

1 Quality Improvement Report

2
3 **Improving the impact of pharmacy interventions in hospitals**

4
5 Rafael Baptista^{1*}, Mary Williams², Jayne Price¹

6
7 ¹ Medicines Management, Powys Teaching Health Board, Hafren Ward, Bronllys Hospital, Brecon, Powys, LD3 0LU,
8 UK.

9 ² Cardiff School of Pharmacy & Pharmaceutical Sciences. King Edward VII Avenue, Cardiff CF10 3NB, UK.

10
11 *Correspondence to Dr Rafael Baptista: rafael.baptista@wales.nhs.uk.

12
13
14 **Abstract**

15
16 The interventions of pharmacy professionals are considered impactful inputs towards optimised
17 patient care and safety, by rationalising prescriptions, enhancing therapeutic choices and reducing
18 and preventing medication errors and adverse effects. Between October 2020 and October 2021, the
19 community hospitals at Powys Teaching Health Board recorded 158 interventions, corresponding to
20 0.4 interventions per pharmacy staff per week. Predominantly, only two members of the team were
21 recording these pharmacy interventions (PIs). Poor indicative PIs can result in lost opportunities for
22 medication optimisation and prescribing rationalisation, increased costs and unidentified education
23 and training potentials.

24 The aims of this project were (1) to record 180 interventions between 22/11/2021 and 08/04/2022
25 (20 weeks), corresponding to an average 3-fold increase, compared to the interventions recorded
26 between October 2020 and October 2021 (52 weeks); (2) to have all hospital pharmacy staff
27 recording at least one intervention during the same period.

28 The number of interventions recorded and the number of pharmacy staff recording each intervention
29 were two process measures. The project was completed through two Plan-Do-Study-Act (PDSA)
30 cycles and applied theory on managing change in healthcare.

31 The most successful intervention influencing positively the process measures was the
32 implementation of a new Pharmacy Intervention Record Tool (xPIRT) toolkit that included an online
33 recording tool (xPIRT) and an interactive panel with up-to-date results from all interventions
34 recorded (xPIRT Dashboard). Motivating change was proven to be one of the best determinants of

35 user satisfaction and engagement that contributed to meet the project’s targets. xPIRT Dashboard
36 provided staff the capacity to act on possible personal motivators and the possibility to improving
37 care with medicines on their wards. The implementation of xPIRT toolkit was able to increase the
38 representativity and significance of PIs recorded by the hospital pharmacy team and it is expected to
39 be used for personal professional development, demonstrating team activity and impact, service
40 planning, prescribing practice optimisation, and to identify education/training needs. This toolkit can
41 be easily applied and adapted to other health organisations, settings and services.

42

43 **Keywords:** quality improvement, optimised prescribing, medication errors, drug safety, patient care.

44

45 Word count: 3174

46 Reference Count: 30

47

48

49

50

51 **Problem and aims**

52

53 This project focused on evidencing the impact of interventions made by pharmacy professionals
54 (pharmacists and pharmacy technicians) in Powys Teaching Health Board community hospitals
55 (PTHB), Wales. Optimising learning from these interventions will influence positively patient safety
56 and quality of care.[1,2] Poor indicative pharmacy interventions (PIs) can result in reduced
57 opportunities for medication optimisation and prescribing rationalisation, increased costs and
58 unidentified education and training potentials.

59 Between October 2020 and October 2021, the Medicines Management (MM) team (MM) of PTHB
60 have registered 158 interventions from two hospital pharmacy professionals — or 28.6% of the total
61 number of the pharmacy team (PT) staff. This corresponded to an average of 0.4 interventions per
62 pharmacist/pharmacy technician per week. These figures were not a true representation of the work
63 that the hospital PT develop in Powys and failed to collect representative data.

