

18 **Abstract**

19 **Background** Overuse and misuse of antibiotics are major factors in the development of antibiotic
20 resistance in primary care institutions of rural China. In this study, the effectiveness of an artificial
21 intelligence (AI)-based, automatic, and confidential antibiotic feedback intervention was evaluated to
22 determine whether it could reduce antibiotic prescribing rates and avoid inappropriate prescribing
23 behaviors by physicians.

24 **Methods** A randomized, cross-over, cluster-controlled trial was conducted in 77 primary care
25 institutions of Guizhou Province, China. All institutions were randomly divided into two groups and
26 given either a 3-month intervention followed by a 3-month period without any intervention or vice
27 versa. The intervention consisted of 3 feedback measures: a real-time warning pop-up message of
28 inappropriate antibiotic prescriptions on the prescribing physician's computer screen, a 10-day
29 antibiotic prescription feedback, and distribution of educational brochures. The primary and secondary
30 outcomes are the 10-day antibiotic prescription rate and 10-day inappropriate antibiotic prescription
31 rate.

32 **Results** There were 37 primary care institutions with 160 physicians in group 1 (intervention followed
33 by control) and 40 primary care institutions with 168 physicians in group 2 (control followed by
34 intervention). There were no significant differences in antibiotic prescription rates (32.1% vs 35.6%)
35 and inappropriate antibiotic prescription rates (69.1% vs 72.0%) between the two groups at baseline (p
36 = 0.085, p = 0.072). After 3 months (cross-over point), antibiotic prescription rates and inappropriate
37 antibiotic prescription rates decreased significantly faster in group 1 (11.9% vs 12.3%, p < 0.001)
38 compared to group 2 (4.5% vs 3.1%, p < 0.001). At the end point, the decreases in antibiotic
39 prescription rates were significantly lower in group 1 compared to group 2 (2.6% vs 11.7%, p < 0.001).

40 During the same period, the inappropriate antibiotic prescription rates decreased in group 2 (15.9%, $p <$
41 0.001) while the rates increased in group 1 (7.3%, $p < 0.001$). The characteristics of physicians did not
42 significantly affect the rate of antibiotic or inappropriate antibiotic prescription rates.

43 **Conclusion** The conclusion is that artificial intelligence based real-time pop-up of prescription
44 inappropriate warning, the 10-day prescription information feedback intervention, and the distribution
45 of educational brochures can effectively reduce the rate of antibiotic prescription and inappropriate
46 rate.

47 **Trial registration:** ISRCTN, ID: ISRCTN13817256. Registered on 11 January 2020

48 **Keywords:** Antibiotics; Feedback intervention; Primary care institutions; Artificial intelligence;

49 Cross-over trial

50 **Introduction**

51 Antibiotic resistance is a real threat to human health [1, 2]. Drug-resistant bacteria are continuously
52 being discovered, and even some "superbugs" that are difficult to suppress with antibiotics have
53 emerged [1]. In 2019, about 1.27 million deaths were related to antibiotic resistance [3]. Overuse and
54 misuse of antibiotics are major factors in the development of antibiotic resistance [4]. The total
55 consumption of antibiotics increased by 46% in 204 countries from 2000 to 2018 [5]. According to a
56 World Health Organization (WHO) report the inappropriate use of antibiotics is on the rise, and is more
57 likely to be found in low- and middle-income countries [6].

58 In China, more than 50% of outpatient antibiotic prescriptions are inappropriate [7] and this
59 phenomenon is more prominent in primary care institutions [8]. In our previous retrospective
60 investigation of 16 primary care institutions in Guizhou Province, approximately 90% of patients
61 received inappropriate antibiotic treatment. The major inappropriate prescriptions were found in the
62 patients diagnosed with diseases of the respiratory, digestive, and urinary systems [9] despite
63 controlling for physicians' individual prescribing behavior [10-14].

64 Previous researchers have developed a variety of interventions to control the misuse and overuse
65 of antibiotic prescriptions, including information technology interventions, such as a Clinical Decision
66 Support System (CDSS) or electronic health records, whereby electronic modules are sent to physicians
67 to help them make the best clinical decisions [15-17]; educational interventions, such as distribution of
68 educational brochures or training courses given to medical personnel or patients [18, 19]; and antibiotic
69 prescription audit and feedback interventions [20-22]. We conducted a cluster randomized
70 crossover-controlled trial based on a Hospital Information System (HIS) with 163 physicians in 31
71 primary care institutions in Guizhou Province in 2019. Significant results were achieved, with

72 antibiotic prescription rates falling by 15% [23]. One limitation of the study, however, is that it did not
73 take into account the rate of the rate of inappropriate antibiotics.

74 To this end, we introduce Depth Graph Neural Network technology (DGNN), an artificial
75 intelligence (AI) deep learning algorithm. It is a new heterogeneous and complex network structure
76 model and iterative optimization method [24]. The technology includes two parts: deep learning and
77 graph neural networks. Deep learning is a type of machine learning technology based on
78 representational learning of data; the technique mimics the way the human brain interprets data. Graph
79 neural network is a deep learning model, which combines graph data with a neural network and
80 performs end-to-end computation on the graph data. In recent years, DGNN has been used in medicine,
81 organizational management, and marketing [25-27]. In view of this, based on prescription data and
82 DGNN technology, a graph model of training data was established. At the same time, several shallow
83 network structures were used to visualize the antibiotic use path graph and to realize the formulation
84 and recommendation of an ideal treatment plan.


85 Therefore, an intelligent, confidential, and long-term feedback intervention warning system for
86 inappropriate antibiotic prescription was thus developed. Among them, AI real-time warning was
87 added on the basis of the previous feedback intervention study [23]. The objective of this study was to
88 investigate whether the new feedback intervention could reduce the rates of antibiotic prescription and
89 inappropriate prescription rates among primary care physicians.

90 **Methods design**

91 **Trial designs and setting**

92 A randomized, cross-over, cluster-controlled trial was conducted from April 1st, 2021 to September
93 30th, 2021. A cross-over design is a repeated measurement method in which each unit receives different

94 interventions at different times [28]. In this study, a primary health care institution was used as a cluster
 95 unit. Physicians from the same institution were grouped together. As shown in Figure 1, all primary
 96 care institutions included in the trial were randomly divided into two groups: group 1 and group 2. The
 97 3-month intervention was performed in group 1 while group 2 acted as the control group (no
 98 intervention given). As stated in the proposal [29], since this was a behavioral change intervention
 99 study, there was no washout period for this crossover design. Therefore, after 3 months, the two groups
 100 switched, with group 1 switching to be the control group and group 2 switching to receive the
 101 intervention for 3 months. The entire trial lasted for 6 months from April 1st, 2021 to September 30th,
 102 2021 with the two groups entering the crossover point on June 30th.



