

# IMPROVING MEDICATION RECONCILIATION REPORTS: EVALUATION THROUGH QUALITY AUDITS

M.I. SÁEZ RODRÍGUEZ, C. LÓPEZ GÓMEZ, J.J. ARENAS VILAFRANCA, M. MIRANDA MAGAÑA, B. TORTAJADA GOITIA.  
COSTA DEL SOL HOSPITAL, PHARMACY, MARBELLA, SPAIN.



## BACKGROUND

**Medication reconciliation (MR)** before a **scheduled surgical procedure (SSP)** improves patient **safety**, but quality of this process must be taken into account. In our center, MR-protocol includes **hospital pharmacists' reports (RR)** that encourage the process.

## AIM AND OBJECTIVES

Evaluate the **evolution of quality of pharmacists' MR-reports** after annual audits.

## MATERIALS AND METHODS

MR PROTOCOL

1

Before a SSP, a pharmacist prepares a **MR-report** that contains an **individualized MR proposal** for surgeons to **adapt** their medication during hospitalization



MR proposals can be **"maintain"**, **"suspend"**, **"evaluate"** or **"replace for"**.

2

Subsequently, another protocol was developed to **evaluate the quality of the MR-report**. Five relevant items were selected:

Ítem 1 % of reports with empty medication list

Ítem 2 % of reports with at least one item from column "medication" written by commercial name

Ítem 3 % of reports with at least one item from column "medication" empty

Ítem 4 % of reports with at least one item from column "dosing" empty

Ítem 5 % of reports with at least one item from column "reconciliation proposal" empty

From 2016 to 2019 an **audit** was carried out **annually**, selecting a **random sample** of 30 patients and establishing an **annual improvement plan** according to the results.

## IMPROVEMENT PROPOSALS ESTABLISHED

2016

- Include a **week rotation** in the **reconciliation area** for the first-year resident

2017

- **Extend MR rotation** of the third-year resident from two to five months

2018

- Establish a **supervision/review** circuit by the reference pharmacist of the RRs performed

## RESULTS

| ÍTEM | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 |
|------|------|------|------|------|
| I    | 10%  | 10%  | 7%   | 0%   |
| II   | 26%  | 9%   | 10%  | 4%   |
| III  | 0%   | 0%   | 0%   | 0%   |
| IV   | 0%   | 4%   | 0%   | 0%   |
| V    | 10%  | 0%   | 0%   | 0%   |

\*Results were considered optimal if items error were  $\leq 10\%$  and excellent if  $\leq 5\%$

## CONCLUSION

After each **improvement proposal** introduced, especially the review of the RRs, an **improvement in the quality** of the RRs is observed over the years. After the last audit, all the indicators are at **excellent levels** of achievement.