64 The aims of this project were: (1) the hospital PT in Powys to record at least 180 interventions
65 between 22/11/2021 and 08/04/2022 (20 weeks), corresponding to an average 3-fold increase of the
66 number of PIs recorded between October 2020 and October 2021 (52 weeks); (2) to have all PT staff
67 recording at least one intervention during the same period, corresponding to an increase of 75% in

68 the number of staff recording interventions. These goals were based on staffing numbers, their
69 working hours, and targets set up by the MM team in Powys.

70

71 **Background**

72

73 The interventions of pharmacy professionals are considered valuable inputs towards optimised
74 patient care and safety, by rationalising prescriptions and reducing and preventing medication
75 errors.[3] Multiple reports have concluded that pharmacy professionals were able to reduce the
76 length of stay of hospital inpatients[4] reduce readmission rates,[4,5] decrease the number of adverse
77 drug reactions,[6] promote better medicines use and adherence,[7–9] and discontinue inappropriate
78 prescribed medicines.[10]

79 Besides the consensus on the positive clinical impact of PTs, more cost-consequence analyses are
80 needed to evaluate the economic outcomes of these interventions. Nonetheless, several research
81 articles and meta-analysis concluded PIs contribute for more cost-effective prescribing choices
82 across a range of clinical conditions.[11–14] The economic impact of PIs may inform stakeholders
83 and decision-makers for policies that support more pharmacy funding to hospitals and community
84 pharmacies.[15]

85 Several strategies have been used to assess the clinical impact of PTs worldwide. The All Wales
86 Intervention Database (AWID) is available for the health boards in Wales. The Pharmacists Achieve
87 Results with Medications Documentation (PhARMD), a template that captures interventions and
88 outcomes of clinical pharmacists in an integrated healthcare system, is currently being used in
89 several hospitals in the United States of America.[3] Other recording tools have been previously
90 reported.[16–18]

91

92 **Baseline measurement**

93

94 An initial baseline study was conducted on the recorded interventions by the hospital PT in Powys
95 between October 2020 and October 2021. The only available tool used to collect this information
96 was AWID. Data collected — date, number of interventions and identification of the contributor —
97 was organised in a Microsoft Excel spreadsheet. A total of 158 interventions was recorded by two
98 pharmacy professionals. The calculated median was zero due to the lack of consistent data
99 throughout the period (Figure 1).

100

101

102 **Design**

103 The first author of this report was secured as ‘champion’ for this project and implemented all PDSA
104 methodology and quality improvement strategies. The PIs recorded by the author were not
105 considered in the project, reducing the risk of bias.

106 The process measures of the project were the number of interventions recorded and the number of
107 staff recording them. The outcome measures were the number of new local guidelines being
108 considered/written for Powys’ hospitals, based on the interventions recorded, and the awareness level
109 of the PT for recording PIs.

110 In this project, it was important to understand unintended consequences of the changes that were
111 implemented. Thus, the average time taken to record one intervention was indicated as a balancing
112 measure, to ensure that recording interventions would not have a considerable impact in the existing
113 pharmacy services on the wards of Powys hospitals. The time taken to record interventions was
114 automatically retrieved via Microsoft Forms.

115

116

117

118

119

120

121

122

123

124

125

126

127

128

129

130

131

132

133

134

135

136 **Strategy**

137

138 Two Plan-Do-Study-Act (PDSA) cycles were undertaken over a 20-week period. Table 1 provides a
 139 summary of these details.

