced variation
Audit and feedback	Review adherence, variance, safety events, length of stay, and cost variance.	Continuous improvemen
Recognition and improvement	Provide feedback, learning, and recognition for quality-based adherence	Sustained clinical engagement

Table 4. Efficiency Strategies, Patient Safety Contributions, and Ethical Considerations in Clinical Pathway Implementation

Efficiency strategy	Potential patient safety contribution	Ethical caution
Generic medicine use when appropriate	Maintains access and continuity of therapy	Must remain clinically indicated and quality assured.
Standardized medical consumables	Promotes procedural consistency and reduces error	Must not restrict necessary alternatives.
Rational length of stay	Reduces exposure to hospital-acquired infection and improves bed availability.	Early discharge must meet safety and readiness criteria.
Elimination of duplicated services	Reduces unnecessary interventions and patient burden.	Repeat testing remains justified when clinically required.
Routine audit	Detects unsafe deviation and supports learning.	Audit must not be punitive or purely financial.

Implementation Challenges in Type D Hospitals

Although clinical pathways provide a practical instrument for integrating quality and cost control, implementation in Type D hospitals may face several challenges. First, limited specialist availability may affect the development, supervision, and periodic review of pathways. Second, resistance may arise if clinicians perceive cost control as a managerial intervention that threatens professional autonomy. Third, incomplete documentation and weak health information systems may limit the ability to monitor adherence, outcomes, and cost variation. Fourth, formulary alignment and procurement policies may not always support consistent pathway implementation.

To address these challenges, hospital leadership should position clinical pathways as professional and ethical tools rather than purely financial instruments. Multidisciplinary involvement, transparent audit mechanisms, regular feedback, and recognition of clinical compliance are essential to sustain implementation. Cost efficiency should be communicated as the elimination of waste and unnecessary variation, not as reduction of clinically necessary care.

Table 5. Challenges, Risks, and Mitigation Strategies in Clinical Pathway Implementation in Type D Hospitals

Challenge	Risk	Mitigation strategy
Limited specialist availability	Pathways may not be reviewed or supervised adequately.	Use priority pathways, involve referral specialists, and schedule periodic clinical review.
Clinician resistance	Pathways may be perceived as cost-cutting tools.	Emphasize professional ownership, patient safety, and justified variance.
Weak documentation	Adherence and variance cannot be evaluated.	Simplify forms, integrate pathway checklist, and train staff.
Limited data systems	Cost and quality indicators are difficult to monitor.	Begin with simple indicators and manual audit before digital expansion.
Procurement inconsistency	Formulary and consumable	Align pharmacy, procurement,

Challenge	Risk	Mitigation strategy
	standards cannot be sustained.	and clinical pathway committee.

Implications for Hospital Management and Policy

For hospital management, clinical pathways provide a common language between clinical teams and financial governance. Instead of giving general instructions to reduce costs, management can facilitate multidisciplinary pathway development, provide data on cost variation, support formulary alignment, and ensure non-punitive audit systems. This approach may reduce tension between clinicians and management because efficiency is discussed through professional standards rather than arbitrary budget restriction.

For policymakers and payers, pathway-based governance illustrates how national payment systems can be operationalized safely at hospital level. Case-based reimbursement requires internal clinical governance instruments so that efficiency does not become under-service. Supporting hospitals, especially Type D hospitals, with pathway templates, audit tools, and training may improve alignment between national policy and local implementation.

Limitations

This article has several limitations. First, it does not present primary empirical data from a specific Type D hospital. Second, the proposed framework has not yet been tested using quantitative indicators such as cost variance, length of stay, readmission, patient safety incidents, or claim outcomes. Third, implementation may vary according to hospital resources, leadership commitment, clinical culture, payer dynamics, and local service profiles. Fourth, the indicators proposed in this article require adaptation before use in specific hospital settings. Future studies should evaluate the framework using prospective, retrospective, or mixed-method designs and should examine both clinical outcomes and financial sustainability.

Conclusion

Clinical pathway-based quality and cost control may provide a practical and ethically grounded governance framework for Type D hospitals. By positioning patient safety as the non-negotiable core, clinical pathways can help standardize care, reduce unnecessary variation, support rational resource use, and strengthen accountability. However, the proposed framework should be understood as a conceptual and practical model rather than evidence of proven effectiveness. Future empirical evaluation is needed to assess its impact on clinical quality, patient safety, cost variance, length of stay, and hospital sustainability.

