1 ARTICLE TITLE

2 Pharmacogenomics implementation training improve self-efficacy and competency to drive adoption

3 in clinical practice

4

5 AUTHOR NAMES

Fadhli Adesta^{1†}, Caroline Mahendra^{1†}, Kathleen Irena Junusmin¹, Arya Melissa Selva Rajah¹, Sharon
 Goh¹, Levana Sani¹, Alexandre Chan², Astrid Irwanto^{1,3*}

8

9 AUTHOR AFFILIATIONS

- ¹Nalagenetics Pte Ltd, Singapore
- 11 ²Department of Clinical Pharmacy Practice, School of Pharmacy & Pharmaceutical Sciences,
- 12 University of California, Irvine
- ³Department of Pharmacy, Faculty of Science, National University of Singapore
- ¹⁴ [†]These authors contributed equally to this work.
- 15 *Author for correspondence: astrid@nalagenetics.com

16

17 ABSTRACT

- 18 Background: Administration of pharmacogenomics (PGx) testing in clinical practice has been
- 19 suboptimal, presumably due to lack of PGx education. Here, we aim to evaluate the standpoint of
- 20 PGx testing among a diverse group of healthcare professionals (HCPs) through conducting surveys
- 21 before and after training. Materials & Methods: Training modules were designed to cover 3 key
- 22 learning objectives and deployed in 5 sections. A pre- and post-training survey questionnaire was
- 23 used to evaluate participants self-assessments on employing PGx in clinical practice. Results &
- 24 **Conclusion:** Out of all enrollments, 102 survey responses were collected. Overall, respondents agree
- 25 on the benefits of PGx testing, but have inadequate self-efficacy and competency in utilizing PGx
- data. Our results show that training significantly improve these, and even leading to greater
- 27 anticipation of PGx adoption.
- 28
- 29 **KEYWORDS:** Healthcare professionals, education, implementation training, pharmacogenomics,
- 30 programme evaluation

31

32 INTRODUCTION

Pharmacogenomics (PGx) focuses on the influence of genetic variations on drug response [1]. PGx is progressing from identifying drug-gene pairs to assimilating into clinical practice [2]. A recent study conducted in Singapore observed that 30% of adverse drug reactions (ADRs) were caused by at least one drug with a PGx clinical annotation, suggesting the potential to prevent ADR occurrence via PGx testing [3]. Despite PGx testing demonstrating its potential to enhance medication safety and 38 efficacy [4], its utility in clinical practice has been suboptimal [5], specifically in Asia [6]. The lack of

39 PGx education is an often-cited barrier to the widespread implementation of PGx [7–10].

40 Although PGx didactic teaching is increasing in undergraduate and postgraduate schools of medicine

and pharmacy [2,10–15], PGx education is not readily available to practising clinicians [5,10,16].

42 Clinicians may not have sufficient training and educational background to offer patient care

43 incorporating PGx and personalized care overall [5,8]. Consequently, their poor perceived ability to

44 clinically integrate PGx has been widely reported [5,9,10,16,17]. In particular, a survey on

45 Singaporean clinicians practising in psychiatry observed that only 46.4% of respondents felt

46 competent to order PGx tests [5]. In this regard, PGx education may help to bridge the knowledge

47 translation gap of PGx use among clinicians [16].

48 PGx educational courses may be the key to encouraging greater assimilation of PGx into routine 49 practice, having proven to improve attitudes [7] and increase the adoption of testing [18]. A study 50 conducted on physicians observed that a 45-minute PGx presentation can improve their attitudes 51 towards PGx testing [7]. PGx educational courses would have to be constantly updated to ensure 52 sustainable PGx assimilation into routine clinical practice [4,6]. This study is novel because this is the 53 first training material that considers the current level of understanding in Asian healthcare 54 professionals towards pharmacogenomics. It is also novel because of the evaluation of such training 55 material being tested to offline and online healthcare professionals. Therefore, this study aims to 56 evaluate the development and outcomes of a PGx implementation training programme. Participants' perceptions of the clinical relevance and utility of PGx, and their self-efficacy and knowledge to 57 58 integrate PGx into practice were assessed.

59

60 MATERIALS AND METHODS

61 Study Design and Subjects

62 This is a mixed method study incorporating two phases: (1) development of training materials and 63 (2) training evaluation measures. In the first phase (development phase), we build the training 64 materials consisting of two versions, TM1 (prototype) and TM2 (finalized). The flow of training 65 delivery is as stated in Fig 1b. Both trainings were conducted by licensed pharmacists who are 66 certified in PGx through American Society of Health-System Pharmacists (ASHP). In the second 67 phase, we assess the designed training materials through pre- and post-surveys after each training. 68 Healthcare professionals (HCPs) were recruited to participate in the focus group discussion (FGD) 69 including medical practitioners (both general practitioners and specialists) as well as pharmacists 70 and students for diversity. Written consent was obtained from FGD participants, highlighting 71 voluntary participation.

72

73 Phase 1: Development of Training Materials

The content of both training materials focused on the PGx applications. Training outcomes were based on the competency inventory curated by the Pharmacogenetics/Pharmacogenomics Special Interest Group of the American Association of Colleges of Pharmacy [19]. The training objectives were: (1) to understand PGx applications to clinical practice, (2) to engage in patient discussion about PGx testing, and (3) to interpret, evaluate and implement PGx recommendations.

80 Development of Training Material Prototype (TM1)

The "5W1H" approach was adopted for developing the initial training material. Elaborating on the "what, when, why, where, who and how" of PGx systematically introduced fundamental PGx concepts. The training began with "what" PGx is, defining fundamental terminology and key genetic concepts. Information on "where" HCPs may gather relevant PGx information and "how" to manoeuvre through PGx resources, such as PharmGKB, CPIC, and DPWG, was shared. A patient case was used to consolidate four concepts: "when" PGx testing can be implemented, "why" PGx is important, "how" HCPs can interpret PGx information, and "who" to apply PGx to in clinical settings.

88

89 TM1 Evaluation: Focus Group Discussion (FGD)

90 TM1 was used to conduct a 30-minute duration offline training before the FGD. The main objective 91 for the FGD was to collect feedback on TM1. The FGD spanned over an hour, was audio-recorded 92 and conducted offline. FGD questions were tailored to explore the participants' views on the 93 fundamentals of PGx, PGx applications and course delivery. Questions were structured in an open-94 ended format to facilitate rich discussion. The FGD sequence of questions mirrored the sequence of 95 TM1 content. Additionally, the free-flowing nature of the FGD allowed participants to voice 96 suggestions on supplementary aspects of the training. Feedback collected during this FGD was used 97 to revamp TM1 to TM2.

98

99 TM2 Implementation

100 TM2 was used to conduct the final PGx implementation training. The final presentation utilizing TM2 101 was 90 minutes long due to changes in content and was done online via a private e-learning 102 platform. This was due to the COVID-19 pandemic where social distancing was enforced. Therefore, 103 online training was the most appropriate alternative. Pre-post surveys were distributed to 104 participants before and after training respectively. The analysis of these surveys contributed to the 105 validation of TM2.

106

107 Phase 2: Training Evaluation Measures

108 We administered pre-training and post-training surveys to evaluate the training materials, both TM1 109 and TM2. Pre- and post-training surveys for TM1 were conducted offline while for TM2 were 110 conducted online. FGD participants brought forward insightful comments regarding blockers to 111 clinical pharmacogenomics implementation in the local context. Thus, feedback from the FGD was 112 used to modify the survey questions in TM1 assessment and the modified survey questions were 113 used to assess TM2, assessing the main blockers of clinical PGx implementation The surveys, gauging mostly parallel measures, were anonymous and unlinked. Written consent was obtained 114 115 from the participants, highlighting voluntary participation. Survey questions were adapted from 116 various studies analyzing HCPs' general PGx perceptions [1,5] and HCPs' attitudes and knowledge of 117 existing PGx pre- and post-education [7,20]. Due to differing training objectives and varying content, 118 specific modifications were made.

119The survey consisted of five sections. Perceptions and self-efficacy sections consisted of two sub-120sections (P1 and P2; SC1 and SC2) each and utilized five-point Likert scales. Knowledge questions121required participants to choose the best multiple choice options. Needs assessment and evaluation

of training sections were only included in the post-surveys. Rationales for each section are describedbelow.