140

141 Table 1 – Overview of the study design with specific changes in each PDSA cycle listed.

PDSA cycle	Contributors for inadequate record of PI	Changes
PDSA 1 (10 weeks)	Existing tools – AWID – are not easy to use.	Implementation of a new <u>Pharmacy Intervention Record Tool</u> — xPIRT — via Microsoft Forms.
	MM leadership did not inform the team of the importance of PI.	To remind and motivate the PT every Monday, via email.
		Any small changes on xPIRT should be implemented within 24 hours, after emailed feedback.
	Time limitation.	Reassurance that xPIRT is an easy-to-use form that would take less than 5 minutes to complete per intervention.
PDSA 2 (10 weeks)	Interventions’ results were not accessible for users.	Implementation of xPIRT Dashboard (via Microsoft Power BI), where all instantly updated results are readily available to all PT, via Microsoft Teams.
	Intervention’s results were not editable.	Creation of a sharable file, xPIRT List, (via Microsoft Lists) where results can be editable.
	Lack of awareness on the purpose/use of the data from interventions.	PT advisory meeting with intervention of the Head of Community Services/Pharmacy about the use of xPIRT and its data – local clinical governance meetings, inform local clinical guidelines and training needs.
	Time limitation.	PT advisory meeting with reassurance that, in order to meet the project’s targets, each PT staff would only need to invest 3 minutes per week on xPIRT.

142 AWID – All Wales Intervention Database; MM – Medicines Management; PDSA – Plan-Do-Study-Act; PT – pharmacy
 143 team; xPIRT – Pharmacy Intervention Record Tool.

144

145 **Plan-Do-Study-Act (PDSA) cycle 1**

146

147 To complement the baseline data, two surveys were completed by stakeholders (PT members, ward
148 managers and ward doctors), to evaluate the understanding and satisfaction with the current methods
149 of recording PIs.

150 All ward managers and prescribers initially surveyed agreed or strongly agreed that pharmacy
151 interventions change practice, improve patient safety and support service planning, and would make
152 them more aware of the role of the pharmacy teams in hospitals.

153 A stakeholder analysis was completed to establish priorities and differentiate stakeholders based on
154 their power/ interest in the project. Although essential stakeholders, ward managers and prescribers
155 were considered to have low power in the project, as this change focused more on the pharmacy
156 teams. In order to meet the aims of the project, these stakeholders would only be consulted in the
157 beginning of the project.

158 The PT stakeholders revealed that 75% of the hospital PT have not recorded their interventions in a
159 platform that maintained data security, between October 2020 and October 2021. Half of the PT did
160 not record any interventions at all. A fishbone diagram (Supplementary Figure 1) depicted the issues
161 encountered with the low number of interventions recorded. Further analysis showed that time
162 limitation, poor existing recording tools – AWID –, and lack of information or targets set up by the
163 MM leadership were the key factors that influenced the inadequate number of documented PIs
164 (Supplementary Figure 2).

165 Following the collection of the baseline data, our findings were presented to the PT stakeholders, to
166 encourage feedback and suggestions for improvement. Using the baseline data and feedback received
167 in the meeting, a PDSA methodology was implemented to complete a quality improvement strategy
168 over a 20-week period. Each PDSA cycle included a survey completed by all PT following by a short
169 planning meeting for loop feedback.

170

171 A short meeting and feedback loop, with baseline data for PIs recorded between October 2020 and
172 October 2021, was held with PT stakeholders in the beginning of PDSA cycle 1. After suggested
173 changes were in place, data was collected using the new Pharmacy Intervention Record Tool —
174 xPIRT (Supplementary Figure 3) — for 10 weeks, from 22/11/2021 to 28/01/2022. xPIRT was
175 developed using Microsoft Forms. Punctual feedback and additional suggestions were sent via email
176 and resolved within the same day.

177

178

179

180 **PDSA cycle 2**

181

182 A short meeting and feedback of an advisory survey took place before recording interventions for the
183 second PDSA cycle. A driver diagram was built to better visualise the changes that needed to be
184 implemented (Supplementary Figure 4).

185 In addition to the use of xPIRT, started in PDSA cycle 1, changes discussed in the meeting included
186 the assessing and editing of intervention results. Thus, an editable file available online via xPIRT
187 List with real-time recordings was shared with the PT, along with xPIRT Dashboard (Supplementary
188 Figure 5), available on Microsoft PowerBI (Premium License). Thus, xPIRT Toolkit was then
189 formed by xPIRT, xPIRT List and xPIRT Dashboard. This enabled the team to keep track of all
190 interventions done and select them, interactively, by ward, contributor, date, drug, and severity. The
191 overall intervention recording pathway is depicted in Supplementary Figure 5.