103
 104 **Figure 1 Cross-over intervention diagram showing 10-day intervals**

105
 106 Guizhou Province, the setting of the study, is in the hinterland of southwest China and is one of
 107 the least developed provinces of the country. The study population involved 252 primary care
 108 institutions that use the same HIS in Guizhou Province. Township health centers and community health
 109 service centers are called primary care institutions, which mainly provide primary health care services
 110 for the local population [30]. The inclusion criteria were the same as in our previous study [23], and

111 were also set out in the published protocol [29]: 1) institutions with at least 3 outpatient general
112 physicians, 2) the physicians had worked in a primary care institution for at least one year, and 3) each
113 physician saw at least 100 patients every 10 days. The exclusion criteria for prescriptions included
114 patients treated for tuberculosis, leprosy and other diseases requiring combination drugs. Informed
115 consent forms were signed by physicians before the trial commenced. One hundred thirty-two primary
116 care institutions meeting the above criteria were included.

117 Antibiotic prescription records used in this trial were provided by Guizhou Lianke Weixin
118 Technology Co., LTD. (LWTC). LWTC is a technology service company that develops and maintains
119 medical and health information systems. Authorized by the Information Center Guizhou Provincial
120 Health Commission (ICGPHC), an early warning intervention plug-in for antibiotic prescriptions was
121 designed. The plug-in used DGNN technology to provide real-time warning and information feedback.
122 Before the formal trial, the intervention plug-in had been successfully applied in two primary care
123 institutions in Guizhou province for three months, and the sensitivity and reliability of the plug-in have
124 been scientifically verified. The trial was approved by the Human Trial Ethics (Appendix 2) Committee
125 of Guizhou Medical University (Certificate No.: 2019 (148)) in Dec. 27, 2019, and the protocol was
126 published on January 7th, 2022 [29].

127 **Depth graph neural network technology (DGNN)**

128 In the artificial intelligence (AI) part of this study, the representation of relevant data and knowledge
129 for training and model evaluation was addressed. Specifically, based on the results of big data analysis,
130 the influencing factors of physicians and patients on the rational use of antibiotics were summarized,
131 and the Graph model-based knowledge representation and modeling method was studied in
132 combination with the relevant contents of our self-made Guidance and Recommendations on Clinical

133 Use of Antibiotics in Primary Care Institutions.


134 After solving the representation problem of Graph model of training data, the Depth Graph
135 Neural Network (DGNN) technology with Directed Graphs structure and edge-informative Graph
136 structure was studied. Specifically, a new heterogeneous and complex network structure model
137 and iterative optimization method was used. The DGNN method made use of several shallow
138 network structures at the same time, with the depth of the traditional neural network dozens or
139 even hundreds of layers in the stack to achieve higher network expression ability and
140 performance. It can effectively avoid the traditional deep learning technology update iteration
141 complex problem.

142 In order to improve the interpretability of the developed DGNN method in the process of
143 antibiotic abuse assessment and analysis, the graph data representing antibiotic use path was visualized
144 by similarity measurement and clustering technology based on graph data. Exploratory retrieval and
145 presentation of multiple analysis results were provided to improve the comprehensibility and clinical
146 reference value of the results of antibiotic prescription evaluation in this study.

147 **Randomization and masking**

148 The 79 primary care institutions that met the criteria were randomly selected from the 132 using a
149 random number table by LWTC information technology staff. In total, 335 qualified outpatient
150 physicians were enrolled in the intervention trial. Figure 2 shows the flow chart of the trial. Physicians
151 participating in the trial were randomly assigned to the two groups. All physicians involved in the study
152 had a good sense of whether they were entering the intervention, so it was impossible to blind the
153 participants and the researchers.

154



155

156

Figure 2 Flow chart of the trial


157

158 Intervention

159 Feedback interventions are the act of providing knowledge of the results of a behavior or performance
 160 to an individual [31, 32]. Feedback interventions can change behavior and improve performance and
 161 outcomes [16, 33]. Physicians who entered the intervention group received 3 feedback measures,
 162 including a real-time warning pop-up message, a 10-day antibiotic prescription feedback, and
 163 distribution of educational brochures.

164 The first measure of the feedback is the real-time warning of inappropriate antibiotics based on
 165 DGNN. In the HIS in China, when a physician prescribes an inappropriate antibiotic, a small window
 166 immediately appears reminding him of his inappropriate prescribing behavior. A brief explanation is
 167 also displayed in the message. There are 3 criteria for inappropriate antibiotic prescribing: 1)

168 **unnecessary use**, such as patients who were diagnosed with viral infections but received antibiotics; 2)
169 **incorrect antibiotic spectrum**, such as aminoglycosides are prescribed for gram-positive bacteria; 3)
170 **combination of antibiotics without indication**, refers to the use of more than one systemic antibiotic
171 in a visit, such as amoxicillin and levofloxacin in combination. Figure 3 shows an example of a pop-up
172 message when an inappropriate antibiotic is prescribed. The feedback messages that the physicians
173 received are actually shown in Chinese but here have been translated into English.




174
175
176

Figure 3 Example of real-time warning pop-up message

177 The second measure of the feedback involves providing antibiotic prescription information to
178 physicians every 10 days according to the HIS. The link to the prescription feedback information
179 appears at the bottom of the physician's computer screen, which the physician can click at any time and
180 automatically updates every 10 days. As shown in Figure 4, the 10-day antibiotic prescription feedback

181 included five functional areas. An automatic pop-up message was used to remind physicians to click on
182 the link to view the information. The message was confidential; only the physician could see it. The
183 physicians are free to pay attention to it or ignore it. The number of clicks per physician was also
184 automatically recorded by the system.



185

186

187

Figure 4 Example of a 10-day antibiotic prescription feedback

188 The third part of the intervention is the educational brochures. Figure 5 shows a screen shot of the
189 brochure's cover, catalogue, and example of content (see Appendix 3 for details). The physicians could
190 receive advice on antibiotic use and guidance on the diagnosis of common infections at the primary
191 level. The number in the disease diagnosis section represents the diagnostic value, the higher the
192 number, the higher the diagnostic value.