124

125 Data Collection

Data collected was used to characterize the participants. To determine whether training could change clinical practice behaviour, the post-training survey also asked about experience with and anticipation of using PGx tests. An open ended section was incorporated in order to solicit feedback on the training course content and delivery to validate TM2 and facilitate future PGx educational programs.

131 Surveys incorporated the following aspects:

132 1. Perceptions

To assess training objective (1), we evaluated for a perception change in clinical relevance (P1) and utility (P2) of PGx. Questions asked in this section are related to how useful PGx is towards the subjects' clinical practice, and in what way PGx is useful.

136 2. Self-efficacy

Evaluation of how to utilize PGx data in making drug therapy decisions (SE1) and how to engage in
patient discussion about PGx (SE2) were necessary to assess training objectives (2) and (3).
Questions asked in this section are related to how competent the subjects feel about implementing
PGx practice.

141 3. Knowledge

Knowledge, comprehension and application questions regarding clinical PGx recommendations were crafted as a patient case scenario to evaluate for training objective (3). Knowledge assessments were adapted from ASHP's pharmacogenomics professional certification course. Questions assessing the knowledge taught in our developed PGx course were designed by licensed pharmacists who had undergone this ASHP's certification course, this section also included a case study example. The aforementioned concepts were adopted from the first three levels of Bloom's taxonomy, i.e. knowledge (remembering), comprehension (understanding), and application (applying).

149

150 Statistical Analysis

- 151 Ordinal data related to participants' perceptions and self-efficacy were summarized using median
- and interquartile range (IQR). Items assessed on a five-point Likert scale were collapsed and
- 153 presented as the percentage of agree, disagree and neutral responses. Distribution of responses
- between the pre- and post-training surveys were compared using Mann-Whitney U test. Knowledge
- 155 questions were scored as correct or incorrect, with missing items scored as incorrect. The
- 156 percentage of correct responses overall and for each question on the pre- and post-training surveys
- were compared using chi-square test. Statistical analyses were conducted using R Version 3.5.2, with
- 158 p < 0.05 considered as statistically significant.

159

160 **<u>RESULTS</u>**

161 **Phase 1: Development of training materials**

163 to PGx implementation. Due to limited time given for offline training, more-detailed materials such 164 as examples of drug-gene interactions were not explained in TM1. To develop TM2, feedback from 165 training participants was collected through an offline focus group discussion (FGD). Feedback 166 showed that the participants felt there were too few examples on common drug-gene interactions 167 and on how PGx can be implemented in clinical settings. From the feedback received, TM2 was 168 developed to have more in-depth materials, specifically for examples of drug-gene interactions 169 commonly found in clinical settings. More details on the science of PGx and drug-gene interactions 170 were also included in TM2. TM2 implementation was done online to have more flexibility in terms of

TM1 was implemented to train medical professionals who will be involved in a clinical study related

171 time and place needed to complete the whole material, as well as scalability. (Fig 1)

172

162

173 Characteristics of survey respondents from training

174 Overall, 102 respondents were collected in our study with 68 in TM1 and 34 in TM2. TM1

respondents consisted of 93.4% physicians, of which 68.9% mainly practiced in Family Medicine. On

the other hand, TM2 consisted of two major groups of respondents, with majority being 61.8%

177 physicians practicing Family Medicine and 33.3% pharmacy students. More than half of the

respondents in TM1 (60.3%) and TM2 (70%) are experienced practitioners with more than 5 years of

practice. Prior experience in PGx education is lacking across the respondents, only 27.9% in TM1 and

180 32.4% in TM2. This includes self-learning from independent resources (internet, colleague, journals,

drug labels or package inserts), attending a lecture or seminar, and/or enrolling university
 curriculum. (Table 1)

183

184 Relevance and utility of pharmacogenomics testing in clinical practice

To understand PGx applications in clinical practice, we evaluated for a perception change in clinical 185 186 relevance and utility of PGx. This was done by inquiring a set of perception questions pre- and post-187 training, relative to 5-point Likert-type scale (Fig 2, Table 2). Prior to training, 52.4% in TM1 and 188 62.5% in TM2 participants generally agree or strongly agree on the clinical relevance and utility of 189 PGx testing, indicating favorable perceptions towards PGx. This number increased even more after 190 training to 84.8% in TM1 and 88.1% in TM2. Overall, participants' median scoring in perceptions for 191 TM1 improved from 3 to 4 (Mann-Whitney U test, p < 0.05), suggesting statistically significant 192 positive perception change from TM1 training. While the corresponding median score for the online 193 training remained at 4 from TM2 (Mann-Whitney U test, p < 0.05). Notably, 77% from TM1 and 194 85.7% from TM2 respondents reported greater anticipation of using PGx tests after attending the 195 training.

196

197 Perceived ability in the implementation of pharmacogenomics in clinical setting

198 To evaluate the self-competency of respondents on the utilization of PGx data in making clinical

decisions, we assess their ability to engage in PGx discussion, and consider PGx recommendations.

200 We inquire on a set of self-efficacy questions on the perceived belief in ability to use PGx

201 information to guide drug therapy decisions and engagement in patient discussion about PGx

202 testing. Pre-training results demonstrate that respondents begin with inadequate self-efficacy in

using PGx data to guide medication therapy and engage with patients (Fig 2, Table 2). Upon

204 completion, both training increased their perceived ability in implementing PGx by 51.5% in TM1 and

44.6% in TM2. Participants median scoring in the self-efficacy section for both improved significantly

from 2 to 4 in TM1, and 3 to 4 in TM2 (Mann-Whitney U test, p < 0.05).

207

208 Knowledge and proficiency in applying pharmacogenomics to practice

Knowledge, comprehension and application questions were crafted as a patient case scenario to test
 the ability to interpret, evaluate and implement PGx recommendations following training. Questions
 were categorized under two sets – knowledge on theoretical PGx and practical clinical
 implementation of PGx. Respondents were quizzed pre- and post-training, and their performance

213 was assessed to evaluate improvements (Fig 2, Table 3). On average, respondents significantly

improved their correct response rate for proficiency questions by 15.1% in TM1 and 28.0% in TM2

215 (Chi-square test, p < 0.05). Both training have statistically significant improvements in scores for one

- 216 knowledge level question under theoretical PGx category (Table 3). On the practical implementation
- of PGx, significant improvements are seen for an application level in TM1 and a comprehension level
- 218 in TM2 (Table3).
- 219

220

221 **DISCUSSION**

222 This study evaluated the outcomes of PGx implementation training which was piloted at Continuing

223 Education (CE) seminars and further developed into an online training module. The aim of the

training was to educate respondents about the fundamental PGx theoretical concepts and clinical

applications. Here, we found that respondents displayed positive perceptions of the clinical

relevance and utility of PGx. We also demonstrated that PGx implementation training conducted as

a case-based presentation can improve self-efficacy to clinically apply PGx information and to

228 engage in PGx discussions.

229 There have been scarce resources available for doctors to learn pharmacogenomics online. The only

accredited online pharmacogenomics certification course is offered by American Society of Health-

231 System Pharmacists (ASHP). However, this course heavily focuses on how to set up a

pharmacogenomics practice, i.e. sourcing labs to run samples and obtaining stakeholder approval.

233 Our course aims to equip the enrollee with the most relevant clinical knowledge at the least amount

of time, without going into the administrative details.

235 Prior to training, we observed that respondents portrayed positive perceptions of PGx. These results

236 confirm the forward-thinking attitudinal findings gathered from other studies regarding clinicians'

237 belief in the concept of PGx and its potential benefits to improving drug efficacy and safety

238 [5,14,17,21]. Another study also concluded that their hour-long PGx seminar significantly improved

the attitudes of twelve physicians [7]. Advancements in PGx will continue and become more

important for patient care to improve drug efficacy and safety [4,22]. Furthermore, their perceptions

continued to improve significantly post-training, brightening prospects of increased PGx integration

242 into clinical practice.