192 Other topics were addressed in the short meeting. Due to the reported time limitations, it was
193 reassured that, in order to meet the goals of this project, all PT staff should only spend 3 minutes per
194 week recording interventions, based on the Microsoft Forms calculated response time per submitted
195 record. Also, due to questions related with accuracy of the data recorded, the project ‘champion’
196 clarified his interventions were not considered when measuring improvement. Finally, due to
197 feedback obtained, it was explained that this data collection would be valuable to use in local clinical
198 governance meetings, would inform specific local guideline needs and could be used for personal
199 continuing professional development (CPD).

200 After all suggested changes were put in place, data was collected using xPIRT for 10 weeks (from
201 31/01/2021 to 08/04/2022). A final survey was sent to the PT stakeholders to evaluate and feedback
202 on the changes implemented during the project.

203

204 **Results and Discussion**

205

206 In the first PDSA cycle, an increase in the average number of interventions recorded (14.7
207 interventions per week) was registered, 63.3% above the target set for end of the project. The median
208 number of interventions recorded rose to 12, indicating a clear improvement from the baseline.
209 However, during this cycle not all the hospital PT, only 6 out of 8, have used xPIRT. Nonetheless,
210 this cycle provided valuable information that the changes impacted positively on the number of
211 interventions completed (Figures 1 and 2).

212 The second PDSA cycle also saw an increase in the average number of interventions recorded (14.8
213 interventions per week), 63.9% above the target set for end of the project. The median number of
214 interventions remained 12, indicating a clear improvement from the baseline but no different from
215 PDSA cycle 1. A total of 254 interventions were recorded, 41.4% above the target. This target was
216 achieved seven weeks before the end of the project (Figures 1 and 2).

217 Both aims of the project were met six weeks in advance of the end of the second PDSA cycle,
218 signified when all members of the PT had recorded at least one intervention (Figures 1 and 2).

219
220

221 Act-IP©, a website where French hospital pharmacists record their interventions,[19] was developed
222 in 2006, due to the lack of validated tools for documenting PIs in hospitals in France. This website
223 has recorded more than 800,000 PIs across 1100 hospitals by 3800 pharmacists, over the last 16
224 years. This enabled the study of key issues in pharmacy practice such as identifying trends in
225 interventions on groups of medicines, diseases or medical speciality, and determining factors
226 associated with prescribers' PI acceptance.[20,21] As the authors concluded that most of the
227 available tools did not measure the clinical, economic and organisational impact of PIs, the CLEO
228 (Clinical, Economic and Organisational) scale was adapted Act-IP© v2.[18] However, the authors
229 reference that the standardisation of documentation systems (e.g. information technology tools) of
230 most of the PI recording tools are still defective.[22] With our project, the xPIRT Toolkit allowed
231 integration of an easy and accessible tool which records clinical data and translated it to indicators of
232 economic and organisational impact. The creation of the xPIRT Toolkit considered not only the
233 identified needs for PI recording tools but was also driven by theory on managing change in
234 healthcare.

235 By adopting a 'systems thinking' approach, people, tasks, technology, environment (physical,
236 cultural, social) and organisational structures were all considered in the project.[23] The following
237 considerations, explained below, were taken into account: (1) foundation concept, (2) multiple
238 perspectives, (3) work conditions, (4) decisions' explanations and understanding and (5) analysis,
239 interactions and performance variability and flow.

240 A clear understanding of the concept of the project by stakeholders with power was essential for a
241 positive impact in quality. Improving knowledge dissemination contributes not only for better
242 clinical practice but also for enhanced performance in service improvements.[24] Knowledge
243 translation in this project was achieved by making explicit the purpose and structure of the
244 communication methods.[24] This project used a range of active-passive interactions to convey
245 information: infographics, workshops, emails and short talks. All different strategies allowed the PT

246 stakeholders to understand the importance of recording PIs, an important outcome measure. From the
247 baseline data gathered, 87.5% of the PT suggested that the record of PIs was important, with this
248 figure rising to 100% at PDSA cycle 2. Additionally, the same group of stakeholders considered that
249 the advantages of recording PIs would outweigh possible disadvantages (from a baseline of 49.9% of
250 the PT, to 85.7% at PDSA cycle 2).