Clinical Use of Common Antibiotics And Diagnosis of Related Disease in Outpatient of Primary Care Institutions

Guidance And Recommendations Brochure

GUIZHOU MEDICAL UNIVERSITY

Catalogue

1. Recommendation table for evaluation of appropriate use of antibiotics for common bacterial infectious page 1
2. Recommendation table for diagnosis of respiratory diseases in primary Care institutions page 10
3. Recommendation table for diagnosis of digestive diseases in primary care institutions page 42
4. Recommendation table for diagnosis of urinary diseases and other diseases in primary care institutions page 70

Recommendation table for evaluation of appropriate use of antibiotics for common bacterial infectious diseases in primary care institutions

Preferred medication (P) Antibiotic can be used or substituted (A) Incorrect spectrum of antibiotics (N) Unnecessary use (W)								
ICD10 code	Diseases	Penicillins	Cephalosporins	Macrolides	Quinolones	Lincomsides	Nitroimidazoles	Aminoglycosides
I. Upper respiratory system								
J00	Acute nasopharyngitis [common cold]	W	W	W	W	W	W	W
J02	Acute pharyngitis	P	A	A	A	N	N	N
J03	Acute tonsillitis	P	A	A	A	N	N	N
J04	Acute laryngitis and tracheitis	P	P	P	P	A	N	N
J06	Acute upper respiratory infections of multiple and unspecified sites	W	W	W	W	W	W	W
J31	Chronic rhinitis, nasopharyngitis and pharyngitis	W	W	W	W	W	W	W
J32	Chronic sinusitis	A	A	A	A	N	N	N
J39	Other diseases of upper respiratory tract	W	W	W	W	W	W	W

Recommendation table for diagnosis of digestive diseases in primary care institutions

serial number	name of disease	Diagnostic basis		Proportion
1	Gingivitis	Symptom	1 Gums bleed when brush teeth or bite on something hard (bright red).	3
			2 Gingiva local itching, swelling, discomfort and bad breath.	3
		Signs	1 The gum margins and nipples are bloodshot, swollen and glistening, the gums are bright red or dark red and may bleed when probed.	4
			2 Free gingival and gingival papilla are bright red or dark red, hyperemia can spread to the attached gingival.	2
2	Periodontitis	Symptom	3 Gingival material is soft and fragile, lack of elasticity.	2
			4 Gingival sulcus probing was more than 3cm, gingival sulcus can bleed lightly, exudate increased in gingival sulci.	2
			1 The gums are red, swollen and bleeding (dull-red).	4
		Signs	2 Gingival abscess, periodontal pocket formation (true periodontal pocket).	2
			3 Loose teeth, weak chewing.	2
			1 Gingival recession, gingival exposure.	4
			2 It is attached and can penetrate into the cementum enamel.	3
assisted examination	3 Periodental abscess.	2		
	1 X-ray examination: periodontal space widened, alveolar bone was horizontal absorption.	2		
3	Acute pulpitis	Signe	1 Severe spontaneous pain, heat and cold irritation pain, pain at night.	4

Figure 5 Example of an Educational Brochure

195 **Control**

196 No intervention was provided for the physicians in the control group who were advised to continue to
197 treat patients as usual. During this period, all prescribing information from the physicians was
198 recorded, but was not reported back to the physicians.

199 **Data collection and management**

200 With the approval of ICGPHC, a data port was opened by LWTC technicians. We collected the
201 antibiotic prescriptions, total prescription data, and relevant patient information from primary care
202 institutions participating in the intervention trial. Codes were used to correlate the names of the
203 physicians and patients in their prescriptions. Demographic information on physicians was obtained
204 from the personnel department of the primary care institutions. All researchers involved in data
205 collection signed confidentiality agreements.

206 The International Classification of Diseases, 10th Edition (ICD-10) was used to classify the
207 diseases of patients who were prescribed antibiotics. According to the list of essential medicines
208 published by the World Health Organization, combined with the national guidelines for clinical
209 application of antibiotics, the clinical application catalogue of antibiotics was summarized (Appendix
210 4) [34-36]. The antibiotics were categorized into seven classes, namely penicillins, cephalosporins,
211 macrolides, quinolones, lincosamides, nitroimidazoles and aminoglycosides. Only systemic antibiotics
212 were considered in this study; patients given external antibiotics such as erythromycin ointment and
213 levofloxacin eye drops were excluded.

214 **Outcome variables**

215 The primary outcome was the 10-day antibiotic prescription rate [23], which was the number of
216 antibiotic prescriptions per 10 days divided by all prescriptions for 10 days. The secondary outcome

217 was the 10-day inappropriate antibiotic prescription rate. The index was obtained by dividing the
218 number of inappropriate antibiotic prescriptions by the total number of antibiotic prescriptions. An
219 antibiotic prescription was determined to be inappropriate if any one of the following 3 criteria was
220 satisfied: 1) unnecessary use; 2) incorrect antibiotic spectrum; 3) combination of antibiotics without
221 indication. The characteristics of the physicians (age, sex, title, education, working years) and
222 information related to antibiotics were included in the analysis as covariates.

223 **Sample size**

224 The two independent means formula (two-tailed) was used to calculate the minimum number of
225 physicians required for each group.

$$n_1 = \frac{\left(z_{1-\frac{\alpha}{2}} + z_{1-\beta}\right)^2 \left[\sigma_1^2 + \frac{\sigma_2^2}{r}\right]}{\Delta^2}$$
$$r = \frac{n_2}{n_1}, \Delta = \mu_1 - \mu_2$$

226
227 According to previous research experience [23], the average antibiotic prescription rate of the two
228 groups were 35% and 30% and the variance was 15% for both. The type I error (α) was 0.05 and type
229 II error (β) was 0.2. At least 142 physicians were needed in each group to observe the effects of the
230 intervention. Considering a 10% attrition rate, at least 160 physicians were required in each group, for a
231 total of 320.

232 **Statistical analyses**

233 Student's t test and rank-sum tests were used to compare the 10-day antibiotic prescription rate and the
234 10-day inappropriate antibiotic prescription rate between the two groups and within the same group.
235 The effect of the intervention was measured by comparing antibiotic prescription rates and
236 inappropriate rates at baseline, cross-over point, and end point. After the intervention, the antibiotic

237 prescription rate and inappropriate prescription rate of physicians may not change immediately, and the
238 magnitude of the change in rates may be different over time. Consequently, a transition model was
239 used to predict the impact of the intervention on the antibiotic prescription rate and inappropriate
240 antibiotic prescription rate. This model can adjust for statistical differences of physicians' baseline
241 characteristics before and after the cross-over point, and further explore the specific impact of the
242 intervention on the antibiotic prescription rate. Spearman and Pearson correlation analyses were used to
243 explore the relationship between antibiotic prescription rates and inappropriate antibiotic prescription
244 rates during the intervention, as well as the relationship between physicians ranking and
245 mouse-clicking frequency. Based on an intention-to-treat principle [37], data from outpatient
246 physicians at all participating primary care institutions were included throughout the analysis (except
247 for seven physicians at two hospitals where HIS was replaced). All data for this study was analyzed
248 using R version 4.0.4.

249 **Results**

250 A total of 79 primary care institutions consisting of 335 physicians were recruited. Thirty-nine primary
251 care institutions containing 167 physicians were randomly assigned to group 1 (intervention followed
252 by control) and 40 primary care institutions containing 168 physicians were randomly assigned to
253 group 2 (control followed by intervention). However, in group 1, two primary care institutions were
254 excluded because they had changed their HIS, so we were unable to obtain their prescription data
255 (Figure 4). Overall, 313,165 antibiotic prescriptions were included in the analysis. Table 1 shows the
256 baseline characteristics of physicians. The antibiotic prescription rates in group 1 and group 2 were
257 32.1% (10582/32938) and 35.6% (13097/36832), respectively. The two groups were similar in terms of
258 sex, age, education, title and working years.