243 Conversely, pre-training responses demonstrate low self-efficacy amongst participants to integrate 244 PGx into clinical practice. A knowledge translation gap of PGx use might explain their low perceived 245 competency [5]. Despite efforts to increase PGx education in undergraduate and postgraduate 246 healthcare courses [2,11–15,23,24], PGx educational efforts for clinicians are still not readily 247 available [5,10,16]. Consequently, clinicians lack confidence in their knowledge of what tests are 248 available, when and for whom to order, and how to interpret and incorporate PGx information to 249 drug therapy [4,9]. Therefore, there is a need to advocate for PGx education available to HCP's to 240 imprave their solf affiance in practicing PGy.

250 improve their self-efficacy in practicing PGx.

251 Training significantly improved participants' self-efficacy to integrate PGx into clinical practice. While

clinical experience is associated with increased perceived competency [5], clinicians must already be proficient to provide PGx services when the opportunity arises [10, 16]. Hence, it is important to

254 improve clinicians' self-efficacy to apply PGx to practice through education. Our finding indicates a

continued need to improve PGx learning, to elevate clinicians' perceived ability in using this

therapeutic opportunity and encourage their prevalence in healthcare services.

257 There were improvements in knowledge questions when comparing pre- and post-training 258 responses. Post-offline training, marginal improvements in participants' knowledge were similarly 259 observed after a PGx educational program for pharmacists [20]. On the other hand, post-online 260 training significantly improved the correct response rate. Limited knowledge retention may have 261 been the culprit in subpar improvements for the offline training due to the complexity of PGx or the 262 transfer of overwhelming information over a short period [14,20]. Revisions made to TM2 addressed 263 these pitfalls. Online training materials promote active learning [25] where participants can playback 264 content to enhance knowledge retention. Moreover, complex PGx concepts were more thoroughly 265 explained and guizzes helped to reinforce internalization of content. This is supported by our 266 findings that all participants agreed that the quizzes helped in understanding PGx concepts.

Additionally, the online training results reflect a more holistic improvement as the questions were

formatted as a case scenario. This has been shown to be more effective for enhancing learning [25].

269 Similar to other studies [5,16,20], respondents express desire to learn more about PGx. Our study 270 demonstrated 77% to 85.7% of respondents also anticipated using PGx tests after training. This 271 highlights the need to develop effective PGx education for HCPs. We recommend introducing 272 structured educational programs for HCPs to learn about PGx. Participants expressed eagerness to 273 learn more about basic concepts of PGx and its application during the trainings. This highlights the 274 need to develop sustainable education for HCPs. Furthermore, we suggest exploring hands-on 275 development of PGx- focused clinical skills as it is vital to the effective adoption of PGx [5,8,14,20]. 276 Hence, we recommend integrating point-of-care PGx information into electronic health records 277 [5,26], and making PGx test kits readily available [5].

Most of the training materials that are available were developed in a top-down approach, without considering the audience's level of knowledge. This study's focus group discussion discovered that explaining pharmacogenetics concepts using case studies increases efficacy. Moreover, the delivery of training materials offline and online are increasingly important during the pandemic. This study shows that the combination of content, length, design, and platform to conduct training does not interfere with the efficacy of an offline training program. The study also highlights the importance of basic pharmacogenomics training for any healthcare professional interested in implementing it in their practice. Understanding the limitations of time and resources in new markets such as Asia,

these training can be offered by teaching hospitals or commercial entities.

287 Our study has several possible limitations. In both training modules, the pre- and post- training 288 survey responses were unlinked. Consequently, we could not analyze changes to individual 289 responses and could only report aggregate data. Our study population were non-randomized and 290 formed a convenient sample, which may imply selection bias for only respondents with PGx 291 interests. While TM1 offline training involved mainly physicians, with limited participation from four 292 pharmacists, TM2 online training had a lower response rate. This may limit the generalizability of our 293 results to the broader population of clinicians. Results from pre- and post-surveys between TM1 and 294 TM2 could also have been impacted by the mode of delivery (offline vs online). Finally, actual 295 implementation of testing and the long-term effects of training were not evaluated. This is because 296 our study was intended to provide baseline and initial assessments of the outcomes of PGx 297 implementation training for clinicians. Therefore, we suggest conducting future studies to follow 298 HCP's over a prolonged period to evaluate the effectiveness of regular PGx educational programs 299 and actual clinical update of PGx integration. A follow-up study is currently underway with our 300 webinar respondents to assess the sustainability of the training's impacts during the clinical

301 implementation of PGx in their practice.

302

303 <u>CONCLUSION</u>

304 Overall, respondents have favorable perceptions towards PGx testing, but lack self-efficacy and 305 competency in PGx data utilization. Training has been proven to significantly improve self-efficacy 306 and competency, and lead to greater anticipation of PGx adoption in clinical practice. Online training 307 delivery mode is evidently preferable for further improvements. With its flexibility and scalability, it 308 can be expanded as continuous education over a prolonged period to evaluate the effectiveness of 309 PGx education and integration into clinical practice.

310

311 **FUTURE PERSPECTIVE**

Online training delivery mode is evidently preferable for further improvements. With its ability to be
 flexible and scalable, it can be expanded as continuous education over a prolonged period to
 evaluate the effectiveness of PGx education and integration into clinical practice.

315

316 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

317 Background

318	•	PGx testing has demonstrated potential to enhance prevention of ADR occurrence in
319		patients with distinguishable genetic variations.

- However, due to lack of PGx education among HCPs, testing is not administered regularly in
 clinical practice.
- PGx education has only seen increase in medical schools, but not in practicing clinicians.

323 Methods

324	•	Training materials were developed to cover theoretical concepts and clinical applications of
325		PGx as implementation training.
326	•	PGx implementation training was conducted across diverse group of HCPs including
327		clinicians, pharmacists and students from both fields.
328	٠	Evaluate changes in thoughts and opinions of respondents pre- and post- training.
329	Results	5
330	•	Pre-training responses demonstrate respondents already have positive perception of the
331		utility of PGx testing.
332	•	Respondents have statistically significant increase in self-assessed efficacy and PGx
333		knowledge upon completion of training.
334	Conclu	sion
335	•	PGx education improve HCPs self-assessment and encourage adoption of PGx diagnostics to
336		support clinical decisions.

Online training delivery mode is preferred for their flexibility and scalability as continuous
 education.

339

340 AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

F.A. and A.I. conceived the study. S.G. and A.M.S.R. designed survey and developed training material
with guidance from F.A., L.S., A.C. and A.I. F.A., A.C. and A.I. conducted the trainings. C.M. analysed

data collected. C.M. and K.I.J wrote the manuscript with input from all authors

344

345 ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We thank the participants for their time in attending the training courses, focus group discussions
and filling our survey. We thank S. Chandrasekaran and M. Tan for assistance in developing the
training materials.

349

350 FINANCIAL DISCLOSURE

F.A., C.M., K.I.J., L.S. and A.I. are employees of Nalagenetics Pte Ltd. A.I. and L.S. has financial

holdings in Nalagenetics Pte Ltd. Resources for conducting training and surveys were sponsored by

353 Nalagenetics Pte Ltd. None of the respondents received incentive except for FGD participants who

received a small compensation for their transport and time.

355

356 ETHICAL DISCLOSURE

357 This study was approved by the institutional review board (IRB No. 038/KEPK/III/2018 for Indonesia;

358 2017/007 for Singapore). Written consent was obtained from FGD participants, highlighting

359 voluntary participation.

361 DATA SHARING STATEMENT

- 362 Will individual participant data be available (including data dictionaries)?
- 363 Yes
- 364 What data in particular will be shared?
- 365 Individual participant data that underlie the results reported in this article, after deidentification
- 366 (text, tables, figures, and appendices).
- 367 What other documents will be available?
- 368 None
- 369 When will data be available (start and end dates)?
- 370 Immediately following publication. No end date.
- 371 With whom?
- 372 Anyone who wishes to access the data.
- 373 For what types of analyses?
- Any purpose.
- 375 By what mechanism will data be made available?
- 376 All data generate or analysed during this study are included in this published article and appendices.
- 377 Request for additional material should be addressed to A.I.

