

1 Differences in medication reconciliation interventions between six 2 hospitals: a mixed method study

3
4 C C M Stuijt PharmD, MSc¹, B J F vd Bemt PharmD, PhD^{2,3}, V E Boerlage BA⁴, M J A
5 Janssen PharmD, PhD⁵, K Taxis PharmD, PhD⁴, F Karapinar PharmD, PhD⁵

6 7 8 9 **Investigators degrees, affiliations and email:**

10 Clementine Stuijt, PharmD, MSc¹ stuijt@apomed.nl, corresponding author

11 Michelangelostraat 62-2

12 1077CG Amsterdam

13 Tel 0031633568067

14 ORCID iD: 0000-0002-5514-7195

15 Fatma Karapinar, PharmD, PhD⁹ f.karapinar@olvg.nl

16 ORCID iD: 0000-0002-3077-9663

17 Bart JF van den Bemt, PharmD, PhD^{2,3} b.vandenbemt@maartenskliniek.nl

18 ORCID iD: 0000-0002-8560-9514

19
20 ¹ ApoMed, Amsterdam

21 ² Department of Pharmacy, Sint Maartenskliniek, Nijmegen

22 ³ Department of Pharmacy, Radboud University Medical Centre, Nijmegen

23 ⁴ Department of Pharmacotherapy and Pharmaceutical Care, University of Groningen

24 ⁵ Department of Hospital Pharmacy, OLVG Hospital, Amsterdam

25 All institutes are situated in the Netherlands.

26

27 .

28

29 **Acknowledgements**

30 The investigators would like to thank participating hospital pharmacists and technicians.

31 These are: E Helfrich, Department of Pharmacy, Wilhelmina Hospital, Assen; M Meijs,

32 Department of Pharmacy, Sint Antonius Hospital, Nieuwegein; S v Bommel and R Smit,

33 Department of Pharmacy, Albert Schweitzer Hospital, Dordrecht; S vd Meer and S Dings,

34 Department of Pharmacy, VieCuri Hospital, Venlo, all in the Netherlands, for their

35 cooperation in this study. Furthermore we express gratitude to the following students for
36 collecting data: D Bervoets, R de Rooij, N Wartenberg.

37

38

39

40

41

42 **Abstract**

43 **Background**

44 Although medication reconciliation (MedRec) is mandated and effective in decreasing
45 preventable medication errors during transition of care, hospitals implement MedRec
46 differently.

47

48 **Objective**

49 Quantitatively compare the number and type of MedRec interventions between hospitals
50 upon admission and discharge, followed by a qualitative analysis on potential reasons for
51 these differences.

52

53 **Methods**

54 This explanatory retrospective mixed method study included patients from six hospitals and
55 various wards in case MedRec was performed both on hospital admission and discharge.
56 Information on pharmacy interventions to resolve unintended discrepancies and medication
57 optimizations were collected. Based on these quantitative results, interviews and a focus
58 group was performed to give insight in MedRec processes. Descriptive analysis was used for
59 the quantitative-, content analysis for the qualitative part.

60

61 **Results**

62 On admission, patients with at least one discrepancy varied from 36-95% (mean per patient
63 2.2 (SD± 2.4) Upon discharge, these numbers ranged from 5-28% while optimizations
64 reached 2% (admission) to 95% (discharge).The main themes explaining differences in
65 numbers of interventions were patient-mix, healthcare professionals involved, location and
66 moment of the interview plus embedding and extent of medication optimization.

67

68 **Conclusions**

69 Hospitals differed greatly in the number of interventions performed during MedRec. A
70 combination of patient-mix, healthcare professionals involved, location and timing of the
71 interview plus embedding and extent of medication optimization resulted in the highest yield
72 of MedRec interventions on unintended medication discrepancies and optimizations. This
73 study supports to give direction to optimize MedRec processes in hospitals.

74

75 **Key words**

76 medication reconciliation

77 medication errors

78 hospital admission

79 hospital discharge

80 hospital pharmacy

81

82 Introduction

83

84 Medication errors upon hospital admission and discharge are common and can lead to
85 preventable adverse drug events (ADEs).^{1,2} To diminish these errors, medication
86 reconciliation (MedRec) is recommended in many countries: several studies have
87 demonstrated substantial error reductions in medication errors, specifically medication
88 discrepancies, and, to some extent, in ADEs.^{3,4,5,6,7}

89

90 In fact, MedRec consists of three different steps which are described by the Healthcare
91 Improvement Institute (USA): 1. verification (eliminating discrepancies between a patients'
92 actual medication use and in-hospital prescriptions by comparing medication overviews and
93 interviewing patients), 2. clarification (medication optimization, e.g. start of a laxative if an
94 opioid is prescribed, eliminating double medications) and 3. reconciliation (discussion of step
95 1 and 2 and reasons for medication changes with the physician and
96 documentation) (Appendix box 1a).⁶