259

Table 1 Baseline characteristic of the physicians [Mean ± SD or n (%)]


Characteristic	group 1 (n = 160)	group 2 (n = 168)	Total (n = 328)
Antibiotic prescription rate	32.1	35.6	33.9
Sex			
Male	98 (61.2)	108 (64.3)	206 (62.8)
Female	62 (38.8)	60 (35.7)	122 (37.2)
Age			
21-31	58 (36.3)	61 (36.3)	119 (36.3)
32-41	44 (27.4)	59 (35.1)	103 (31.4)
42-65	58 (36.3)	48 (28.6)	106 (32.3)
Education			
Technical secondary school	23 (14.3)	27 (16.1)	50 (15.2)
Junior college	58 (36.3)	78 (46.4)	136 (41.5)
college	79 (49.4)	63 (37.5)	142 (43.3)
Title			
resident physician	121 (75.6)	145 (86.3)	266 (81.1)
attending physician	24 (15.0)	14 (8.3)	38 (11.6)
associate chief physician	15 (9.4)	9 (5.4)	24 (7.3)
Working years	14.6 ± 10.7	13.2 ± 9.6	13.9 ± 10.3

260

261 The trends of antibiotic prescription and inappropriate antibiotic prescription rates over time in the
262 two groups are shown in Figure 6. The bottom half of the figure shows trends in antibiotic prescription
263 rates for group 1 (blue triangles) and group 2 (red circles). At baseline, there was no statistically
264 significant difference in antibiotic prescription rates between the two groups ($p = 0.085$). The rate of
265 antibiotic prescription in group 1 decreased significantly after 20 days and then gradually leveled off.
266 The antibiotic prescription rate of group 2 also decreased, but the change was not as obvious compared
267 with group 1. At the end of the first period (at the cross-over point), the antibiotic prescription rate in
268 group 1 decreased by 11.9% ($p < 0.001$) and in group 2 by 4.5% ($p < 0.001$). In period 2, after the
269 cross-over, the rate of antibiotic prescriptions in group 1 increased initially but decreased overall (Δ APR
270 = 2.6%, $p = 0.045$). At this stage, group 2 was receiving the intervention and maintained their

271 downward trend (Δ APR = 11.7%, $p < 0.001$).

272 The top half of Figure 5 shows trends in inappropriate antibiotic prescription rates for group 1 and
 273 group 2. In Period 1, the rate in group 1 decreased by 12.3% ($p < 0.001$), while in group 2 the rate
 274 decreased by 3.1% ($p = 0.028$). In period 2, group 2 received the intervention, and the inappropriate
 275 antibiotic prescription rate decreased rapidly at the beginning and then gradually decreased (Δ AIR =
 276 15.9%, $p < 0.001$). In group 1, who crossed over to the control, the inappropriate antibiotic prescription
 277 rate increased to 64.1% ($p < 0.001$) by the end of the study.



278

279 *APR: Antibiotic prescription rate #IAPR: Inappropriate antibiotic prescription rate

280 **Figure 6 Comparison of antibiotic prescription rates and inappropriate antibiotic prescription rates over**
 281 **time between the two groups**

282

283 To predict changes in antibiotic prescription and inappropriate antibiotic prescription rates over

284 time, two transition models were fit to the data with the results shown in Table 2. The coefficients

285 represent changes in rates under the influence of explanatory variables. The intercept coefficients of
 286 antibiotic prescription rate and inappropriate rate were -0.05 ($p = 0.005$)/ -0.04 ($p = 0.616$), indicating
 287 that when all variables were controlled for in the initial state, antibiotic prescription and inappropriate
 288 antibiotic prescription rates decreased by 5% and 4% every 10 days, respectively. The respective
 289 coefficients for the feedback intervention were -0.05 ($p < 0.001$) and -0.04 ($p = 0.046$), meaning that
 290 the intervention resulted in a 5% and 4% reduction in 10-day antibiotic and inappropriate antibiotic
 291 prescribing rates. The coefficients for time point were 0.01 ($p = 0.009$) and 0.007 ($p = 0.037$), for
 292 antibiotic prescriptions and inappropriate antibiotic prescriptions, respectively and for period were
 293 -0.04 ($p = 0.041$) and -0.05 ($p = 0.145$), respectively, indicating that both rates decreased gradually
 294 with the passage of time, and the decreasing rates in period 2 were 4% and 5% lower than that of
 295 period 1. The correlation coefficients of physicians' demographic characteristics were not significant in
 296 both models. Period was also not significant for inappropriate antibiotic prescription rates.

Table 2 Transition model predicting the change in antibiotic prescription rates and inappropriate antibiotic prescription rates

Characteristic	Coef.	95% CI	p (t-test)	p (F-test)
(Intercept)	-0.05 / -0.04		0.005 / 0.616	0.005 / 0.616
Feedback (intervention vs control)	-0.05 / -0.04	(-0.07, -0.03) / (-0.07, 0)	< 0.001 / 0.046	< 0.001 / 0.046
Time point (1–19)	0.01 / 0.007	(0.00, 0.01) / (0, 0.01)	0.009 / 0.037	0.009 / 0.037
Period (2 vs 1)	-0.04 / -0.05	(-0.08, 0.00) / (-0.13, 0.02)	0.041 / 0.145	0.041 / 0.145
Physicians' characteristic				
Sex: male vs female	0.00 / 0.00	(-0.02, 0.02) / (-0.04, 0.04)	0.872 / 0.917	0.872 / 0.917
Age: ref. = 22–31 years				0.992 / 0.999
32-41	0.00 / 0.00	(-0.03, 0.03) / (-0.05, 0.05)	0.908 / 0.991	
42-65	0.00 / 0.00	(-0.07, 0.06) / (-0.11, 0.11)	0.908 / 0.968	
Education: ref. = college				0.919 / 0.942
Junior college	0.00 / 0.00	(-0.03, 0.02) / (-0.04, 0.04)	0.687 / 0.95	

Technical secondary school	0.00 / 0.01	(-0.04, 0.03) / (-0.05, 0.07)	0.815 / 0.774	
Title: ref. = Associate chief physician				0.99 / 0.996
Attending physician	0.00 / 0.00	(-0.05, 0.06) / (-0.09, 0.09)	0.91 / 0.98	
Resident physician	0.00 / 0.00	(-0.04, 0.05) / (-0.08, 0.08)	0.886 / 0.972	
Working years	0.00 / 0.00	(0.00, 0.00) / (-0.01, 0)	0.947 / 0.877	0.947 / 0.877

*APR: Antibiotic prescription rate


#IAPR: Inappropriate antibiotic prescription rate

297

298 Figure 7 shows the correlation of antibiotic prescription rate and inappropriate antibiotic

299 prescription rate between the two groups under the intervention state. The correlation coefficients are

300 0.954 ($p < 0.001$) and 0.947 ($p < 0.001$), respectively.