251 Multiple perspectives from all stakeholders were considered. The use of anonymous staff feedback
252 and rapid engaging techniques are known to contribute for improved service quality.[25,26] The use
253 of anonymous surveys, in PDSA cycles 1 and 2, and continuous engagement via weekly emails,
254 allowed the project to take on board essential feedback that contributed for building the xPIRT
255 toolkit. In the short talk post-survey analysis, all ideas were considered but only some were applied.
256 However, no discarded ideas were left without an adequate explanation. At the PDSA cycle 1, 80%
257 of the PT considered that all their suggestions were considered, with this figure rising to 85.7% by
258 the second PDSA cycle.

259 A focus was also given to the PT work conditions. The average time to complete one intervention, an
260 important balancing measure of the project, was calculated to be in average 2.46 min in PDSA cycle
261 1 and 2.42 min in PDSA cycle 2. Although the average time to record one intervention did not
262 change significantly between PDSA cycles ($P = 0.903$, $t=0.1221$, $df=285$, independent unpaired t-
263 test), 83.3% of the PT indicated that recording PIs were a challenging competing priority with ward
264 work at PDSA cycle 1, with this figure decreasing to 71.4% at PDSA cycle 2. This was achieved by
265 avoiding the interesting concept of ‘projectness’ referred by Dixon-Woods et al.[27] Exhaustive
266 project-centric ideas or conversations were avoided during surveys or short talks, reducing the risk of
267 alienating staff. By acknowledging that PI would take some time from ward work and by keeping
268 goals realistic and achievable, the PT staff was able to successfully participate and engage with the
269 project.

270 The last point of ‘systems thinking’ regarding analysis, interactions and performance variability and
271 flow was considered by applying three effective approaches: (1) relationship-, (2) motivational- and
272 (3) value-based.

273 As relationship-based quality improvement strategies are often well succeeded due to easier
274 coordination processes[28] this project made sure that tight communication channels were kept with
275 every single PT staff.

276 The theory of motivating change describes the psychosocial-structural conditions for sustained
277 change from the perspective of front-line staff. A total of 85.7% of the PT staff mentioned that
278 xPIRT Dashboard would motivate them to record more interventions. The project intended to narrow
279 the gap between intrinsic and extrinsic motivators. xPIRT Dashboard provided staff the capacity to

280 act on possible personal motivators and the possibility of improving care on their wards. In addition,
281 witnessing effective change was motivating for the staff as positive outcomes provided a convincing
282 argument for the need to sustain improvement activity [29]. For instance, xPIRT Dashboard allowed
283 the identification of four different potential needs for local guidelines or formulary changes. This has
284 been identified as another important outcome measure. Motivating change along with the
285 implementation of xPIRT Dashboard may justify the success of the project in meeting both targets
286 during the second PDSA cycle.

287 Lastly, a value-based approach was linked to the ‘systems thinking’ as it empowers frontline teams
288 and can achieve a transformational outcome.[30] xPIRT Dashboard allowed each member of the PT
289 to consult cost avoidance projections by recording their interventions, per member of staff and as a
290 group. This not only improved extrinsic motivation but also improved team culture and project
291 engagement, towards a continuous quality improvement.

292 Overall, the PT satisfaction on this project, an important outcome measure, improved from the
293 baseline of 2.5/5 to 4.9/5 stars, at PDSA cycle 2.

294

295 **Limitations**

296

297 The significant variability within the PT presented as an important limitation for accurately assessing
298 improvement, in this project. These variables included staffing numbers and profile, the number of
299 days per week with ward cover by PT, and the information technology (IT) skill-mix.