97

98 Despite this clear definition, there is remarkable diversity in the reported effect of MedRec.
99 For example, in the verification step detected discrepancies between the actual medication
100 use of a patient and the medication list constituted in the hospital, was found to vary between
101 3.4 and 98%.^{8,9,10,11} This broad range may be explained by variances in study methodology,
102 differences in study population (eg acute admissions, elderly and high numbers of admission
103 medication) but also in dissimilarities in definition.¹² The latter may result in different
104 interpretations or implementation of the distinct steps of MedRec.^{11,12,13,14} E.g. the clarification
105 step is not frequently implemented: it may be included in verification- and reconciliation steps
106 without explicit reporting or not at all been executed^{15,16}. Knowledge on inter-hospital
107 variability of MedRec processes upon hospital admission and discharge, may give insight in

108 MedRec-strategies and the impact on numbers of interventions. This will give direction to
109 optimize MedRec processes in hospitals.^{11,12}

110

111 Existing literature describes the impact of available staff, the employee who performs
112 MedRec, hospital stay duration and number of admission medications on the number of
113 interventions. However, no study performed a broader, in depth analysis to compare MedRec
114 processes between hospitals in a real-world setting.¹³ Hence, the objective of this mixed-
115 method study is to quantitatively compare the number and type of MedRec interventions
116 between hospitals upon admission and discharge, followed by a qualitative analysis of
117 potential reasons for these differences.

118

119 **Methods**

120 *Study design*

121 This explanatory mixed method study consisted of a quantitative and a qualitative part.

122 *Ethics*

123 The Nijmegen ethics committee reviewed the study and confirmed compliance with the Dutch
124 legislation by giving the waiver of approval (registration nr 2013/328)

125 .

126 **QUANTITATIVE PART**

127 *Setting*

128 A retrospective cohort study was performed. Selected hospitals executed MedRec for at
129 least five years, both upon hospital admission and discharge. As this study focussed on
130 MedRec in a real-world setting, included wards varied based on the MedRec activities of
131 each hospital (orthopaedics, surgery, pulmonary diseases, internal medicine and cardiology;
132 table 1).

133

134 *Study population*

135 All consecutive patients admitted to a selected hospital were included if a patient had
136 medication intended for chronic use before admission. Patients received MedRec both upon
137 hospital admission and discharge. All included patients had had at least a discharge
138 interview, those without an admission interview (eg due to a short length of stay) were
139 included in case the interview could be executed upon discharge. Patients incapable to be
140 interviewed e.g. with a language barrier were excluded. Also, patients living in an
141 institutionalised setting before admission were excluded (presuming dependence in
142 medication administration with consequent inability of assessing a medication history from
143 the patient or their proxy). Per hospital we included 150 patients (900 total) based on a
144 previous analysis on the same data.¹¹

145 *Medication Reconciliation*

146 At the time of inclusion most patients (>90%) used one community pharmacy (CP)¹⁷. Here,
147 prescriptions from multiple prescribers are documented. Therefore, a medication history from
148 the CP combined with a patient interview is considered gold standard to obtain the Best
149 Possible Medication History (BPMH) in the Netherlands^{18,19}. In case of doubt the GP could be
150 consulted. Generally, the medication history of the CP is electronically available, otherwise it
151 was obtained by fax.^{15,20}

152 MedRec is fulfilled as described in appendix box 1a and performed by (specialized)
153 pharmacy technicians with background support of pharmacists. Pharmacy technicians have
154 shown to perform MedRec accurately in the Netherlands.²¹ They have had a three year
155 intermediate vocational training, which involves a combination of study at a college or open
156 learning, in addition to practical working experience. A pharmacy technician can specialise
157 further into pharmaceutical consultants, who have received an additional 3 year bachelor
158 training focused on pharmacotherapy and communication.

159

160 *Quantitative outcomes*

161 Number and type of interventions in the verification - and clarification step of MedRec, i.e.
162 resolving unintentional medication discrepancies and optimization of pharmacotherapy
163 upon admission and discharge.

164

165 *Data collection*

166 All data were collected by three trained data collectors from hospital patient records and
167 admission/discharge pharmacy checklists. Participating pharmacists and pharmacy
168 technicians documented proposed medication changes (interventions) on their checklist,
169 and, if possible communicated with the physician in charge of the patient, who would follow
170 or reject the advice. Accepted interventions were counted, non-accepted interventions were
171 regarded as either an intentional medication change or a non-relevant suggestion for an
172 intervention. In case interventions were not clearly documented, pharmacy teams were
173 available to clarify or, if no explanation could be provided, discarded.

174 Each accepted discrepancy or optimization was counted as an unique intervention. A single
175 drug could therefore induce several interventions, e.g. restarting furosemide on admission to
176 correct a discrepancy and adjusting the dose upon discharge back to the dose used at home
177 after a temporal dose increase. In case a discrepancy between the CP list and patient
178 reported use of medicines was noticed (including potentially stopped medication during
179 admission), this was checked in the electronic medical record and documented as stated by
180 the patient with discussion remarks. In case of doubt about the correct recall on medicines
181 use of the patient, additional measures were implemented (e.g. asking for medication boxes,
182 contacting GP).