301

302 *APR: Antibiotic prescription rate #IAPR: Inappropriate antibiotic prescription rate

303 **Figure 7 Correlations between antibiotic prescription rates and inappropriate antibiotic prescription rates**

304 **under intervention condition. Notes:** In Figure 7, the correlations between the antibiotic prescription rate and

305 inappropriate antibiotic prescription rate are shown. The box in the lower left corner indicates the relevant

306 direction; blue means positive. The top right pie chart shows the strength of the correlation. The larger areas of the


307 color portion of the pie, the stronger the correlation.

308

309 Figure 8 shows a strong negative correlation between antibiotic prescription ranking and number

310 of clicks on the pop-up during the intervention period ($r = 0.591$, $p < 0.001$). The lower the physicians'

311 rankings (representing lower rates of antibiotic prescriptions), the higher the number of clicks.



312

313 **Figure 8 Correlation between antibiotic prescription ranking and number of clicks under intervention**
314 **conditions. Notes:** In Figure 8, the correlation between antibiotic prescription rate ranking and number of clicks
315 during the intervention period are shown. The box in the lower left corner indicates the relevant direction; red
316 means negative. The top right pie chart shows the strength of the correlation. The larger areas of the color portion
317 of the pie, the stronger the correlation.

318

319 Discussion

320 In this study, we attempted to build on the previous study [23] with a more comprehensive feedback
321 intervention in new primary care institutions (n=77) and outpatient physicians (n=328). These
322 interventions aimed to provide antibiotic prescription feedback to physicians every 10 days, real-time
323 warnings of inappropriate antibiotic prescriptions, and educational brochures. The latter two
324 interventions were added from our previous study [23]. These interventions were significant and stable
325 in reducing antibiotic prescription rates by outpatient physicians in primary care institutions. In terms
326 of the inappropriate antibiotic prescription rate, the effect was evident in the first intervention period
327 but had an upward trend in the second control period. None of the physician characteristics were
328 associated with antibiotic prescription or inappropriate prescription rates.

329 From baseline to endpoint, the antibiotic prescription rates of the two groups were reduced by
330 14.5% (group 1) and 16.2% (group 2) This is close to the reduction in antibiotic prescription rates seen
331 in our previous study [23]. Recent studies have shown that interventions can reduce antibiotic

332 prescription rates by 5.6% to 22% [15, 38, 39]. However, the limitation of our previous study [23] was
333 that it only considered the reduction of antibiotic prescription rate, without considering the rationality
334 of antibiotics. As a result, the primary care institutions and physicians focused only on reducing
335 antibiotic prescriptions, regardless of whether antibiotic prescriptions were justified. Therefore, an
336 effective intervention can only be achieved if both the overall prescribing rate and the inappropriate
337 prescribing rate of antibiotics are reasonably reduced. In addition, we also collected secondary
338 diagnostic information in this study. Therefore, the judgment of inappropriate antibiotic prescription
339 rates was more reasonable.

340 The feedback intervention measures mainly reminded the outpatient physicians to pay attention to
341 their prescribing behavior through real-time early warning feedback and information feedback once
342 every 10 days. Real-time warning pop-up messages are used to intervene when the physicians are about
343 to make an inappropriate prescribing behavior. This intervention makes them immediately aware that
344 there might be a problem with their prescription. Physicians can choose to change prescriptions or
345 ignore these warnings. The intervention is not mandatory, which may be why it was widely supported
346 by physicians and primary care institution leaders during the study period. In addition, the
347 confidentiality and non-coercive nature of the 10-day antibiotic prescription feedback, which continues
348 the previous study [23], made it more acceptable to the physicians. Moreover, in this study we
349 collected the number of mouse clicks made by physicians looking at information about prescriptions.
350 There was a negative correlation between the number of clicks and antibiotic prescription rate. This
351 indicates that the physicians with high compliance were more likely to change their prescribing
352 behavior. Future researchers should devise more interventions in which physicians voluntarily
353 participate. In addition, the educational brochures distributed were introduced in our intervention

354 protocol [29]. We developed the educational materials specifically for primary care physicians using
355 the Delphi method [40]. Distribution of educational manuals is a common educational intervention and
356 does not fall within the scope of a feedback intervention [18, 31]. However, it provides a powerful aid
357 for our feedback intervention. In the pre-intervention research phase, the physicians liked this brochure,
358 which was provided free of charge. It was conducive to the further development of feedback
359 intervention measures.

360 In the intervention period, the antibiotic and inappropriate antibiotic prescription rates of both
361 groups showed a rapid decline, followed by fluctuations. This phenomenon may be explained by the
362 transtheoretical model [41], which interprets behavior change as a continuous, dynamic, and gradual
363 process [42]. It is divided into 5 stages, including precontemplation, contemplation, preparation, action
364 and maintenance, and the transformation of each stage requires a process [43]. Real-time warning
365 pop-up messages accelerate the first four stages of the process enabling physicians to consider behavior
366 changes and act in just a few minutes. The contamination effect and Hawthorne effect also explain why
367 the first four stages of the transtheoretical model were so rapid in our study. As a result, antibiotic
368 prescription rates in the intervention group initially declined rapidly. However, due to obstacles such as
369 physician prescribing habits, patient interference, and distrust by some physicians, not everyone can
370 complete all five stages [44, 45]. This is probably why there were two slight rises in the prescription
371 rates during the intervention period. In the end, the intervention effect was consolidated again due to
372 the repeated reinforcement of prescription information reminders and educational brochure given once
373 every 10 days, and the overall change of physicians' prescribing behavior was finally realized.

374 We observed a rebound in inappropriate antibiotic prescription rates after the transition from
375 intervention to control. This may be due to the generally low professional and technical level of

376 physicians in primary care institutions in China [46, 47]. Without the real-time warning pop-up
377 message, physicians would not have been able to realize when they were prescribing inappropriate
378 antibiotics. Due to the delayed effect of behavioral interventions [48], they might blindly reduce
379 antibiotic prescriptions even in the absence of an intervention, but could not effectively change their
380 inappropriate prescription behavior. This result may also reflect the high compliance of physicians to
381 the real-time warning pop-up message. But overall, from our correlation test, there was a strong
382 positive correlation between the rate of antibiotic prescription and the rate of inappropriate antibiotic
383 prescription under the intervention conditions.

384 To further explore the effects of the intervention, transition models were used to predict the
385 impact of antibiotic and inappropriate antibiotic prescription rates. As expected, the effect of the
386 feedback intervention was significant and stable, which might be attributed to the real-time warning
387 pop-up message and educational brochures provided to the physicians. Further validation of the
388 relationship in the inappropriate antibiotic prescription rates between two periods may be required.

389 In conclusion, the combination of real-time warning pop-up messages, antibiotic prescription
390 feedback, and educational brochures enabled primary care physicians to prescribe antibiotics
391 appropriately and effectively reduce their antibiotic prescription rates. Our study plays an important
392 role in reducing the risk of antibiotic resistance. This new intervention may be preferable to our
393 previous study [23].