378 **REFERENCES**

379 Papers of special note have been highlight as: * of interest; ** of considerable interest 380 Just KS, Steffens M, Swen JJ, Patrinos GP, Guchelaar HJ, Stingl JC. Medical education in 1. 381 pharmacogenomics—results from a survey on pharmacogenetic knowledge in healthcare 382 professionals within the European pharmacogenomics clinical implementation project 383 Ubiquitous Pharmacogenomics (U-PGx). Eur. J. Clin. Pharmacol. [Internet]. 73(10), 1247–1252 384 (2017). Available from: https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/28669097/. 385 2. Frick A, Benton CS, Scolaro KL, et al. Transitioning pharmacogenomics into the clinical setting: 386 Training future pharmacists. Front. Pharmacol. [Internet]. 7(AUG) (2016). Available from: 387 https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/27551265/. 388 3. Chan SL, Ang X, Sani LL, et al. Prevalence and characteristics of adverse drug reactions at 389 admission to hospital: a prospective observational study. Br. J. Clin. Pharmacol. [Internet]. 390 82(6), 1636–1646 (2016). Available from: /pmc/articles/PMC5099543/?report=abstract. 391 4. Dunnenberger HM, Crews KR, Hoffman JM, et al. Preemptive Clinical Pharmacogenetics 392 Implementation: Current Programs in Five US Medical Centers. Annu. Rev. Pharmacol. 393 Toxicol. [Internet]. 55(1), 89–106 (2015). Available from: 394 /pmc/articles/PMC4607278/?report=abstract. 395 5. Chan CYW, Chua BY, Subramaniam M, Suen ELK, Lee J. Clinicians' perceptions of 396 pharmacogenomics use in psychiatry. Pharmacogenomics [Internet]. 18(6), 531-538 (2017). 397 Available from: https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/28290747/. * 398 Web-based survey conducted to evaluate specific themes on pharmacogenomics including 399 self-assessed competency, perceived usefulness, risks and preferred mode of education. 400 Majority of clinicians acknowledge the potential of pharmacogenomic testing in psychiatric 401 clinical practice. 402 6. Lee Y-F, Ching R, Kwok C, et al. The Pharmacogenomic Era in Asia: Potential Roles and 403 Challenges for Asian Pharmacists. J Pharmacogenomics Pharmacoproteomics [Internet]. 8(1), 404 164 (2017). Available from: www.accessdata.fda.gov/scripts/cder/daf/index.cfm. 405 7. Luzum JA, Luzum MJ. Physicians' attitudes toward pharmacogenetic testing before and after 406 pharmacogenetic education. Per. Med. [Internet]. 13(2), 119–127 (2016). Available from: 407 https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/29749904/. * 408 Brief PGx education conducted acrross physicians significantly improve their attitude toward 409 PGx testing 410 8. Kisor DF, Bright DR, Chen J, Smith TR. Academic and professional pharmacy education: A 411 pharmacogenomics certificate training program [Internet]. Per. Med.12(6), 563-573 (2015). 412 Available from: https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/29750615/. 413 9. Mccullough KB, Formea CM, Berg KD, et al. Assessment of the pharmacogenomics 414 educational needs of pharmacists. Am. J. Pharm. Educ. [Internet]. 75(3) (2011). Available 415 from: /pmc/articles/PMC3109805/?report=abstract. 416 10. Kisor DF, Farrell CL. Expanding Pharmacist and Student Pharmacist Access to 417 Genetics/Genomics/Pharmacogenomics Competency Education. J. Med. Educ. Curric. Dev. [Internet]. 6, 238212051983432 (2019). Available from: 418 419 /pmc/articles/PMC6415470/?report=abstract.

- 420 ** PGx certificate training program focused on groups of pharmacists, pharmacy educators and
 421 pharmacy students.
- Remsberg CM, Bray BS, Wright SK, *et al.* Design, implementation, and assessment approaches
 within a pharmacogenomics course. *Am. J. Pharm. Educ.* [Internet]. 81(1) (2017). Available
 from: https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/28289301/.
- Marcinak R, Paris M, Kinney SRM. Pharmacogenomics Education Improves Pharmacy Student
 Perceptions of Their Abilities and Roles in Its Use. *Am. J. Pharm. Educ.* [Internet]. 82(9), 6424
 (2018). Available from: /pmc/articles/PMC6291667/?report=abstract.
- Frick A, Benton C, Suzuki O, *et al.* Implementing Clinical Pharmacogenomics in the Classroom:
 Student Pharmacist Impressions of an Educational Intervention Including Personal
 Genotyping. *Pharmacy* [Internet]. 6(4), 115 (2018). Available from:
 https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/30360487/.
- 432 14. Adams SM, Anderson KB, Coons JC, *et al.* Advancing pharmacogenomics education in the core
 433 pharmd curriculum through student personal genomic testing. *Am. J. Pharm. Educ.* [Internet].
 434 80(1) (2016). Available from: /pmc/articles/PMC4776296/?report=abstract.
- ** Personal genomic testing (PGT) offered in a course of pharmd students to incorporate course
 materials and exercises using individual-level and population-level genetic data.
 Implementation of PGT in the curriculum enhanced student learning of pharmacogenomics.
- Lee KC, Hudmon KS, Ma JD, Kuo GM. Evaluation of a shared pharmacogenomics curriculum
 for pharmacy students. *Pharmacogenomics* [Internet]. 16(4), 315–322 (2015). Available from:
 https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/25823780/.
- Kuo GM, Lee KC, Ma JD. Implementation and outcomes of a live continuing education
 program on pharmacogenomics. *Pharmacogenomics* [Internet]. 14(8), 885–895 (2013).
 Available from: https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/23746183/.
- Stanek EJ, Sanders CL, Taber KAJ, *et al.* Adoption of pharmacogenomic testing by US
 physicians: Results of a nationwide survey. *Clin. Pharmacol. Ther.* [Internet]. 91(3), 450–458
 (2012). Available from: https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/22278335/.
- 18. Owusu-Obeng A, Weitzel KW, Hatton RC, *et al.* Emerging roles for pharmacists in clinical
 implementation of pharmacogenomics. *Pharmacotherapy* [Internet]. 34(10), 1102–1112
 (2014). Available from: /pmc/articles/PMC4188772/?report=abstract.
- 450 19. Roederer MW, Kuo GM, Kisor DF, *et al.* Pharmacogenomics competencies in pharmacy
 451 practice: A blueprint for change [Internet]. J. Am. Pharm. Assoc.57(1), 120–125 (2017).
 452 Available from: https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/27816542/.
- 453 20. Formea CM, Nicholson WT, McCullough KB, *et al.* Development and evaluation of a
 454 pharmacogenomics educational program for pharmacists. *Am. J. Pharm. Educ.* [Internet].
 455 77(1) (2013). Available from: /pmc/articles/PMC3578323/?report=abstract.
- PGx education course was conducted amongst pharmacists with accompanying test to
 evaluate knowledge before and after participation. Results demonstrate knowledge retention
 is a barrier that requires large effort to increase knowledge and comfort level.
- 459 21. Kudzi W, Addy BS, Dzudzor B. Knowledge of Pharmacogenetics among Healthcare
 460 Professionals and Faculty Members of Health Training Institutions in Ghana. *Ghana Med. J.*461 [Internet]. 49(1), 50–56 (2015). Available from: /pmc/articles/PMC4549817/?report=abstract.

- 462 22. Moen M, Lamba J. Assessment of healthcare students views on pharmacogenomics at the
 463 University of Minnesota. *Pharmacogenomics* [Internet]. 13(13), 1537–1545 (2012). Available
 464 from: /pmc/articles/PMC3562085/?report=abstract.
- 465 23. O'Brien TJ, Lelacheur S, Ward C, Lee NH, Callier S, Harralson AF. Impact of a personal CYP2D6
 466 testing workshop on physician assistant student attitudes toward pharmacogenetics.
 467 *Pharmacogenomics* [Internet]. 17(4), 341–352 (2016). Available from:
 468 https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/26907849/.
- Patrinos GP, Katsila T. Pharmacogenomics education and research at the Department of
 Pharmacy, University of Patras, Greece. *Pharmacogenomics* [Internet]. 17(17), 1865–1872
 (2016). Available from: https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/27790924/.
- 472 25. Gleason BL, Peeters MJ, Resman-Targoff BH, *et al.* An active-learning strategies primer for
 473 achieving ability-based educational outcomes. [Internet]. Am. J. Pharm. Educ.75(9), 186
 474 (2011). Available from: /pmc/articles/PMC3230347/?report=abstract.
- 475 ** Active learning involves actively engaging in the classroom teaching-learning process. This
 476 review highlights evidences that support the use of active-learning strategies in pharmacy
 477 education and provide strategies on their implementation.
- 478 26. Vitek CRR, Nicholson WT, Schultz C, Caraballo PJ. Evaluation of the use of clinical decision 479 support and online resources for pharmacogenomics education. *Pharmacogenomics*
- 480 [Internet]. 16(14), 1595–1603 (2015). Available from:
- 481 https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/26419532/.