183 Hospitals defined *unintended medication discrepancies* as differences among medication
184 regimens i.e., between actual use of a patient's home regimen and medications prescribed
185 upon admission or discharge.²²

186 *Optimizations of medication* entail a check on whether the medication list is adequate and
187 optimal regarding (high risk) medication (eg NSAID use in combination with gastro-protection
188 in elderly) and on duplication of therapy, based on guidelines. Both discrepancies and

189 optimizations were recorded as described by Karapinar et al. and classified into the
190 categories as described in appendix box 1b: *start*, *dosage*, *switch* and *discontinuation*.^{15,16}

191

192 The following covariates were collected: number of chronic drugs (based on BPMH upon
193 hospital discharge) and demographic data including age, gender and social class (via postal-
194 code).^{23 24} Postal-codes were also used for deprived neighbourhoods as registered by The
195 Dutch Healthcare Authority (NZA).²⁵

196

197 *Analysis*

198 Statistics were executed with SPSS 23. Total and mean numbers of interventions both on
199 medication discrepancies and optimizations per patient were calculated in patients with either
200 an admission-, or discharge interview. Mean (standard deviation) or median (range) were
201 determined dependent on the distribution of data. To compare hospitals regarding their case-
202 mix, normally distributed continuous variables including age, number of admission- and
203 discharge medications was analysed by ANOVA. For analysis on differences in gender,
204 social class, deprived area, length of hospital stay, ward and admission type, the Pearson
205 Chi-square test was used.

206 QUALITATIVE PART

207 *Design*

208 A qualitative explorative study using individual interviews and a focus group interview, was
209 conducted. For the data analysis a content analysis was performed.

210

211 *Participants*

212 For the interviews, responsible pharmacists (1 to 2 per hospital) and pharmacy technicians (2
213 - 4 per hospital) from included hospitals participating in the quantitative part of the study and
214 present at the time of investigators visit, were eligible.

215 Involved pharmacy team members were invited to attend the focus group discussion. Five
216 pharmacists participated in person, one was contacted by phone.

217 *Data collection*

218 The qualitative part consisted of an inventory questionnaire to get knowledge on
219 (hospital)pharmacy components of MedRec activities and feasibility of data collection.
220 Questions included were for instance: how was the MedRec process performed (eg were all
221 4 steps implemented) and what type of staff members performed MedRec (see table 2 for all
222 topics). The questionnaire was completed during an in person, semi-structured interview with
223 participants. All interviews were conducted by the first investigator (female, pharmacist, > 20
224 years' experience in community -, outpatient- and hospital pharmacy). The questionnaire
225 was developed based on literature, experience and expert-discussion (FK, BvB). To
226 understand the causes for differences in numbers of MedRec interventions, an explanatory
227 focus group was conducted. During this focus group, we reached a point of 'theoretical
228 saturation' as focus group members could not provide new concepts regarding the
229 differences in the quantitative results.

230 To ensure correct interpretation of collected information, all interviewees were sent the
231 outcomes of the questionnaire to provide feedback on the data (member check).

232

233 An independent moderator (KT) led the group and FK acted as an observer to document
234 relevant contributions that would not necessarily have been picked up by audio-recording.
235 Interviewees gave oral consent for audio recording and anonymity was guaranteed.
236 Before the meeting, all attendees were provided with drafts of the table and figures to get a
237 clear overview of processes in each centre, patient characteristics and numbers and types of
238 interventions. KT proposed to touch upon the following themes (based on differences
239 between hospitals in the quantitative results) : differences in processes, persons performing
240 MedRec and patient-mix.

241 The audio-recording was transcribed verbatim by an official transcriber. Also, a member
242 check was conducted by sending participants a summary of the transcripts in order to
243 provide feedback on the factual and interpretive accuracy of the data.

244

245 *Qualitative Outcome*

246 Explanations for differences in numbers of MedRec interventions by a focus group
247 discussion.

248

249 *Analysis*

250 Based on the group discussion, an inductive, content analysis was applied on the transcripts.
251 First, relevant text fragments were selected individually by three researchers (CS, FK, BB)
252 and compared to ensure no data would be missed. Second, the first researcher performed
253 the open coding of the fragments, and applied axial coding. Relationships between the open
254 codes were identified with axial coding and the codes were labelled into themes. This
255 process was reviewed in its entirety by two researchers (FK, BB) until all researchers fully
256 agreed on the content of the themes.

257

258 **Results**

259 QUANTITATIVE PART

260 Overall, 899 of 900 patients were included (one exclusion due to missing information on
261 medication use). On admission 765 (85% of 899) and upon discharge 632 (70%) patients
262 received MedRec (table 1).

263 Most participants were elderly patients with a low social class (50%) (mean age 65 years,
264 gender equally distributed) and were admitted on internal medicines, lung diseases and
265 surgery. Overall, acute-, and elective admissions were equally distributed. However,
266 individual hospitals varied highly in the proportion of acute admissions (0-100%), median

267 length of stay (4 - 9 days), mean number of admission medications (6.4 -10.8) and social
268 class (17-75% in the lowest category) (table 1).