394 There are some limitations to the current study. Firstly, it is difficult to prevent communication
395 between physicians in different primary care institutions. Physicians in the control group of one
396 institution can inform their colleagues in other institutions of the intervention content in advance,
397 resulting in a contamination effect [49]. Secondly, all antibiotic prescribing data in our study came

398 from the HIS. Primary care institutions often run out of antibiotics. Some physicians gave their patients
399 paper prescriptions and instructed them to visit the pharmacy to buy the prescribed antibiotics. As a
400 result, the actual number of antibiotic prescriptions may be higher than what was reported in this study.

401 **Acknowledgments**

402 We thank all the participating institutions for providing information and assistance during the study.
403 The authors also thank all members of the investigational team who collected the data. We
404 acknowledge the assistance of Edward McNeil from The Chinese University of Hong Kong for
405 proof-reading the manuscript and providing suggestions to improve it.

406 **Declaration**

407 **Conflict of Interest**

408 All authors have no conflicts of interest to declare.

409 **Consent for publication**

410 Not applicable.

411 **Availability of data and materials**

412 The datasets used and/or analysed during the current study are available from the corresponding author
413 on reasonable request.

414 **Authors' contributions**

415 Conceptualization: YC and ZZC;

416 Data curation: STY;

417 Formal analysis: YC and JLY;

418 Funding acquisition: YC;

419 Investigation: YC, JLY, WD and SYW;

420 Methodology: YC and JLY;

421 Project administration: YC;

422 Supervision: XJL and XH;

423 Resources: XJL and XH;

424 Software: YC and JLY;

425 Visualization: YC and ZZC;

426 Writing – original draft: JLY;

427 Writing – review & editing: YC and ZZC

428 **Abbreviations**

429 CDSS: Clinical Decision Support System

430 HIS: Hospital Information System

431 DGNN: Depth Graph Neural Network technology

432 AI: artificial intelligence

433 LWTC: Lianke Weixin Technology Co., LTD.◦

434 ICGPHC: Information Center Guizhou Provincial Health Commission

435 ICD-10: International Classification of Diseases 10th Edition

436 APR: Antibiotic prescription rate

437 IAPR: Inappropriate antibiotic prescription rate

438 Reference

- 439 1. World Health Organization. Global Antimicrobial Resistance and Use Surveillance System
440 (GLASS) report: 2021. Report No. 9789240027336 Geneva (2021).
- 441 2. Seventy-Second World Health Assembly. Antimicrobial resistance 2019.
442 URL: https://apps.who.int/gb/ebwha/pdf_files/WHA72/A72_R5-en.pdf.
- 443 3. Global burden of bacterial antimicrobial resistance in 2019: a systematic analysis. *Lancet*
444 (London, England). 2022;399(10325):629-55.
- 445 4. World Health Organization. Antimicrobial resistance.
446 <https://www.who.int/en/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/antimicrobial-resistance>.
- 447 5. Browne AJ, Chipeta MG, Haines-Woodhouse G, Kumaran EPA, Hamadani BHK, Zaraa S, et al.
448 Global antibiotic consumption and usage in humans, 2000-18: a spatial modelling study. *Lancet*
449 *Planet Health*. 2021;5(12):e893-e904.
- 450 6. World Health Organization. WHO report on surveillance of antibiotic consumption: 2016-2018
451 early implementation. Report No. 9789241514880 Geneva (2018).
- 452 7. Zhao H, Wei L, Li H, Zhang M, Cao B, Bian J, et al. Appropriateness of antibiotic prescriptions in
453 ambulatory care in China: a nationwide descriptive database study. *The Lancet Infectious*
454 *diseases*. 2021;21(6):847-57.
- 455 8. Xiao Y, Wang J, Shen P, Zheng B, Zheng Y, Li L. Retrospective survey of the efficacy of
456 mandatory implementation of the Essential Medicine Policy in the primary healthcare setting in
457 China: failure to promote the rational use of antibiotics in clinics. *International Journal of*
458 *Antimicrobial Agents*. 2016;48(4):409-14.
- 459 9. Chang Y, Chusri S, Sangthong R, McNeil E, Hu J, Du W, et al. Clinical pattern of antibiotic
460 overuse and misuse in primary healthcare hospitals in the southwest of China. *PLoS One*.
461 2019;14(6):e0214779. 2019.
- 462 10. Queder A, Arnold C, Wensing M, Poß-Doering R. Contextual factors influencing physicians'
463 perception of antibiotic prescribing in primary care in Germany - a prospective observational
464 study. *BMC Health Serv Res*. 2022;22(1):331.
- 465 11. Laka M, Milazzo A, Merlin T. Inappropriate antibiotic prescribing: understanding
466 clinicians' perceptions to enable changes in prescribing practices. *Australian health*
467 *review : a publication of the Australian Hospital Association*. 2022;46(1):21-7.
- 468 12. Liu C, Wang D, Duan L, Zhang X, Liu C. Coping With Diagnostic Uncertainty in Antibiotic
469 Prescribing: A Latent Class Study of Primary Care Physicians in Hubei China. *Front Public*
470 *Health*. 2021;9:741345.
- 471 13. Dyar OJ, Yang D, Yin J, Sun Q, Stålsby Lundborg C. Variations in antibiotic prescribing among
472 village doctors in a rural region of Shandong province, China: a cross-sectional analysis of
473 prescriptions. *BMJ Open*. 2020;10(6):e036703.
- 474 14. Liu C, Liu C, Wang D, Deng Z, Tang Y, Zhang X. Determinants of antibiotic prescribing
475 behaviors of primary care physicians in Hubei of China: a structural equation model based on the
476 theory of planned behavior. *Antimicrob Resist Infect Control*. 2019;8:23.
- 477 15. McIsaac W, Kukan S, Huszti E, Szadkowski L, O'Neill B, Virani S, et al. A pragmatic
478 randomized trial of a primary care antimicrobial stewardship intervention in Ontario, Canada.
479 *BMC Fam Pract*. 2021;22(1):185.
- 480 16. Gulliford MC, Prevost AT, Charlton J, Juszczak D, Soames J, McDermott L, et al. Effectiveness