300 It is known that recording interventions would have an impact on the PT ward work, as this could
301 draw staff’s attention from patients. Although this was constantly fed back throughout the project, it
302 is yet to be known the impact of this expected drawback.

303 This project was based on the work of the PT in community hospitals Powys and have not yet been
304 transposed to primary care or district general hospitals. Also, the technology behind xPIRT Toolkit
305 are dependent on Office 365 and Microsoft Power BI Premium licensing, which may be a limiting
306 step for some pharmacy teams.

307 While it is known that PIs contribute for improved patient care and safety, as they optimise
308 prescriptions and reduce and prevent medication errors, this measure of patient care and safety was
309 not directly assessed throughout this project. A higher number of PI yields more representative data,
310 true data, and xPIRT Toolkit can identify safety risks or unsafe care. However, it does not estimate
311 harm, disability or death due to adverse events in inpatients.

312

313 **Conclusions**

314

315 In the beginning of the PDSA cycle 1, it was highlighted that the record of PI lacked representativity
316 and significance. Besides the low number of interventions recorded, the team was not motivated and
317 did not understand the importance of recording this data.

318 The results here presented showed that an effective recording tool, that reflects the organisation's
319 wants and needs, is key for increasing the number of PI documented. xPIRT Dashboard created an
320 automatically updated visual platform that organised data into infographics ready to be used for
321 personal CPD, evidencing activity and impact, allowing service planning and informing clinical
322 governance meetings, and identifying education/training needs.

323 Although it was reported that recording interventions may have drawn staff's attention from patients,
324 it is yet to be known the impact of this expected drawback. Future work will evaluate the additional
325 workload potentially associated with the use of xPIRT Toolkit. The long-term success of this project
326 after PDSA cycle 2 will continue to be monitored.

327 This toolkit can be easily applied and adapted to other health organisations, settings and services and
328 is expected to contribute positively to patient safety.

329

330 **Acknowledgments**

331 The authors would like to thank all hospital staff of the medicines management/pharmacy, Powys
332 Teaching Health Board.

333

334 **Competing interests**

335 None declared

336

337 **Contributors**

338 Not applicable.

339

340 **Ethical approval**

341 Not applicable.

342

343 **Funding**

344 The publication costs of this quality improvement report have been supported by the Q Community,
345 led by The Health Foundation.