TABLES

Table 1. Participant Characteristics in Offline and Online Training.

		Offline	; TM1		Online; TM2				
	Pre, n =	68	Post, n =	61	Pre, n =	34	Post, n =	21	
Characteristics	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	
Age (mean and range)	42.1	(24-73)	43.1	(24-73)	30.41	(23-50)	29.69	(23-46)	
Gender									
Male	33	48.5	32	52.5	19	55.9	10	47.6	
Female	28	41.2	21	34.4	15	44.1	11	52.4	
Position									
Doctor	63	92.6	57	93.4	0	0.0	0	0.0	
Pharmacist	4	5.9	3	4.9	1	2.9	1	4.8	
Nurse	0	0.0		0.0	2	5.9	2	9.5	
Medical Student	0	0.0	47	77.0	3	8.8	3	14.3	
Pharmacy Student	0	0.0	1	1.6	7	20.6	7	33.3	
Others	1	1.5	1	1.6	0	0.0	0	0.0	
Specialty									
Family medicine	44	64.7	42	68.9	21	61.8	8	38.1	
Surgery	1	1.5	2	3.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	
Emergency Medicine	1	1.5	0	0.0	2	5.9	2	9.5	
Others	8	11.9	3	4.8	0	0.0	0	0.0	
Not applicable	1	1.5	1	1.6	11	32.4	11	52.4	
Practice experience									
1 to 5 years	18	26.5	15	24.6	10	29.4	6	28.6	
6 to 10 years	11	16.2	10	16.4	4	11.8	2	9.5	
11-20 years	12	17.6	10	16.4	7	20.6	3	14.3	
21-30 years	11	16.2	9	14.8	3	8.8	0	0.0	
31-40 years	3	4.4	4	6.6	0	0.0	0	0.0	
41-50 years	1	1.5	1	1.6	0	0.0	0	0.0	
Previous experience with PGx education	19	27.9			11	32.4			

486 **Table 2**. Pre- and post-training results related to perceptions and self-efficacy of addressing PGx

487 testing.

		(Offline; TM	1		Online; TM2				
	Pre, n =	68	Post, n =	61		Pre, n =	34	Post, n =	21	
Survey items	Median Score ^a	IQR	Median Score ^a	IQR	p- value ^c	Median Score ^a	IQR	Median Score ^a	IQR a	p-value ^c
Perceptions (P1): Relevance of PGx to clinical pra-	ctice									
P1-1 PGx is relevant to my clinical practice / I am keen in adopting PGx into my clinical practice	3	2	4	0	< 0.05	4	1	4	1	< 0.05
P1-2 I believe that a patient's genetic profile may influence his/her response to drug therapy.	4	1	4	1	< 0.05	4	0	4	1	< 0.05
Perceptions (P2): Clinical utility of PGx										
P2-1 In general, the benefits of PGx testing outweigh the risks.	3	1	4	1	< 0.05	4	1	4	0	< 0.05
P2 PGx testing is useful for										
P2-2identifying suitable medications for treatment.	4	1	4	1	< 0.05	4	1	4	1	< 0.05
P2-3guiding dosing of medications.	3	1	4	1	< 0.05	4	1	4	1	< 0.05
P2-4reducing adverse drug reactions.	4	1	4	1	< 0.05	4	0	5	1	< 0.05
P2-5improving treatment efficacy.	4	1	4	1	< 0.05	4	1	5	1	< 0.05
P2-6reducing treatment costs.	3	1	4	2	< 0.05	3	1	4	1	0.1092
Self-efficacy (SE1): Perceived belief in ability to us	e PGx inf	ormat	ion to guide	e drug	therapy of	decisions				
SE1 I feel competent in										
SE1-1identifying clinical situations and/or patients in which PGx testing is indicated.	3	1	4	1	< 0.05	3	2	4	1	< 0.05
SE1-2interpreting PGx test results.	2	1	4	1	< 0.05	3	1	4	1	< 0.05
SE1-3making treatment recommendations based on PGx test results.	2	1	4	1	< 0.05	3	1	4	1	< 0.05
SE1-4 I can identify good PGx resources (e.g. guidelines) for use clinically.	2	1	4	1	< 0.05	3	2	4	1	< 0.05
Self-efficacy (SE2): Perceived belief in ability to en	gage in p	atient	discussion	abou	t PGx tes	ting				
SE2-1 I feel competent in explaining the rationale of PGx testing to patients.	3	1	4	1	< 0.05	3	2	4	0	< 0.05
SE2-2 I feel competent in discussing the risks and benefits of PGx testing with patients.	2	1	4	1	< 0.05	3	2	4	1	< 0.05
3			•							

488 ^aScore is ranged using five-point Likert scale from (1) strongly disagree to (5) strongly agree.

489 ^bIQR is calculated as the difference in scores falling in the 1st and 3rd quartile.

490 ^cMann-Whitney U test was used to analyse changes in pre- and post- training responses. Significant

491 p-values (<0.05) are bolded.

Table 3. Correct responses to questions about knowledge on PGx comparing pre- and post- online

493 training for TM1 and TM2

		Correct Responses			es								
				Of	fline; 1	⁻ M1		(Dnlir	ne; TM2	2		
		Pre		Post		Post			Pre		Post		
Survey Questions	Correct Answer	n	%	n	%	p-value	n	%	n	%	p-value		
Knowledge (K1): Knowledge on theoret	ical PGx												
K1-1. What may be the consequence of a PGx polymorphism? (comprehension level)	An individual has a higher risk for toxicity when using prescription drugs.	40	59%	43	65%	0.4507 ^a	9	43%	4	50%	1 ^b		
K1-2. What does a poor metabolizer phenotype indicate? (knowledge level)	Decreased enzyme activity.	17	25%	18	27%	0.7646 ^ª	13	62%	5	63%	1 ^b		
K1-3. A patient with CYP2D6 activity score of 1.5 has which CYP2D6 phenotype? (knowledge level)	Normal metabolizer.	6	38%	10	63%	0.1573ª							
K1-4. Which of the following is not correct about pre-emptive and reactive genotyping? (knowledge level)	Reactive genotyping has been shown to be more cost- effective than pre-emptive genotyping.	14	27%	28	56%	< 0.05ª	4	19%	1	13%	1 ⁶		
K1-5. What does an ultra-rapid metabolizer phenotype for CYP2C19 indicate? (knowledge level)	Increased enzyme activity						5	38%	13	100%	< 0.05 ^b		
Knowledge (K2): Practical clinical imple	mentation of PGx												
K2-1. There is a high chance that Ms Lee will develop Stevens Johnsons Syndrome? (comprehension level)	FALSE						8	62%	12	92%	0.1602 ^b		
K2-2. What is Ms Lee's CYP2D6 enzyme activity score? (comprehension level)	2						2	15%	13	100%	< 0.05 ^a		
K2-3. Which of the following would be appropriate regarding Ms Lee's amitriptyline therapy according to CPIC guidelines? (application level)	Consider alternative drug not metabolized by CYP2C19						1	8%	1	8%	1 ⁶		
K2-4. A woman is diagnosed with breast cancer and, as part of her oncology regimen, she is treated with tamoxifen. She did not have genetic testing performed before initiating treatment. What PGx reason would cause the treating physician to decide to change the drug? (application level)	CYP2D6 poor metabolizer resulting in lack of drug.	11	69%	10	63%	0.7097ª							
K2-5. Which of the following would be appropriate regarding clopidogrel therapy in patients who are CYP2C19 poor metabolizers? (application level)	Consider alternative antiplatelet therapy if no contraindications.	15	29%	31	62%	< 0.05ª							

494 ^aChi-square test was used to compare the percentage of correct responses between pre- and post-

495 training surveys. Significant p-values (<0.05) are bolded.