269

270 *Number and types of interventions*

271 Overall, 2309 (74%) interventions were accepted by physicians; 1675 interventions (in 765
272 interviewed patients) were collected on admission and 634 (632 patients) upon discharge.

273

274 *Unintended discrepancies (verification)*

275 On admission, the proportion of patients with at least one discrepancy varied between
276 hospitals from 36% to 95%. Upon discharge, this ranged from 5% to 28% of patients.

277

278 **Figure 1 mean number and type of interventions per patient due to unintentional** 279 **discrepancies upon admission and discharge**

280

281

282 Overall, hospitals varied with regard to the distribution of types of interventions. In general,
283 start and dosage interventions were most frequently implemented, as medication a patient
284 used pre-admission was omitted or patients used different dosages. Also, stops and switches
285 were needed: medication was prescribed that the patient did not use anymore (commission
286 error) or patients used another drug at home (e.g. pantoprazole instead of omeprazole).

287 Upon discharge, start interventions were performed most frequently in the majority of the
288 hospitals (e.g. restart of pre-admission medication that was temporarily discontinued).

289

290 *Optimizations of medication*

291 On admission, the proportion of patients with at least one optimization varied from 0 to 27%
292 and upon discharge, this ranged from 2 to 95% of patients. Highest numbers of optimizations
293 were found in hospitals where the clarification step was integrated into the MedRec process,

294 specifically on discontinuation of medication (e.g. discontinuing hypnotics that were initiated
295 during admission and had no indication anymore upon discharge)(figure 2).

296

297

298 **Figure 2 mean number and type of optimizations per patient per hospital on**
299 **admission and discharge**

300 QUALITATIVE PART

301 *MedRec differences between hospitals*

302 Analysis of the audio-transcript of the focus group emerged in three themes: *who* performed
303 MedRec, *where* and *how* was MedRec performed (table 2).

304

305 *Who* (interviewer, patient mix, physician type)

306 interviewer: all participants agreed that highly trained MedRec interviewers, resulted
307 in high numbers of pharmacy interventions (although hospital A, with the highest
308 numbers of interventions, had both higher educated and highly trained interviewers).

309 Therapeutic knowledge of medicines use was judged key to apply properly
310 optimization checklists (see below) in order to remove inappropriate and unnecessary
311 medications from a patient's medication list.

312 patient-mix/physician type: participants agreed that surgical patients generally have
313 less discrepancies versus general wards as they use less medication. Also,
314 participants reflected that a high social class would result in less discrepancies due to
315 the higher education level. This could explain the high amount of interventions in
316 hospital A with 75% of patients having a low social class and 100% patients from the
317 pulmonary department. In contrast: hospital B, C and D included a substantial
318 percentage of surgical patients resulting in the lowest number of interventions upon
319 discharge (table 1, figures 1,2). According to participating pharmacists, surgeons
320 generally will not act upon optimization interventions.

321 Hospital A and E had very comparable workflows but had different numbers of
322 interventions on discrepancies: 3.0 versus 1.1 on admission (figure 1). Included
323 patients differed highly: lung diseases only (hospital A), as compared to 70% of
324 internal medicine patients (hospital E, table 1). In participants' opinion, internal
325 medicine doctors pay more attention to medication, probably resulting in a lower
326 number of discrepancies (less found by the pharmacy team), even though high
327 numbers of medication were used.

328 *Where* (at home, outpatient pharmacy or on the ward)

329 Pre-admission preparation at home: a form filled out by the patient himself (instead of
330 using the CP medication history to perform MedRec) several weeks before elective
331 admission, resulted in a shift in type of interventions from start to dosage (figure 1,
332 hospital C and D). Patients appeared to recall which medicines were used, but failed
333 to note or remember dose and/or strength of a medication. This resulted in the high
334 number of dosage interventions when MedRec was performed as compared to
335 omissions in all other centres.

336 Location of the interviews (ward versus outpatient pharmacy): two hospitals, B and D,
337 discussed discharge medication and counselled patients in the outpatient pharmacy
338 only, instead of ward-based counselling. Those hospitals had at least 50% less
339 interventions on discrepancies as compared to hospitals with ward-based MedRec
340 and/or telephone interviews. This might have been the result of a less intense
341 connection with in-hospital activities, according to participants.

342 *How* (optimizations and documentation)

343 optimizations: hospitals differed in numbers and types of medication optimizations (0-
344 8 checks structurally included) eg the extensiveness of the checklist resulted in large
345 differences in numbers of optimization interventions (figure 2). Furthermore, in
346 hospital E, two pharmacists performed a medication review for selected patients
347 (elderly, more medications) which, potentially contributed to the higher number of
348 optimization interventions, specifically upon discharge. This higher yield was

349 explained by acceptance of certain clinical situations (in the context of medication
350 use) while being admitted and were discussed during medication review while action
351 and documentation was postponed to discharge (e.g. accepting potassium supplementation
352 in combination with potassium sparing medications while being admitted, but not in
353 the outpatient setting without frequent lab control).

