

How best to report pharmaceutical intervention to a medical team ?

A clinical relevance assessment.

C. DI FIORE-FAYE (1), E. BOUVET (1), M. VIE(1), P. MASSIP (2), J.M. CANONGE (1) (1) Department of pharmacy, (2) Department of Infectious Disease and Tropical, CHU Toulouse, FRANCE

Background

The clinical Pharmacy department has recently started working with the medical team of infectious and tropical diseases department. A Pharmacy resident, supervised by a clinical pharmacist, daily analyses 28 patient's prescriptions.

Purpose

The aim of this study is to evaluate the impact and quality of pharmaceutical interventions (PI) issued over a period of 8 months.

Materials and method

All interventions are recorded and coded according to the criteria defined by the working group of the French society of clinical pharmacy [1]. A note of relevance is attributed separately by the pharmacy resident and the clinical pharmacist to each PI, according to the scale used in the work of Bayliff and Einarson [2].

Scale of clinical relevance clinical relevance **IP3** Avoiding a potentially fatal accident **IP 3 = Vital** Prevents organ dysfunction, intensive medical supervision IP 2 = A veryclinical impact **IP 0 =** significant 0% prevents or irreversible sequelae **Informative** clinical impact objective 21% Increases the effectiveness of treatment and/or safety of the patient and/or improves the quality of life of patients **33**% Without direct clinical impact but financial objective, informative, or proposed after the event Results **IP 1 = Significant** clinical impact 133 Patients 980 patients **46%** From concerned hospitalized january 2012 to 168 Pharmaceutical · 209 • 1947 paper august interventions accepted **Pharmaceutical** prescriptions 2012 Interventions analysed drug-related problems type of pharmacists' recommendations 80 70 IP2 60 50 IP1 IP2 40 IP1 IP0 30 IP0 20 10 Adverse drug reaction inistration receive drug Orugwithoutindication Oruginteraction

Conclusion

Highlighting the clinical impact of PI increased the interest of physicians for pharmaceutical work. Consequently, they asked for report more frequent (twice a month versus once a year).

Discussion

It would be interesting to compare these results with impact evaluation of pharmaceutical interventions by physicians.

Bibliography

[1]: Bedouch P, Charpiat B, Roubille R, et al.site internet de la société française de pharmacie Clinique pour l'analyse des interventions pharmaceutiques : finalités, mode d'emploi et perspectives. JPharm Clin 2007 ; 26(1) : 40–4.

[2]: Bayliff CD, Einarson TR. Physician assessment of pharmacist's intervention: a method of estimating cost avoidance and determining quality assurance. Can J Hospi Pharm 1990; 43(4):167-7.



EAHP 18th Congress
"Improving patient outcomes: a shared responsibility"
13–16 march 2013, Paris, France

Abstract number: CPC-064 <u>email</u>: celine-difiore-faye@orange.fr