496 ^bFisher's test was used if criteria for Chi-square (expected value size > 5) is not met.

506 FIGURES



C Mo

Module Sections	Learning Objectives	Topics in TM1	Topics in TM2			
	To evolving the element situation on ADD and its likelihood	1. Importance of PGx testing				
	- To inculcate the need of reducing ADR	2. Factors that inhibit PQx imple	2. Factors that inhibit POx implementation			
Introduction: Why do	- To elaborate on the measures that has been taken to reduce ADR and its	3. Benefits of PGx testing				
Pharmacogenomics Testing?	varying degrees or success - To diskinguish the different types of genotyping and its place in therapy - To identify the situations that calls for pre-emptive genotyping and reactive genotyping	4. Types of genolyping (pre-emptive vareactive)				
Fundamentals of	- To explain what is pharmacogenomics, and various genetic lingos, i.e.	1. Definitions commonly used in POx field (e.g. pharmacogenomics, alleles, haplotypes, etc.)				
Pharmacogenomics I	orers, allete, genouple, haptoype, prenovype, unovype, and san alletes - To inform where one can find information about pharmacogene variations in PharmVer	2. The science of how PGx work	C8			
Fundamentals of Pharmacogenomics I	 To inform about resources and to look for reliable informations related to pharmacogenomics 	1. Pharmacogenomics resources (e.g. PharmGKP, CPIC, etc.)				
	- To exclain how pharmacogenes are affecting drug response in certain		1. CYP2D6, CYP2C19, and TCAs			
Important	medications	1. Brief description about five	2. Allopurinol and HLA-B*58:01			
Pharmacogenes and	 To increase capability in engaging pavents in discussion about 	genes that affect ten commonly	3. Codeine and CYP2D6			
How to Interpret I nem	 To increase capability in interpreting and evaluating pharmacogenomic recommendations 	prescribed drugs.	4. Clopidogrel and CYP2C19			
Implementation of Pharmacogenomics	- To increase capability in implementing pharma cogenomic recommendations	1. Study case of PGx feasibility study conducted at Raffles Medical Group	1. Workflow of ordering PGx testing, interpreting results, and actions to take by physicians			

507 508

509 Fig.1 | Development of training materials. a, Questions composed of 5W1H (what, when, why,

where, who, and how) are used to determine the first training materials and objectives. b, The first
 training material (TM1) was designed based 5W1H questions as seen on Figure 1a and implemented

in an offline training. Focus group discussion (FGD) with the TM1's training participants was held

offline to collect feedback. Feedback from the FGD was used to develop a more comprehensive

training materials (TM2) and implemented as online training. c, Details of the learning objectives and
 topics covered in TM1 and TM2.

516

517

518

519

520





Responses from Online Training, TM2
Strongly Disagree/Disagree Neutral Agree/Strongly Agree



Fig.2 | Overall percent of respondents relative to 5-point Likert-type scale labels pre- and post-PGx training conducted a, Offline, TM1; and b, Online, TM2. Survey domains included Perceptions of the relevance and clinical utility of PGx, Self-Efficacy through perceived ability to use PGx information in guiding medical decisions and engage in patient discussions about PGx testing, and Knowledge questions on the PGx-based case studies. ^aTM1 respondents pre-training, n = 68. ^bTM1 respondents post-training, n = 61. ^cTM2 respondents pre-training, n = 34. ^dTM2 respondents post-training, n = 21. *Statistically significant p-values (p < 0.05) were observed in changes from pre- and post- training responses.

- Appendix 1: Pre-training survey for TM1
- 540 **Survey 1:** Pre-training pharmacogenomics survey

541

542 Introduction

- Pharmacogenomics is the study of how genes affect an individual's response to drugs. This survey
 aims to examine clinicians' knowledge and perceptions of the clinical use of pharmacogenomics
- 545 testing. This survey should take approximately 5 minutes to complete; thank you for your time.
- 546 Please rate the following (circle your answer):

547 Section 1: Perceptions

548

- 549 1. Pharmacogenomics is useful to my current practice.
- 550

Strongly Disagree Strongly Agree							
1	2	3	4	5			

551

552 2. I believe that a patient's genetic profile may influence his/her response to drug therapy.

553

Strongly Disagree Strongly Agree						
1	2	3	4	5		

554

555 3. In general, the benefits of pharmacogenomics testing outweigh the risks.

556

Strongly Disag	Strongly Disagree Strongly Agree							
1	2	3	4	5				

- 558 4. Is pharmacogenomics testing useful for the following?
- 559

	Not usefu	l at all	Extremely useful		
(a) Identifying suitable medications for treatment	1	2	3	4	5
(b) Guide dosing of medications	1	2	3	4	5
(c) Reducing adverse drug reactions	1	2	3	4	5
(d) Improving treatment efficacy	1	2	3	4	5

(e) Reducing treatment costs	1	2	3	4	5
------------------------------	---	---	---	---	---

561 Section 2: Ability

562

- 563 5. Please rank your perceived ability:
- (a) I feel competent in identifying clinical situations and/or patients in which pharmacogenomics
 testing is indicated.
- 566

Strongly Disagree Strongly Agree						
1	2	3	4	5		

567

568 (b) I feel competent in interpreting results of pharmacogenomics tests.

569

Strongly Disag	Strongly Disagree			ngly Agree
1	2	3	4	5

570

571 (c) I feel competent in making treatment recommendations based on results.

572

Strongly Disagree			Stro	ngly Agree
1	2	3	4	5

573

(d) I can identify good pharmacogenomics resources (e.g. guidelines) for use clinically.

575

Strongly Disag	Strongly Disagree			ngly Agree
1	2	3	4	5

576

577 (e) I feel competent in explaining the rationale of pharmacogenomics testing to patients.

578

Strongly Disag	Strongly Disagree			ngly Agree
1	2	3	4	5

579

(f) I feel competent in discussing the risks and benefits of pharmacogenomics testing with patients.

Strongly Disagree			Stroi	ngly Agree
1	2	3	4	5

582		
583	Secti	on 3: Knowledge
584		
585 586	6. V	What may be the consequence of a pharmacogenomics polymorphism?
587 588 589 590 591	•	An individual cannot metabolize any drugs An individual has a higher risk for toxicity when using prescription drugs A single drug dose is appropriate for a given indication Individualized dose adjustments should be made according to body surface area
592 593	7. V	What does a poor metabolizer phenotype indicate?
594 595 596 597 598	•	Lower drug safety because of poor metabolism Good drug efficacy because of poor metabolism Decreased enzyme activity Increased enzyme activity
599 600	8. V	Which of the following is <u>not</u> correct about pre-emptive and reactive genotyping?
601 602 603 604 605 606 607	•	Reactive genotyping is ordered as a drug therapy is being initiated or contemplated. Pre-emptive genotyping allows pharmacogenomics information to be available to guide prescribing. Reactive genotyping has been shown to be more cost-effective than pre-emptive genotyping. Pre-emptive genotyping usually tests for a panel of genes, whereas reactive genotyping usually tests for one to two genes.
608 609 610	9. V C	Which of the following would be appropriate regarding clopidogrel therapy in patients who are CYP2C19 poor metabolizers?
611 612 613 614 615	• • •	Initiate therapy with recommended starting dose Consider a 25% increase of recommended starting dose Consider a 25% decrease of recommended starting dose Consider alternative antiplatelet therapy if no contraindications
616 617 618	10. V (What sources have you used to learn about pharmacogenomics testing and its applications? please select all that apply)
619 620 621 622 623 624 625 626 627	• • • • • •	Undergraduate education curriculum Postgraduate education curriculum Internet, website: Seminar, seminar name: Journal, journal name: Drug labels (package inserts) Colleague I have not learnt about pharmacogenomics testing and its applications Other (please specify):

628						
629	Section 4: De	mographics				
630						
631 632	11. Year of bi	irth:				
633 634	12. Gender:	Male	Female			
635 636	13. Position:					
637 638 639 640	DoctoPharnNurseOther	or nacist (please specify):		_	
641 642 643	14. Main prac	ctice specialty: _				
644 645	15. Number o	of years of practi	ce experience: _			
646						
647	Appendix 2: F	Post-training su	rvey for TM1			
648	Survey 2:	Post-training ph	armacogenomic	s survey		
649						
650	Please rate the	e following (circ	ele your answer)	:		
651						
652	Section 1: Pe	rceptions				
653						
654 655	1. Pharmaco	ogenomics is use	eful to my curren	t practice.		
		Strongly Disag	ree		Stror	ngly Agree
		1	2	3	4	5
656						
657 658	2. I believe t	that a patient's g	genetic profile m	ay influence his	her response to	drug therapy.
		Strongly Disag	ree		Stror	ngly Agree
		1	2	3	4	5

660 3. In general, the benefits of pharmacogenomics testing outweigh the risks.