346 References

347

- 348 1 Cardwell K, Smith SM, Clyne B, *et al.* Evaluation of the General Practice Pharmacist (GPP)
349 intervention to optimise prescribing in Irish primary care: a non-randomised pilot study. *BMJ*
350 *Open* 2020;**10**:e035087. doi:10.1136/bmjopen-2019-035087
- 351 2 Donaldson LJ, Kelley ET, Dhingra-Kumar N, *et al.* Medication Without Harm: WHO's Third
352 Global Patient Safety Challenge. *Lancet* 2017;**389**:1680–1. doi:10.1016/S0140-
353 6736(17)31047-4
- 354 3 Groppi JA, Ourth H, Morreale AP, *et al.* Advancement of clinical pharmacy practice through
355 intervention capture. *American Journal of Health-System Pharmacy* 2018;**75**:886–92.
356 doi:10.2146/ajhp170186
- 357 4 Fosnight S, King P, Ewald J, *et al.* Effects of pharmacy interventions at transitions of care on
358 patient outcomes. *American Journal of Health-System Pharmacy* 2020;**77**:943–9.
359 doi:10.1093/ajhp/zxaa081
- 360 5 van der Linden L, Hias J, Walgraeve K, *et al.* Clinical Pharmacy Services in Older Inpatients:
361 An Evidence-Based Review. *Drugs & Aging* 2020;**37**:161–74. doi:10.1007/s40266-019-
362 00733-1
- 363 6 Suzuki S, Horinouchi A, Uozumi S, *et al.* Impact of outpatient pharmacy interventions on
364 management of thyroid patients receiving lenvatinib. *SAGE Open Medicine*
365 2020;**8**:2050312120930906. doi:10.1177/2050312120930906
- 366 7 Zhao A, Dangerfield DT, Nunn A, *et al.* Pharmacy-Based Interventions to Increase Use of
367 HIV Pre-exposure Prophylaxis in the United States: A Scoping Review. *AIDS and Behavior*
368 Published Online First: 2021. doi:10.1007/s10461-021-03494-4
- 369 8 Presley B, Groot W, Pavlova M. Pharmacy-led interventions to improve medication adherence
370 among adults with diabetes: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Research in Social and*
371 *Administrative Pharmacy* 2019;**15**:1057–67.
372 doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sapharm.2018.09.021>
- 373 9 Ylä-Rautio H, Siissalo S, Leikola S. Drug-related problems and pharmacy interventions in
374 non-prescription medication, with a focus on high-risk over-the-counter medications. *Int J*
375 *Clin Pharm* 2020;**42**:786–95. doi:10.1007/s11096-020-00984-8
- 376 10 Christopher CM, KC B, Blebil A, *et al.* Clinical and Humanistic Outcomes of Community
377 Pharmacy-Based Healthcare Interventions Regarding Medication Use in Older Adults: A
378 Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *Healthcare* . 2021;**9**. doi:10.3390/healthcare9111577
- 379 11 Steed L, Sohanpal R, Todd A, *et al.* Community pharmacy interventions for health promotion:
380 effects on professional practice and health outcomes. *Cochrane Database of Systematic*
381 *Reviews* Published Online First: 2019. doi:10.1002/14651858.CD011207.pub2
- 382 12 Onatade R, Appiah S, Stephens M, *et al.* Evidence for the outcomes and impact of clinical
383 pharmacy: Context of UK hospital pharmacy practice. *European Journal of Hospital*
384 *Pharmacy* 2018;**25**:E21–8. doi:10.1136/ejhpharm-2017-001303
- 385 13 Jourdan J-P, Muzard A, Goyer I, *et al.* Impact of pharmacist interventions on clinical outcome
386 and cost avoidance in a university teaching hospital. *International Journal of Clinical*
387 *Pharmacy* 2018;**40**:1474–81. doi:10.1007/s11096-018-0733-6
- 388 14 Mi X, Su X, Jin Z, *et al.* Economic evaluations of clinical pharmacy services in China: a
389 systematic review. *BMJ Open* 2020;**10**:e034862. doi:10.1136/bmjopen-2019-034862
- 390 15 Dalton K, Byrne S. Role of the pharmacist in reducing healthcare costs: current insights.
391 *Integr Pharm Res Pract* 2017;**6**:37–46. doi:10.2147/IPRP.S108047
- 392 16 Al-jedai A. Electronic Documentation of Clinical Pharmacy Interventions in Hospitals. In:
393 Karahoca ZANE-A, ed. . Rijeka: : IntechOpen 2012. Ch. 7. doi:10.5772/50425