Ethical Statement

This article is based on conceptual analysis, literature synthesis, and professional experience in hospital governance and management. No individual patient data, identifiable hospital records, or human subject data were used. The author assumes full responsibility for the content, interpretation, and ethical integrity of this work.

REFERENCES

1. Donabedian A. The quality–cost–outcome framework in health care. Milbank Q. 1988;66(Suppl 2):81–97.
2. Institute of Medicine. Crossing the Quality Chasm: A New Health System for the 21st

Century. Washington, DC: National Academy Press; 2001.

3. Republic of Indonesia. Law of the Republic of Indonesia No. 44 of 2009 on Hospitals. Jakarta: Government of the Republic of Indonesia; 2009.
4. Kaplan RS, Anderson SR. Time-Driven Activity-Based Costing. Boston: Harvard Business School Press; 2007.
5. Republic of Indonesia. Presidential Regulation No. 82 of 2018 on Health Insurance. Jakarta: Government of the Republic of Indonesia; 2018.
6. Ministry of Health of the Republic of Indonesia. Regulation of the Minister of Health No. 82 of 2018 on the National Health Insurance (JKN). Jakarta: Ministry of Health; 2018.
7. Panella M, Marchisio S, Di Stanislao F. Clinical pathways for reducing complications and costs. Int J Qual Health Care. 2018;30(2):79–85.
8. World Health Organization. WHO Guidelines on the Rational Use of Medicines. Geneva: WHO; 2019.
9. Rotter T, de Jong RB, Lacko SE, Ronellenfitsch U, Kinsman L. Clinical pathways: effects on professional practice, patient outcomes, length of stay, and hospital costs. Cochrane Database Syst Rev. 2019;3:CD006632. doi:10.1002/14651858.CD006632.pub3.
10. World Health Organization. Quality of Care and Patient Safety. Geneva: WHO; 2020.
11. Ministry of Health of the Republic of Indonesia. Guidelines for the Development and Implementation of Clinical Pathways in Hospitals. Jakarta: Ministry of Health; 2021.
12. Ministry of Health of the Republic of Indonesia. Guidelines on Quality Control and Cost Control in Hospitals. Jakarta: Directorate General of Health Services; 2022.
13. Ministry of Health of the Republic of Indonesia. Technical Guidelines for the Implementation of INA-CBGs in Hospitals. Jakarta: Ministry of Health; 2022.
14. Townsend CM, Beauchamp RD, Evers BM, Mattox KL. Sabiston Textbook of Surgery. 21st ed. Philadelphia: Elsevier; 2022.
15. Cunningham FG, Leveno KJ, Bloom SL, et al. Williams Obstetrics. 26th ed. New York: McGraw-Hill; 2022.
16. Hospital Accreditation Commission (KARS). Hospital Accreditation Standards. Jakarta: KARS; 2022.
17. Republic of Indonesia. Law of the Republic of Indonesia No. 17 of 2023 on Health. Jakarta: Government of the Republic of Indonesia; 2023.
18. Ministry of Health of the Republic of Indonesia. Hospital Minimum Service Standards. Jakarta: Ministry of Health; 2023.
19. Ministry of Health of the Republic of Indonesia. National Formulary. Jakarta: Ministry of Health; 2023.
20. Ministry of Health of the Republic of Indonesia. Hospital Internal Audit Guidelines. Jakarta: Ministry of Health; 2023.
21. BPJS Health. Technical Guidelines for INA-CBGs Claims. Jakarta: BPJS Health; 2023.
22. Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. Health System Efficiency and Quality. Paris: OECD; 2023.

23. World Health Organization. Patient Safety and Quality Improvement. Geneva: WHO; 2023–2024.
24. BPJS Health. Strategies for Quality and Cost Control in the National Health Insurance System. Jakarta: BPJS Health; 2024.
25. World Bank. Value-Based Healthcare in Low- and Middle-Income Countries. Washington, DC: World Bank; 2024.
26. Porter ME, Kaplan RS. How to pay for health care. Harv Bus Rev. 2016;94(7):88–100.
27. Kaplan RS. Value-based health care and time-driven activity-based costing. Harv Bus Rev. 2014;92(10):58–65.