354

355

356 **Table 2 categories and sub-classifications extracted from the focusgroup**

357

358

359 Discussion

360 *Key findings*

361 In this real-world setting study, quantitative and qualitative comparison of MedRec processes
362 in 6 different hospitals revealed considerable differences in numbers of interventions: upon
363 admission, patients with at least one discrepancy varied from 36-95%, while upon discharge,
364 these numbers ranged from 5-28%. Optimizations reached 2% (admission) to 95%
365 (discharge). Based on the qualitative analysis, we identified three main themes explaining
366 differences between hospitals: patient- and healthcare professionals involved, where the
367 interview was started or performed and to what extent medication optimization was
368 embedded in the process.

369 *Comparison with previous work*

370 In a recently published report (among 19 hospitals) the large variability between hospitals on
371 performance of all steps was confirmed.²⁶ In this report describing highly involved hospitals
372 and pharmacy teams, the variation was explained by obstacles like resource shortage,
373 available staff and enthusiasm of the management. Comparable results were found in a
374 study of the MedRec process in four acute care hospitals: varying levels of compliance with
375 guidelines were noticed e.g. interview with the patient occurred in less than half of all
376 MedRec (45.7%).²⁷ Other important barriers for MedRec implementation mentioned were:
377 lack of awareness and insufficient knowledge of health care professionals.¹³ Apart from
378 aforementioned obstacles and high risk patient population (elderly with or without
379 polypharmacy), other factors like, social class and process-related factors have not been
380 mentioned or investigated in previous studies. Therefore, our results give new insight in
381 facilitators and barriers to perform MedRec activities within hospitals.

382 *Implications for practice*

383 This retrospective cohort without robust analysis should be interpreted with caution prior to
384 further research. However, some specific topics may have the potential of a quick win in daily
385 practice: differences in types of interventions were noticed amongst electively admitted

386 patients having had the ability to fill out their medication list before admission. In that case,
387 the majority of MedRec interventions were on dosage adaptations, whereas in situations
388 lacking this patient list, medication was mostly started due to MedRec. Hence, the most
389 common intervention type changed from omission to dosage, which might decrease the
390 severity of the error from moderate to mild.²⁸ Furthermore, an optimization checklist
391 increased the number of interventions on general wards. This effect on inappropriate
392 medication use by standardization of a medication chart, especially with a high number of
393 focus points, has been proven previously.^{29,30} However, no such effect was noticed on
394 surgical wards in our study. This was explained by the fact that surgeons generally will not
395 act upon optimization interventions and the high number of general, non-surgical focus points
396 in the checklist.

397 Introduction of medication review (for selected patients) increased the intervention numbers
398 as compared to the other hospitals (figure 1), giving room to a further improvement of health
399 problems in daily live.³¹

400 Upon discharge, some hospitals had very low numbers of interventions. Two potential
401 explanations were given: 1. high numbers of surgical patients in combination with 2. MedRec
402 performed solely in the outpatient pharmacy (plus discharge medication dispensing).
403 Probably, to prevent a surgical patient from medication related problems, either an admission
404 interview only might be sufficient, (as reflected by the high number of discrepancy
405 interventions on admission in hospital C) and/or a closer connection with the clinic (both
406 pharmacy teams and physicians) may result in better communication and acceptance of
407 more interventions.

408 *Strengths and limitations*

409 To our knowledge this is the first multi-center analysis on MedRec processes providing
410 insight into differences in interventions on medication discrepancies and - optimizations.
411 Inclusion of a large and varied population (eg different patient categories and physician-
412 types) increased generalizability and transferability; the connection of quantitative and

413 qualitative results created the ability to improve our understanding of MedRec and give input
414 for new research.

415 However, several limitations have to be mentioned. First, this study was performed in the
416 Netherlands, reducing its external generalisability due to differences in health care systems.
417 However, we expect that the main drivers between differences in MedRec interventions will
418 not extremely differ between countries. Not all possible factors influencing the extent of
419 MEdRec are measured in the quantitative part of this study (eg specific patient
420 characteristics like disease burden and workload of those who perform MedRec). However,
421 the qualitative synthesis gave important insight and augmented also new facilitators and
422 barriers for MedRec.

423 Third, documentation between hospitals differed and the retrospective nature of the study
424 gave rise to a reporting bias as interventions were not always clear. This could result in an
425 underestimation of the total number of interventions. However, this was not very frequent
426 except for hospital F where we excluded the discharge results. Fourth, the actual impact of
427 prevention of medication discrepancies on the individual patient has not been analysed.
428 Therefore, we do not know if these discrepancies would have resulted in patient harm.
429 However, Mekonnen et al. showed that a pharmacist-led MedRec program upon hospital
430 transitions decreased ADE-related hospital revisits, all-cause readmissions and ED visits,
431 resulting in a positive impact of MedRec.³²

432

433 **Conclusion**

434 Hospitals differed greatly in the number of interventions performed during MedRec. Upon
435 admission a variation of 0.4-3.7 interventions per patient was noted. Upon discharge the
436 variation was 0.1-1.7 interventions per patient. A combination of patientmix, healthcare
437 professionals involved, location and moment of the interview plus embedding and extent of
438 medication optimization resulted in the highest yield of MedRec interventions on unintended
439 medication discrepancies and optimizations.