- 394 17 Fernández-Llamazares CM, Manrique-Rodríguez S, Pérez-Sanz C, *et al.* Validation of a
395 method for recording pharmaceutical interventions. *J Clin Pharm Ther* 2012;**37**:459–63.
396 doi:10.1111/j.1365-2710.2011.01328.x
- 397 18 Vo HT, Charpiat B, Chanoine S, *et al.* CLEO: a multidimensional tool to assess clinical,
398 economic and organisational impacts of pharmacists' interventions. *European Journal of*
399 *Hospital Pharmacy* 2021;**28**:193 LP – 200. doi:10.1136/ejhpharm-2020-002642
- 400 19 Allenet B, Bedouch P, Rose F-X, *et al.* Validation of an instrument for the documentation of
401 clinical pharmacists' interventions. *Pharmacy World and Science* 2006;**28**:181–8.
402 doi:10.1007/s11096-006-9027-5
- 403 20 Bedouch P, Sylvoz N, Charpiat B, *et al.* Trends in pharmacists' medication order review in
404 French hospitals from 2006 to 2009: analysis of pharmacists' interventions from the Act-IP©
405 website observatory. *J Clin Pharm Ther* 2015;**40**:32–40. doi:10.1111/jcpt.12214
- 406 21 Mongaret C, Quillet P, Vo TH, *et al.* Predictive factors for clinically significant pharmacist
407 interventions at hospital admission. *Medicine* 2018;**97**:e9865.
408 doi:10.1097/MD.00000000000009865
- 409 22 Vo T-H, Charpiat B, Catoire C, *et al.* Tools for Assessing Potential Significance of Pharmacist
410 Interventions: A Systematic Review. *Drug Saf* 2016;**39**:131–46. doi:10.1007/s40264-015-
411 0370-0
- 412 23 McNab D, McKay J, Shorrocks S, *et al.* Development and application of systems thinking
413 principles for quality improvement. *BMJ Open Quality* 2020;**9**. doi:10.1136/bmjopen-
414 000714
- 415 24 Eljiz K, Greenfield D, Hogden A, *et al.* Improving knowledge translation for increased
416 engagement and impact in healthcare. *BMJ Open Quality* 2020;**9**. doi:10.1136/bmjopen-
417 000983
- 418 25 Frampton A, Fox F, Hollowood A, *et al.* Using real-time, anonymous staff feedback to
419 improve staff experience and engagement. *BMJ Open Quality* 2017;**6**.
420 doi:10.1136/bmjquality.u220946.w7041
- 421 26 Espin S, Indar A, Gross M, *et al.* Processes and tools to improve teamwork and
422 communication in surgical settings: a narrative review. *BMJ Open Quality* 2020;**9**.
423 doi:10.1136/bmjopen-2020-000937
- 424 27 Dixon-Woods M, McNicol S, Martin G. Ten challenges in improving quality in healthcare:
425 lessons from the Health Foundations programme evaluations and relevant literature. *BMJ*
426 *Quality & Safety* 2012;**21**:876–84. doi:10.1136/bmjqs-2011-000760
- 427 28 Purdy EI, McLean D, Alexander C, *et al.* Doing our work better, together: a relationship-
428 based approach to defining the quality improvement agenda in trauma care. *BMJ Open*
429 *Quality* 2020;**9**. doi:10.1136/bmjopen-2019-000749
- 430 29 Breckenridge JP, Gray N, Toma M, *et al.* Motivating Change: a grounded theory of how to
431 achieve large-scale, sustained change, co-created with improvement organisations across the
432 UK. *BMJ Open Quality* 2019;**8**. doi:10.1136/bmjopen-2018-000553
- 433 30 Siddiqui R, Naimi N al, Hassan RN, *et al.* 3 Value improvement methods across a healthcare
434 system demonstrating rapid results and innovative emergence of practical evidence of
435 improvement. *BMJ Open Quality* 2020;**9**:A3--A6. doi:10.1136/bmjopen-2020-IHI.3

436
437
438
439
440
441



442

443 Figure 1. A - Total number of interventions recorded on xPIRT (blue line) and target established for the project (orange
444 line). The target was met during PDSA cycle 2. B – Total number of pharmacy team (PT) staffing recording interactions
445 via xPIRT (blue line) and target established for the project (dashed orange line). This target was met during PDSA cycle
446 2.


447

448 Figure 2. Number of interventions recorded on xPIRT and respective median. Background data was obtained via All
449 Wales Intervention Database (AWID): interventions recorded in ‘A’ represent an attempt to use AWID, showing to be
450 unsuccessful after March 2021; astronomical points ‘B’ and ‘C’ demonstrate that AWID does not allow the user to
451 choose the interventions dates, thus concentrating all recordings in the same date, when interventions are submitted.
452 PDSA cycle 1 and 2 are evidenced with the red and green areas, respectively.

453

A**B**

Number of interventions



Interventions

Median