Strongly Disagree			Stroi	ngly Agree
1	2	3	4	5

663 4. Is pharmacogenomics testing useful for the following?

	Not usefu	l at all		Extremel	y useful
(a) Identifying suitable medications for treatment	1	2	3	4	5
(b) Guide dosing of medications	1	2	3	4	5
(c) Reducing adverse drug reactions	1	2	3	4	5
(d) Improving treatment efficacy	1	2	3	4	5
(e) Reducing treatment costs	1	2	3	4	5

```
666 Section 2: Ability
```

668 Please rank your perceived ability:

(a) I feel competent in identifying clinical situations and/or patients in which pharmacogenomics
 testing is indicated.

Strongly Disag	Strongly Disagree			ngly Agree
1	2	3	4	5

674 (b) I feel competent in interpreting results of pharmacogenomics tests.

Strongly Disagree			Stroi	ngly Agree
1	2	3	4	5

677 (c) I feel competent in making treatment recommendations based on results.

Strongly Disagree	Strongly Agree
-------------------	----------------

4	2	2		_
1	2	3	4	5

(d) I can identify good pharmacogenomics resources (e.g. guidelines) for use clinically.

681

Strongly Disagree Strongly Agree					
	1	2	3	4	5

682

(e) I feel competent in explaining the rationale of pharmacogenomics testing to patients.

684

Strongly Disagree Strongly Agree					
	1	2	3	4	5

685

(f) I feel competent in discussing the risks and benefits of pharmacogenomics testing with patients.

Strongly Disagree Strongly Agree						
1	2	3	4	5		

688

689 Section 3: Knowledge

- 690
- 691 5. What may be the consequence of a pharmacogenomics polymorphism?692
- An individual cannot metabolize any drugs
- An individual has a higher risk for toxicity when using prescription drugs
 - A single drug dose is appropriate for a given indication
- Individualized dose adjustments should be made according to body surface area
- 697

699

695

- 698 6. What does a poor metabolizer phenotype indicate?
- Lower drug safety because of poor metabolism
- Good drug efficacy because of poor metabolism
- Decreased enzyme activity
- Increased enzyme activity
- 705 7. Which of the following is **not** correct about pre-emptive and reactive genotyping?
- 706 707

- Reactive genotyping is ordered as a drug therapy is being initiated or contemplated.
- Pre-emptive genotyping allows pharmacogenomics information to be available to guide prescribing.
- Reactive genotyping has been shown to be more cost-effective than pre-emptive genotyping.

711 712 713		• Pre-emptive genotyping usually tests for a panel of genes, whereas reactive genotyping usually tests for one to two genes.
714 715 716 717 718 719 720	8.	 Which of the following would be appropriate regarding clopidogrel therapy in patients who are CYP2C19 poor metabolizers? Initiate therapy with recommended starting dose Consider a 25% increase of recommended starting dose Consider a 25% decrease of recommended starting dose Consider a ltarmetive antipletalet therapy if no contraindications
721		• Consider alternative antiplatelet therapy if no contraindications
722	Sec	tion 4: Needs assessment
723 724 725 726	9.	To better utilize pharmacogenomics information in the management of drug therapy, I would need (please select all that apply)
727 728 729 730 731 732 733 734 735 736 736 737		 Better knowledge on pharmacology Better knowledge on drug metabolism Better knowledge on the basic concepts of pharmacogenomics Stronger evidence that pharmacogenomics improves clinical outcomes Better ability to apply my knowledge Better knowledge of legal regulations Support of my working institution Insurance coverage Expert counsel Other (please specify):
738 739 740	10.	What is your preferred format for learning more about pharmacogenomics? (please select all that apply)
741 742 743 744 745 746 747		 Lectures Journal clubs Medical app E-learning Case discussion Other (please specify):
748	Sec	tion 5: Evaluation of the training
749		
750 751	11.	Please rate the following:
		Strongly disagree Strongly agree

(a) The topics covered were relevant to me.

(b) The content was organized and easy to follow.	1	2	3	4	5	
(c) The patient case aided my understanding of the clinical applications of pharmacogenomics.	1	2	3	4	5	
(d) The training expanded my knowledge on pharmacogenomics.	1	2	3	4	5	
Section 6: Demographics						
 12. Within the past 6 months, how often have you order test? 0 1 time per month 2-5 times per month >5 times per month 	ed or rec	commenc	led a pha	rmacoge	enomics	
 13. Do you anticipate ordering or recommending a phar next 6 months? Yes No 14. Year of birth: 	macoger	iomics te	st for a p	patient w	ithin the	
15. Gender: Male Female						
16. Position:						
 Doctor Pharmacist Nurse Other (please specify):						
17. Main practice specialty:18. Number of years of practice experience:	. <u> </u>					
19. Please list any additional comments or feedback her	e:					

787

788 Appendix 3: Pre-training survey for TM2

789 Nalagenetics Pharmacogenomics Pre-Training Survey

- 790 We are Nalagenetics and we are creating a pharmacogenomics (PGx) program to integrate
- 791 PGx into clinical practice. Pharmacogenomics is the study of how genes affect an
- individual's response to drugs. One of the main benefits of PGx is to prevent and minimize
- adverse drug reactions (ADRs). This survey aims to gain feedback on our existing prototype
- PGx course. It will take approximately 10 minutes to complete, thank you for your time.
- 795 *Required
- 796

799

800

797 **Perceptions**

- 798 1. Are you currently integrating PGx into your clinical practice? *
 - a. Yes
 - b. No
- 2. Please rate the following: * (Mark only one oval per row.)

	Strongly	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly
	disagree				agree
I am keen in adopting PGx					
into my clinical practice.					
My patients experience					
ADRs from their prescribed					
medications.					
I believe that a patient's					
genetic profile may influence					
his/her response to drug					
therapy.					
In general, the benefits of					
pharmacogenomics testing					
outweigh the risks.					
I am keen in adopting PGx					
into my clinical practice.					
My patients experience					
ADRs from their prescribed					
medications.					
I believe that a patient's					
genetic profile may influence					
his/her response to drug					
therapy.					
In general, the benefits of					

pharmacogenomics testing outweigh the risks.			

3. PGx is useful for the following: * (Mark only one oval per row.)

	Strongly	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly
	disagree				agree
(a) Choosing the best					
treatment option					
(b) Optimizing drug dosing					
regimen					
(c) Minimizing ADRs					
(d) Improving treatment					
efficacy					
(e) Reducing treatment costs					

804

4. Some of the obstacles involved in implementing PGx into my clinical practice are: * (Mark
only one oval per row.)

	Strongly	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly
	disagree				agree
(a) Cost					
(b) Turn around time					
(c) Lack of clear					
guidelines/evidence					
(d) Confuse/worry patients					
(e) PGx is not accurate					
(f) PGx is not applicable to					
me					

807

808 Ability

- 5. If I were to adopt PGx into my clinical practice, I know how to do the following: * (Mark
- 810 only one oval per row.)

	Strongly	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly
	disagree				agree
(a) Identifying clinical					
situations/patients in which					
PGx is indicated					
(b) Interpret PGx test results					
(c) Make treatment					
recommendations based on					
PGx results					
(d) Identify good PGx					
resources for clinical use					
(e) Explain the rationale of					
PGx testing to my patients					
(f) Discuss the risks and					
benefits of PGx testing					

812 Knowledge

- 6. What may be the consequence of a pharmacogenomics polymorphism? (Mark only one
- 814 oval.)
- 815 a. An individual cannot metabolize any drugs
- b. An individual has a higher risk for toxicity when using prescription drugs
- c. A single drug dose is appropriate for a given indication
- d. Individualized dose adjustments should be made according to body surface area
- 819

820 7. What does a poor metabolizer phenotype indicate? (Mark only one oval.)