440

441 **Statements and declarations**

442 The authors have no conflicts of interest to declare. They declare to have no financial or non-
443 financial interests that are directly or indirectly related to the work submitted for publication.

444

445 The dataset generated during and/or analysed during the current study is available from the
446 corresponding author on reasonable request.

447 **Funding**

448 This study is supported by insurance company Stichting Volksgezondheidszorg Zuid
449 Nederland (VGZ) Eindhoven, the Netherlands. The funding source had no role in the design,
450 conduct, and reporting of the study or in the decision to submit the results for publication

451

452 **References**

- 453 1. Tam VC, Knowles SR, Cornish PL, et al. Frequency, type and clinical importance of
454 medication history errors at admission to hospital: a systematic review. *CMAJ*.
455 2005;173(5):510-515.
- 456 2. Cornish PL, Knowles SR, Marchesano R, et al. Unintended medication discrepancies
457 at the time of hospital admission. *Arch Intern Med*. 2005;165(4):424-429.
- 458 3. Using medication reconciliation to prevent errors. *Jt Comm J Qual Patient Saf*.
459 2006;32(4):230-232.
- 460 4. Schnipper JL, Kirwin JL, Cotugno MC, et al. Role of pharmacist counseling in
461 preventing adverse drug events after hospitalization. *Arch Intern Med*.
462 2006;166(5):565-571.
- 463 5. Boockvar K, Liu S, Goldstein N, et al. Prescribing discrepancies likely to cause
464 adverse drug events after patient transfer. *Qual Saf Health Care*. 2009;18(1):32-36.
- 465 6. Institute For Healthcare Improvement. Reconcile Medications at All Transition Points.
- 466 7. Cheema E, Alhomoud FK, Kinsara ASA-D, et al. The impact of pharmacists-led

- 467 medicines reconciliation on healthcare outcomes in secondary care: A systematic
468 review and meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. *PLoS One*.
469 2018;13(3):e0193510.
- 470 8. Redmond P, Grimes T, McDonnell R, et al. Tackling transitions in patient care: the
471 process of medication reconciliation. *Fam Pract*. 2013;30(5):483-484.
- 472 9. Lehnbohm EC, Stewart MJ, Manias E, et al. Impact of Medication Reconciliation and
473 Review on Clinical Outcomes. *Ann Pharmacother*. 2014;48(10):1298-1312.
- 474 10. Rennke S, Nguyen OK, Shoeb MH, et al. Hospital-initiated transitional care
475 interventions as a patient safety strategy: a systematic review. *Ann Intern Med*.
476 2013;158(5 Pt 2):433-440.
- 477 11. Stuijt CCM, vd Bemt B, Boerlage VE, et al. Determinants for medication reconciliation
478 interventions on hospital admission and discharge: An observational multi-centre
479 study. *Eur J Intern Med*. 2017;46:e20-e22.
- 480 12. Penm J, Vaillancourt R, Pouliot A. Defining and identifying concepts of medication
481 reconciliation: An international pharmacy perspective. *Res Social Adm Pharm*.
482 2019;15(6):632-640.
- 483 13. van Sluisveld N, Zegers M, Natsch S, et al. Medication reconciliation at hospital
484 admission and discharge: insufficient knowledge, unclear task reallocation and lack of
485 collaboration as major barriers to medication safety. *BMC Health Serv Res*.
486 2012;12:170.
- 487 14. Leotsakos A, Zheng H, Croteau R, et al. Standardization in patient safety: the WHO
488 High 5s project. *Int J Qual Heal Care*. 2014;26(2):109-116.
- 489 15. Karapinar-Carkit F, Borgsteede SD, Zoer J, et al. Effect of medication reconciliation
490 with and without patient counseling on the number of pharmaceutical interventions
491 among patients discharged from the hospital. *Ann Pharmacother*. 2009;43(6):1001-
492 1010.
- 493 16. Ní Chróinín D, Neto HM, Xiao D, et al. Potentially inappropriate medications (PIMs) in
494 older hospital in-patients: Prevalence, contribution to hospital admission and