- 481 and safety of electronically delivered prescribing feedback and decision support on antibiotic use
482 for respiratory illness in primary care: REDUCE cluster randomised trial. *BMJ*. 2019;364:l236.
- 483 17. Nabovati E, Jeddi FR, Farrahi R, Anvari S. Information technology interventions to improve
484 antibiotic prescribing for patients with acute respiratory infection: a systematic review. *Clinical*
485 *microbiology and infection* : the official publication of the European Society of Clinical
486 *Microbiology and Infectious Diseases*. 2021;27(6):838-45.
- 487 18. Wei X, Zhang Z, Walley JD, Hicks JP, Zeng J, Deng S, et al. Effect of a training and educational
488 intervention for physicians and caregivers on antibiotic prescribing for upper respiratory tract
489 infections in children at primary care facilities in rural China: a cluster-randomised controlled
490 trial. *The Lancet Global Health*. 2017;5(12):e1258-e67.
- 491 19. Delsors E, Monsó F, López-Román FJ, Menárguez-Puche JF, Gonzalez-Barberá M, Hukelova H,
492 et al. Changes in antibiotic prescription following an education strategy for acute respiratory
493 infections. *NPJ Prim Care Respir Med*. 2021;31(1):34.
- 494 20. Kandel CE, Gill S, McCreedy J, Matelski J, Powis JE. Reducing co-administration of proton
495 pump inhibitors and antibiotics using a computerized order entry alert and prospective audit and
496 feedback. *BMC Infect Dis*. 2016;16:355.
- 497 21. Hogli JU, Garcia BH, Skjold F, Skogen V, Smabrekke L. An audit and feedback intervention
498 study increased adherence to antibiotic prescribing guidelines at a Norwegian hospital. *BMC*
499 *Infect Dis*. 2016;16:96.
- 500 22. Zhen L, Jin C, Xu HN. The impact of prescriptions audit and feedback for antibiotic use in rural
501 clinics: interrupted time series with segmented regression analysis. *BMC Health Serv Res*.
502 2018;18(1):777.
- 503 23. Chang Y, Sangthong R, McNeil EB, Tang L, Chongsuvivatwong V. Effect of a computer
504 network-based feedback program on antibiotic prescription rates of primary care physicians: A
505 cluster randomized crossover-controlled trial. *J Infect Public Health*. 2020;13(9):1297-303.
- 506 24. Scarselli F, Gori M, Tsoi AC, Hagenbuchner M, Monfardini G. The graph neural network model.
507 *IEEE transactions on neural networks*. 2009;20(1):61-80.
- 508 25. Gao Q, Ma P. Graph Neural Network and Context-Aware Based User Behavior Prediction and
509 Recommendation System Research. *Computational intelligence and neuroscience*.
510 2020;2020:8812370.
- 511 26. Li Y, Qian B, Zhang X, Liu H. Graph Neural Network-Based Diagnosis Prediction. *Big data*.
512 2020;8(5):379-90.
- 513 27. Zhao T, Hu Y, Valsdottir LR, Zang T, Peng J. Identifying drug-target interactions based on graph
514 convolutional network and deep neural network. *Briefings in bioinformatics*. 2021;22(2):2141-50.
- 515 28. Nolan SJ, Hambleton I, Dwan K. The Use and Reporting of the Cross-Over Study Design in
516 *Clinical Trials and Systematic Reviews: A Systematic Assessment*. *PLoS One*.
517 2016;11(7):e0159014.
- 518 29. Chang Y, Yao Y, Cui Z, Yang G, Li D, Wang L, et al. Changing antibiotic prescribing practices in
519 outpatient primary care settings in China: Study protocol for a health information system-based
520 cluster-randomised crossover controlled trial. *PLoS One*. 2022;17(1):e0259065.
- 521 30. Tang Y, Liu C, Zhang Z, Zhang X. Effects of prescription restrictive interventions on antibiotic
522 procurement in primary care settings: a controlled interrupted time series study in China. *Cost Eff*
523 *Resour Alloc*. 2018;16:1.
- 524 31. Hemkens LG, Saccilotto R, Reyes SL, Glinz D, Zumbunn T, Grolimund O, et al. Personalized

- 525 Prescription Feedback Using Routinely Collected Data to Reduce Antibiotic Use in Primary Care:
526 A Randomized Clinical Trial. *JAMA Intern Med.* 2017;177(2):176-83.
- 527 32. Wattal C, Goel N, Khanna S, Byotra SP, Laxminarayan R, Easton A. Impact of informational
528 feedback to clinicians on antibiotic-prescribing rates in a tertiary care hospital in Delhi. *Indian J*
529 *Med Microbiol.* 2015;33(2):255-9.
- 530 33. Erturk Sengel B, Bilgin H, Oren Bilgin B, Gidener T, Saydam S, Pekmezci A, et al. The need for
531 an antibiotic stewardship program in a hospital using a computerized pre-authorization system. *Int*
532 *J Infect Dis.* 2019;82:40-3.
- 533 34. WHO Access, Watch, Reserve (AWaRe) classification of antibiotics for evaluation and
534 monitoring of use, 2021. Geneva: World Health Organization; 2021
535 (WHO/HMP/HPS/EML/2021.04).
- 536 35. World Health Organization Model List of Essential Medicines – 22nd List, 2021. Geneva: World
537 Health Organization; 2021 (WHO/MHP/HPS/EML/2021.02).
538 <https://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/handle/10665/345533/WHO-MHP-HPS-EML-2021.02-eng.pdf>.
- 539 36. National Health Commission of the People's Republic of China. Guidelines for clinical application
540 of antibiotics (2015).
541 <http://www.nhc.gov.cn/ewebeditor/uploadfile/2015/09/20150928170007470.pdf>.
- 542 37. McCoy CE. Understanding the Intention-to-treat Principle in Randomized Controlled Trials. *The*
543 *western journal of emergency medicine.* 2017;18(6):1075-8.
- 544 38. Hemkens LG, Saccolotto R, Reyes SL, Glinz D, Zumbunn T, Grolimund O, et al. Personalized
545 prescription feedback to reduce antibiotic overuse in primary care: rationale and design of a
546 nationwide pragmatic randomized trial. *BMC Infect Dis.* 2016;16:421.
- 547 39. Du Yan L, Dean K, Park D, Thompson J, Tong I, Liu C, et al. Education vs Clinician Feedback on
548 Antibiotic Prescriptions for Acute Respiratory Infections in Telemedicine: a Randomized
549 Controlled Trial. *J Gen Intern Med.* 2021;36(2):305-12.
- 550 40. Q W, Chang Y, Cui Z, ST Y, L W, XY F. Preparation of recommendation manual for diagnosis
551 and evaluation of bacterial infectious diseases and rational use of antibiotics (respiratory system
552 part) in primary institutions. *Herald of Medicine.* 2022;41(05):733-42.
- 553 41. DiClemente CC, Prochaska JO. Self-change and therapy change of smoking behavior: a
554 comparison of processes of change in cessation and maintenance. *Addictive behaviors.*
555 1982;7(2):133-42.
- 556 42. Hashemzadeh M, Rahimi A, Zare-Farashbandi F, Alavi-Naeini AM, Daei A. Transtheoretical
557 Model of Health Behavioral Change: A Systematic Review. *Iranian journal of nursing and*
558 *midwifery research.* 2019;24(2):83-90.
- 559 43. Norcross JC, Krebs PM, Prochaska JO. Stages of change. *Journal of clinical psychology.*
560 2011;67(2):143-54.
- 561 44. Moges NA, Adesina OA, Okunlola MA, Berhane Y. Barriers and Facilitators of Same-Day
562 Antiretroviral Therapy Initiation Among People Newly Diagnosed with HIV in Ethiopia:
563 Qualitative Study Using the Transtheoretical Model of Behavioral Change. *Journal of*
564 *multidisciplinary healthcare.* 2020;13:1801-15.
- 565 45. Hefnawi B, Leung L, Tomasone JR. Exploring barriers medical residents and established
566 physicians face counselling patients on physical activity by stage of the transtheoretical model.
567 *Psychology, health & medicine.* 2021;26(6):684-91.
- 568 46. Sun Q, Dyar OJ, Zhao L, Tomson G, Nilsson LE, Grape M, et al. Overuse of antibiotics for the