- a. Lower drug safety because of poor metabolism
- b. Good drug efficacy because of poor metabolism
- c. Decreased enzyme activity
- d. Increased enzyme activity
- 825

828

826 8. Which of the following is not correct about pre-emptive and reactive genotyping? (Mark only one oval.)

- a. Reactive genotyping is ordered as a drug therapy is being initiated or contemplated.
- b. Pre-emptive genotyping allows pharmacogenomics information to be available to guide prescribing.
- c. Reactive genotyping has been shown to be more cost-effective than pre-emptive genotyping.
- d. Pre-emptive genotyping usually tests for a panel of genes, whereas reactive genotyping usually tests for one to two genes.
- 835

836 Evaluation

837 9.Please rate the following: * (Mark only one oval per row.)

	Strongly	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly
	disagree				agree
The topics covered were					
relevant to me.					
The content was organized					
and easy to follow.					
The patient case aided my					
understanding of the clinical					
applications of					
pharmacogenomics.					
The training expanded my					
knowledge on					
pharmacogenomics.					

838

839 Appendix 4: Post-training survey for TM2

840 Nalagenetics Pharmacogenomics Post-Training Survey

- 841 We are Nalagenetics and we are creating a pharmacogenomics (PGx) program to integrate
- 842 PGx into clinical practice. Pharmacogenomics is the study of how genes affect an
- 843 individual's response to drugs. One of the main benefits of PGx is to prevent and minimize
- adverse drug reactions (ADRs). This survey aims to gain feedback on our existing prototype
- PGx course. It will take approximately 10 minutes to complete, thank you for your time.

846	*Required
847	
848	1. Age Group: * Mark only one oval.
849	a. <30
850	b. 30-39
851	c. 40-49
852	d. 50-59
853	e. >60
854	2. Gender * Mark only one oval.
855	a. Female
856	b. Male
857	c. Prefer not to say
858	d. Other:
859	3. Number of practicing years * Mark only one oval.
860	a. <5
861	b. 5-10
862	c. 11-20
863	d. 21-30
864	e. >30
865	4. Where did you study medicine? * Mark only one oval.
866	a. Singapore
867	b. Overseas
868	5. What is your specialty?
869	6. I learnt about pharmacogenomics during my medical school * Mark only one oval.
870	a. Yes
871	b. No
872	c. I am not sure
873	

874 **Perceptions**

- 875 7. Are you currently integrating PGx into your clinical practice? * Mark only one oval.
- 876 a. Yes
- 877 b. No
- 878 8. Please rate the following: * Mark only one oval per row.

	Strongly	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly
	disagree				agree
I am keen in adopting PGx					
into my clinical practice.					
My patients experience					
ADRs from their prescribed					
medications.					
I believe that a patient's					
genetic profile may influence					
his/her response to drug					
therapy.					
In general, the benefits of					
pharmacogenomics testing					
outweigh the risks.					

- 879
- 880 9. PGx is useful for the following: * Mark only one oval per row.

	Strongly	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly
	disagree				agree
(a) Choosing the best					
treatment option					
(b) Optimizing drug dosing					
regimen					
(c) Minimizing ADRs					
(d) Improving treatment					
efficacy					
(e) Reducing treatment costs					

882 10. Some of the obstacles involved in implementing PGx into my clinical practice are: *

883 Mark only one oval per row.

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree
(a) Cost					
(b) Turn around time					
(c) Lack of clear					
guidelines/evidence					
(d) Confuse/worry patients					
(e) PGx is not accurate					
(f) PGx is not applicable to					
me					

884

885 Ability

- 11.If I were to adopt PGx into my clinical practice, I know how to do the following: * Mark
- 887 <u>only one oval per row.</u>

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree
(a) Identifying clinical					
situations/patients in which					
PGx is indicated					
(b) Interpret PGx test results					
(c) Make treatment					
recommendations based on					
PGx results					
(d) Identify good PGx					
resources for clinical use					
(e) Explain the rationale of					
PGx testing to my patients					
(f) Discuss the risks and					
benefits of PGx testing					

888

889 Knowledge

- 890 12. What may be the consequence of a pharmacogenomics polymorphism? Mark only one
- 891 oval. 892 a.
 - a. An individual cannot metabolize any drugs
- b. An individual has a higher risk for toxicity when using prescription drugs

- c. A single drug dose is appropriate for a given indication
- d. Individualized dose adjustments should be made according to body surface area

898

- 13. What does a poor metabolizer phenotype indicate? Mark only one oval.
 - a. Lower drug safety because of poor metabolism
- b. Good drug efficacy because of poor metabolism
- 900 c. Decreased enzyme activity
- 901 d. Increased enzyme activity
- 902

906 907

- 903 14. Which of the following is not correct about pre-emptive and reactive genotyping? Mark904 only one oval.
- 904 only one 905 a. F
 - a. Reactive genotyping is ordered as a drug therapy is being initiated or contemplated.
 - b. Pre-emptive genotyping allows pharmacogenomics information to be available to guide prescribing.
- 908 c. Reactive genotyping has been shown to be more cost-effective than pre-emptive909 genotyping.
- 910
- d. Pre-emptive genotyping usually tests for a panel of genes, whereas reactive genotyping usually tests for one to two genes.
- 911 912

913 **Evaluation**

15.Please rate the following: * Mark only one oval per row.

	Strongly	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly
	disagree				agree
The topics covered were					
relevant to me.					
The content was organized					
and easy to follow.					
The patient case aided my					
understanding of the clinical					
applications of					
pharmacogenomics.					
The training expanded my					
knowledge on					
pharmacogenomics.					

915

916 Appendix 5: TM2 Course content

- 917 Online course can be found here: <u>https://learning.nalagenetics.com/courses/course-</u>
- 918 v1:nalagenetics+PGX101+2020 Q1

919 Introduction

- 920 Slides 1-3: Introduction of training, speaker and learning objectives
- 921 Slide 4: Current healthcare landscape
- 922 Slides 5-6: Introducing Nalagenetics

- 923 Slide 7: Content Outline
- 924 Why do Pharmacogenomics Testing?
- 925 Slide 8: Title slide
- 926 Slides 9-11: Strategies to reduce ADRs
- 927 Slide 10: Benefits of PGx testing
- 928 Slides 13-17: Reactive vs pre-emptive genotyping
- 929 Slides 18-22: Benefits of pre-emptive genotyping
- 930 Slides 23-26: Patient case scenario
- 931 What Fundamentals of Pharmacogenomics I
- 932 Slides 27-28: Title slide; Introduction of speaker
- 933 Slides 29-31: PGx background
- 934 Slides 32-38: PGx terms and definitions
- 935 Slides 39-41: Patient case scenario
- Where and How Fundamentals of Pharmacogenomics I: PGx
 resources
- 938 Slide 42: Title slide
- 939 Slide 43: Overview
- 940 Slides 44-45: PharmGKB
- 941 Slides 46-48: CPIC
- 942 Slides 49-51: DPWG
- 943 Slide 52: Regulations
- 944 Slide 53: Scientific Evidence
- 945 Slides 54-57: Patient case scenario

Who, When and How Important Pharmacogenes and How to InterpretThem

- 948 Slide 58: Title slide
- 949 Slide 59: Overview
- 950 Slides 60-63: TCAs: amitriptyline and nortriptyline
- 951 Slides 64-67: Allopurinol and Steven Johnson Syndrome
- 952 Slides 68-73: Codeine
- 953 Slides 74-78: Clopidogrel
- Where and How How do I implement PGx into my Routine ClinicalPractice?
- 956 Slide 79: Title slide
- 957 Slides 80-83: Patient case scenario: conclusion
- 958 Slide 84: Nalagenetics workflow
- 959 Slides 85-90: Nalagenetics user interface
- 960 Slides 91-92: Conclusion