- 495 documentation of rationale for continuation. *Australas J Ageing*. 2016;35(4):262-265.
- 496 17. Richter J, van Starckenburg L, Lukaart J TM. Zijn indicatoren berekend met
497 aflevergegevens per apotheek valide om apothekers te vergelijken wat betreft hun
498 prestaties bij het bevorderen van therapietrouw? *PW Wet Platf*. 2013;7:a1315.
- 499 18. Buurma H, Bouvy ML, De Smet PAGM, et al. Prevalence and determinants of
500 pharmacy shopping behaviour. *J Clin Pharm Ther*. 2008;33(1):17-23.
- 501 19. VeiligheidsManagementSysteem (VMS) [Safety Management System]. Medication
502 reconciliation on admission and discharge [medicatieverificatie bij opname en ontslag].
- 503 20. Central Medication Registration alerts (CMR). CMR's List of High Alert- medications.
- 504 21. van den Bemt PMLA, van der Schrieck-de Loos EM, van der Linden C, et al. Effect of
505 Medication Reconciliation on Unintentional Medication Discrepancies in Acute Hospital
506 Admissions of Elderly Adults: A Multicenter Study. *J Am Geriatr Soc*. Published online
507 July 19, 2013.
- 508 22. Coleman EA, Smith JD, Raha D, et al. Posthospital medication discrepancies:
509 prevalence and contributing factors. *Arch Intern Med*. 2005;165(16):1842-1847.
- 510 23. Stephens M, Fox B, Kukulka G, et al. Medication, allergy, and adverse drug event
511 discrepancies in ambulatory care. *Fam Med*. 2008;40(2):107-110.
- 512 24. van Hooijdonk C, Droomers M, Deerenberg IM, et al. The diversity in associations
513 between community social capital and health per health outcome, population group
514 and location studied. *Int J Epidemiol*. 2008;37(6):1384-1392.
- 515 25. Dutch Authority of Healthcare. Geographic distribution of deprived neighbourhoods and
516 their problems. Selection criteria for the determination of 40 deprived neighbourhoods.
- 517 26. Blok C de, Koster E, Schilp J, et al. *Implementation VMS Safety Program: Evaluation*
518 *in Dutch Hospitals. [Implementatie VMS Veiligheidsprogramma: Evaluatieonderzoek in*
519 *Nederlandse Ziekenhuizen]*; 2013.
- 520 27. Urban R, Armitage G, Morgan J, et al. Custom and practice: A multi-center study of
521 medicines reconciliation following admission in four acute hospitals in the UK. *Res*
522 *Social Adm Pharm*. 2014;10(2):355-368.

- 523 28. Quélenec B, Beretz L, Paya D, et al. Potential clinical impact of medication
524 discrepancies at hospital admission. *Eur J Intern Med.* 2013;24(6).
- 525 29. Leendertse AJ, Egberts ACG, Stoker LJ, et al. Frequency of and risk factors for
526 preventable medication-related hospital admissions in the Netherlands. *Arch Intern*
527 *Med.* 2008;168(17):1890-1896.
- 528 30. Coombes ID, Stowasser DA, Reid C, et al. Impact of a standard medication chart on
529 prescribing errors: a before-and-after audit. *Qual Saf Health Care.* 2009;18(6):478-
530 485.
- 531 31. Verdoorn S, Kwint H-F, Blom JW, et al. Effects of a clinical medication review focused
532 on personal goals, quality of life, and health problems in older persons with
533 polypharmacy: A randomised controlled trial (DREAMeR-study). *PLoS Med.*
534 2019;16(5):e1002798.
- 535 32. Mekonnen AB, McLachlan AJ, Brien J-AE. Effectiveness of pharmacist-led medication
536 reconciliation programmes on clinical outcomes at hospital transitions: a systematic
537 review and meta-analysis. *BMJ Open.* 2016;6(2):e010003.
- 538

Table 1 hospital and overall included patient characteristics

<i>Hospital</i>	A	B	C	D	E	F
<i>County (region)</i>	Capital (West)	Drenthe (North)	Gelderland (East)	Zuid Holland (West)	Utrecht (Centre)	Limburg (south)
<i>surrounding</i>	Urban	Rural	Rural	Urban	Urban	Urban
<i>Type</i>	Teaching	General	Specialized	General	Teaching	Teaching
<i>Number of beds 2012</i>	551	284	317	722	1102	536
<i>Wards with MR activities by pharmacies in 2012</i>	Lung diseases Internal medicine Cardiology Neurology	All wards including ICU, paediatrics	All wards	75% all admissions covered; discharge counselling if patient passes by outpatient pharmacy or on request physician	All wards except ICUs	All wards except ED
<i>Study wards and number of patients included (n)</i>	Lung diseases (150)	Internal medicines (27) Cardiology (50) Surgery (73)	Orthopaedics (150)	Internal medicines (23) Gastroenterology (4) Surgery (114) Lung diseases (8)	Internal medicines (107) Gastroenterology (12) Surgery (28) Lung diseases (3)	Internal medicines (85) Lung disease (65)
<i>length of stay, median (range)</i>	9.0 (3-48)	4.0 (1-60)	6.0 (1-115)	6.0 (1-21)	7.0 (2-32)	7.0 (2-37)
<i>number admission medications, mean (SD)</i>	9.1 (4.5)	6.4 (3.4)	- ‡	8.5 (4.1)	10.8 (4.3)	7.8 (4.3)
<i>number discharge medications, mean (SD)</i>	10.9 (4.8)	8.2 (4.0)	11.1 (4.1)	8.8 (3.6)	10.4 (4.3)	-