- 569 common cold - attitudes and behaviors among doctors in rural areas of Shandong Province, China.
570 BMC Pharmacol Toxicol. 2015;16:6.
- 571 47. Xu R, Mu T, Jian W, Xu C, Shi J. Knowledge, Attitude, and Prescription Practice on
572 Antimicrobials Use Among Physicians: A Cross-Sectional Study in Eastern China. Inquiry : a
573 journal of medical care organization, provision and financing. 2021;58:469580211059984.
- 574 48. Lim CY, In J. Considerations for crossover design in clinical study. Korean journal of
575 anesthesiology. 2021;74(4):293-9.
- 576 49. Torgerson DJ. Contamination in trials: is cluster randomisation the answer? Bmj.
577 2001;322(7282):355-7.

578 **Supporting information**

579 S1 Appendix 1 CONSORT 2010 checklist of information to include when reporting a cluster


580 randomized trial

581 S2 Appendix 2 Certificate of approval for ethical review


582 S3 Appendix 3 The brochures cover, catalogue, and example of content

583 S4 Appendix 4 Catalogue for Clinical Application of Antibacterial Drugs

584 S5 Appendix 5 Metadata



Figure



Figure

Criteria



GUIZHOU MEDICAL UNIVERSITY

medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.07.14.22277620>; this version posted July 17, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license.



There is a risk that your antibiotic prescription may be inappropriate!



Details: Unnecessary use

Unnecessary use: Such as patients who were diagnosed with viral infections but received antibiotics.



GUIZHOU MEDICAL UNIVERSITY



There is a risk that your antibiotic prescription may be inappropriate!



Details: Incorrect antibiotic spectrum

Incorrect antibiotic spectrum: Prescribing aminoglycoside drugs for gram - positive bacteriad.



GUIZHOU MEDICAL UNIVERSITY



There is a risk that your antibiotic prescription may be inappropriate!



Details: Combination of antibiotics
Penicillin: amoxicillin capsule.
Quinolone: levofloxacin tablet.

Combination of antibiotics without indication: Refers to the use of more than one systemic antibiotic in a visit, such as amoxicillin and levofloxacin in combination.

1**This area showed the top 5 main diseases of patients.**

After the 10-day intervention period has been reached in the outpatient department of your institution, the top 5 main diseases of your patients :

1. Acute upper respiratory tract infection
2. Bronchitis
3. Acute pelvic inflammation
4. Confirm the pregnancy
5. Amenorrhea

**3****This area showed starting and ending time.**

From (2021-04-01 00:00:00)
To (2021-04-10 00:00:00)

You wrote out 62 prescriptions altogether

This area showed ranking of antibiotic prescription rate.

4

Your antibiotic prescription rate ranks among institutions: **1.**

Frequency of antibiotic use in 62 prescriptions:

Amoxicillin capsules	25%
Cephalosporin injection	15%
Norfloxacin tablets	10%
Azithromycin granules	8%
Ornidazole dispersible tablet	4%

Antibiotic prescription rate **62%**

Contraindications and precautions :

1. Disabled for penicillin allergies.
2. With a history of allergic diseases such as asthma, eczema, hay fever and urticaria should use with caution.

...

**2**

This area showed: 1) frequency and type of antibiotic;
2) Antibiotic prescription rate.

5

This area showed contraindications and precautions, if the physician clicked on the antibiotic name.

Clinical Use of Common Antibiotics And Diagnosis of Related

Disease in Outpatient of Primary Care Institutions

Guidance And Recommendations Brochure

GUIZHOU MEDICAL UNIVERSITY

Catalogue


1. Recommendation table for evaluation of appropriate use of antibiotics for common bacterial infectious page 1
2. Recommendation table for diagnosis of respiratory diseases in primary Care institutions page 10
3. Recommendation table for diagnosis of digestive diseases in primary care institutions page 42
4. Recommendation table for diagnosis of urinary diseases and other diseases in primary care institutions page 70

Recommendation table for evaluation of appropriate use of antibiotics for common bacterial infectious diseases in primary care institutions

Preferred medication (P) Antibiotic can be used or substituted (A) Incorrect spectrum of antibiotics (N) Unnecessary use (W)								
ICD10 code	Diseases	Penicillins	Cephalosporins	Macrolides	Quinolones	Lincosamides	Nitroimidazoles	Aminoglycosides
1. Upper respiratory system								
J00	Acute nasopharyngitis [common cold]	W	W	W	W	W	W	W
J02	Acute pharyngitis	P	A	A	A	N	N	N
J03	Acute tonsillitis	P	A	A	A	N	N	N
J04	Acute laryngitis and tracheitis	P	P	P	P	A	N	N
J06	Acute upper respiratory infections of multiple and unspecified sites	W	W	W	W	W	W	W
J31	Chronic rhinitis, nasopharyngitis and pharyngitis	W	W	W	W	W	W	W
J32	Chronic sinusitis	A	A	A	A	N	N	N
J39	Other diseases of upper respiratory tract	W	W	W	W	W	W	W

Recommendation table for diagnosis of digestive diseases in primary care institutions

serial number	name of disease	Diagnostic basis			Proportion
		Symptom			
1	Gingivitis	Symptom	1	Gums bleed when brush teeth or bite on something hard (bright red).	3
			2	Gingiva local itching, swelling, discomfort and bad breath.	3
		Signs	1	The gum margins and papilla are bloodshot, swollen and glistening, the gums are bright red or dark red and may bleed when probed.	4
			2	Free gingival and gingival papilla are bright red or dark red, hyperemia can spread to the attached gingiva.	2
			3	Gingival material is soft and fragile, lack of elasticity.	2
			4	Gingival sulcus probing was more than 3mm, gingival sulcus can bleed lightly, exudate increased in gingival sulci.	2
		2	Periodontitis	Symptom	1
2	Gingival abscess, periodontal pocket formation (true periodontal pocket).				2
3	Loose teeth, weak chewing.				2
Signs	1			Gingival recession, gingival exposure.	4
	2			It is attached and can penetrate into the cementum enamel.	3
3	Periodontal abscess.	2			
3	Acute pulpitis	Signs	1	X-ray examination: periodontal space widened, alveolar bone was horizontal absorption.	2
			1	Severe spontaneous pain, heat and cold irritation pain, pain at night.	4



Figure

*APR-Group1



*APR-Group2



Cor. = 0.954
 $p < 0.001$



#IAPR-Group1

Cor. = 0.947
 $p < 0.001$

#IAPR-Group2

Figure

rank



click

Figure