

TRACEABILITY OF IMPLANTABLE MEDICAL DEVICES / PATIENT INFORMATION: WHERE DO WE STAND?



Kimberley LEFEVRE¹, Margaux POULARD², Aurélie FERRE¹, Johann CLOUET^{1,3}, François RONDEAU^{1,} Fabien NATIVEL^{1,3}

(1) Nantes Université, CHU Nantes, Pharmacie, F44000 NANTES, France

(2) Nantes Université, CHU Nantes, Direction de la Qualité, des Risques et de l'Evaluation, F44000 NANTES, France (3) Nantes Université, Oniris, CHU Nantes, INSERM, Regenerative Medicine and Skeleton, RMeS, UMR 1229, 44000, Nantes, France

: kimberley.lefevre@hotmail.fr

INTRODUCTION

Implantable Medical Devices (IMD) are subject to **sanitary traceability**:

defined in R5212-36 to R5212-42 articles of the French Public Health Code, then in decrees of 29/11/2006, 26/01/2007 and 08/09/2021

evaluated by the contract for the improvement of quality and efficiency of healthcare (CAQES) thanks to regional indicators

OBJECTIVE

To evaluate the **quality** of health traceability in our establishment

MATERIALS AND METHODS

The evaluation grid consists of 27 criteria distributed

Selection of 10 tracer IMD references, representative of :

- establishment's activity;
- reimbursement status ("intra-GHS": 3 / "hors-GHS": 7); \bullet
- management methods (purchase: 4 / deposit: 6).



across 4 domains :



- \rightarrow Retrospective analysis of the year 2022 based on 50 implantations of MD (selected from the 10 tracer IMD references).
- \rightarrow Comparison with the analysis conducted in 2020 (excluding 8 criteria) - see QRCode -EuroPharmat 2020 congress



RESULTS

- Traceability by the hospital pharmacy: 86%
- Traceability by the care service: 84%
- Traceability of patient information in the electronic health records (EHR): **52%**



 \rightarrow Divergent practices according to surgical specialties

<u>Communication of information to the patient</u>: 96%

Identification of the healthcare 90% 100% professional user (name) 92% Date and localization of use 100% 42% Name of the manufacturer 100% Designation of the IMD (name, 60% 100% reference) 10% Serial or batch number of the IMD 100% Unique Device Identification (UDI) 0% 20% 40% 80% 100% 60%

Traceability by hospital pharmacy and care services

Traceability of patient information in the EHR

Loss of information between traceability in professional software and information traced as communicated.

No implant card traced as delivered.

Traceability by hospital pharmacy and care services Traceability of patient information in the EHR

Improvement in practices since 2020 (excluding 8 criteria not studied in the previous audit):

	2020	2023
Traceability by the hospital pharmacy	100%	100%
Traceability by the care service	100%	100%
Traceability of patient information in the EHR	6%	49%

DISCUSSION / CONCLUSION

CAQES 2022-2024 target for all criteria: > 75% -> Objective not achieved

Improvements in Pharmacy / Services

- Traceability of UDI: integrate label scanning throughout the IMD circuit;
- Healthcare professional's **RPPS number**;
- Harmonization of the circuit between surgery rooms.

Improvements in patient information traceability

- Standardization of follow-up letters;
- Interoperability of professional software: automatic transfer of information traced by the medical/surgical and pharmaceutical services onto the referral letter (especially the UDI);
- Traceability of the surgical report to the patient;
- Implementation of an **implant card** delivering circuit.