<i>Number admission/discharge interviews*</i>	108/149	140/92	145/136	147/149	78/106	146/-
<i>age, mean (SD)**</i>	67.2 (13.3)	62.1 (16.5)	61.2 (12.9)	69.3 (12.4)	66.1 (14.6)	69.1 (13.0)
<i>female, n (%)**</i>	44 (41)	80 (57)	97 (67)	84 (57)	46 (59)	79 (54)
<i>low social class, n (%)**</i>	81 (75)	83 (59)	46 (32)	57 (39)	13 (17)	85 (58)
<i>deprived area, n (%)**</i>	48 (44)	0	2 (1)	10 (7)	4 (5)	4 (3)

age, number of admission- and discharge medications, length of stay showed significant differences between hospitals (p=0.000)


‡ no differentiation on admission or pre-admission medication was possible

* Admission: 134 patients had no interview, 69 (51%) patients of which were admitted to hospital E and met their exclusion criteria for medication reconciliation, 44 (25%) were incapable of being interviewed without the presence of a caregiver or had a language barrier and 21 (16%) of which had the MedRec interview upon being discharged due to a short length of stay.

Upon discharge, 632 (70%) patients were interviewed and included. Patients from hospital F (n=150, 16%) were excluded due to incomplete documentation regarding intervention performance, 117 patients (15%) were missed due to an unexpected discharge.

** on admission, discharge figures were comparable and changed in a non-significant manner

Figure 1 mean number and type of interventions per patient due to unintentional discrepancies upon admission and discharge




* discharge excluded due to the high number of interventions without documentation on acceptance.

adm: admission

dis: discharge

Figure 2 mean number of optimizations per patient per hospital upon admission and discharge



* discharge excluded due to the high number of interventions without documentation on acceptance.

Adm: admission

Disc: discharge

Table 2 categories and sub-classifications extracted from interview and focusgroup

WHO	A	B	C	D	E	F
Patient selection:	Non	Non	Non	Non	High risk patients*	Exclusion UDS**
Type of pharmacy team members involved:	Pharmaceutical consultant	Pharmacy technician + pharmacist check	Pharmacy technician + pharmacist check Nurse	Pharmacy technician + specialized pharmacy technician + pharmaceutical consultant Nurse	Specialized pharmacy technician + pharmaceutical consultant + pharmacist	Pharmacy technician
WHERE (location interview)	A	B	C	D	E	F
<i>Admission</i>						
	On the ward	Outpatient clinic (elective) On the ward	@ home (mail/phone) On the ward	Elective patients: @ home (mail/phone) On the ward	@ home (mail/phone) On the ward	Outpatient clinic (elective) On the ward
<i>Discharge</i>						
	On the ward	Outpatient pharmacy [†]	On the ward Outpatient pharmacy	Outpatient pharmacy	On the ward Outpatient pharmacy + @home by phone	Outpatient pharmacy

HOW (process)	A	B	C	D	E	F
Admission						
Verification: Information collection	digital or paper-based pharmacy dispensing information and GP	Digital pharmacy dispensing information	Patient list, extra check high risk patients***, lab results	Digital pharmacy dispensing information	digital or paper-based pharmacy dispensing information and GP	digital or paper-based pharmacy dispensing information
Clarification: Optimisation medication	8 focuspoints, generally discussed @ discharge	Thrombo-prophylaxis, oral antidiabetics	see above: focus on renal function, pain meds	No extra checks	see discharge	no extra checks
Suggested medication changes	Substitution implementation of medication changes after check with physician	implementation of medication changes by pharmacy without physician check	No substitution implementation of medication changes after check with physician	Only acutely based on prescriptions	Substitution discussion with doctor after medication review	Only acutely based on prescriptions
Documentation	On electronic dispensing information from pharmacy and checklist (not visible for other healthcare professionals)	On checklist (not visible for other healthcare professionals)	On Checklist (not visible for other healthcare professionals)	? not visible for other healthcare professionals	In EPD and on electronic dispensing information from pharmacy (partly available for other healthcare professionals)	Electronic pre-registration (elective patients) available for other healthcare professionals
Discharge						
Optimisation (number of	8	2	2	0	6 ⁺⁺	3 (surgical ward only)

focuspoints)	A		B		C		D		E		F	
WHEN (timing activity)	A		B		C		D		E		F	
Admission	Day admission		Day admission		Weeks before procedure by mail		Weeks before procedure		Weeks before procedure by phone		Weeks before procedure	
Discharge	If discharge announced 24h beforehand		Only if patient passes by outpatient pharmacy		Always		Only if patient passes by outpatient pharmacy		If discharge announced 24h beforehand		Only if patient passes by outpatient pharmacy	

* Patient interview only in case of >3 chronic drugs + 50 years or over (70-80% of all patients)

** patients with drugs dispensed in unified dosing systems (UDS, Baxter)) are not counselled

*** extra check for high risk patients right before admission (age > 65 years and > 5 chronic medications). All patients fill out their own medication lists before the elective admission

† An *outpatient pharmacy* is a pharmacy based in the outpatient clinic of a hospital with community pharmacy activities, generally with close connections with the hospital pharmacy

†† all issues during medication review if applicable + check on renal function and electrolytes