

Manuscript submission to PLoS One

Enhancing Patient Safety in Opioid Prescribing: A Systematic Review of Potential Indicators

Short title: **Opioid Safety Prescribing Indicators**

Neetu Bansal^{1*}, Wael Y. Khawagi^{2*}, Nan Shang³, Li-Chia Chen⁴

1. Ms Neetu Bansal, NIHR Clinical Doctoral Research Fellow. Centre for Pharmacoepidemiology and Drug Safety, Division of Pharmacy and Optometry, School of Health Sciences, Faculty of Biology, Medicine and Health, University of Manchester, Manchester Academic Health Science Centre. Oxford Road, Manchester, M13 9PT, UK
2. Dr Wael Y. Khawagi, Assistant Professor, Department of Clinical Pharmacy, College of Pharmacy, Taif University, Taif, Kingdom of Saudi Arabia
3. Dr Nan Shang, Research Associate, Centre for Pharmacoepidemiology and Drug Safety, Division of Pharmacy and Optometry, School of Health Sciences, Faculty of Biology, Medicine and Health, University of Manchester, Manchester Academic Health Science Centre. Oxford Road, Manchester, M13 9PT, UK
4. Prof Li-Chia Chen, Professor of Drug Utilisation Research, Centre for Pharmacoepidemiology and Drug Safety, Division of Pharmacy and Optometry, School of Health Sciences, Faculty of Biology, Medicine and Health, University of Manchester, Manchester Academic Health Science Centre. Oxford Road, Manchester, M13 9PT, UK

This notation * indicates that both authors contributed equally and significantly to the paper and shared the first authorship.

Correspondence to:

Ms Neetu Bansal

Division of Pharmacy and Optometry, School of Health Sciences, Faculty of Biology, Medicine and Health, University of Manchester, Stopford Building, Oxford Road, Manchester, M13 9PT, United Kingdom.

Email: neetu.bansal@manchester.ac.uk

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

Abstract

Background

This systematic review aimed to identify a comprehensive list of prescribing safety indicators for opioids in any setting from published literature.

Methods

Literature that reported prescribing indicators from 1990-2019 was retrieved from a published systematic review. A subsequent search was conducted from seven electronic databases to identify additional studies from 2019 to 2022. Potential opioid safety prescribing indicators were extracted from studies that reported prescribing indicators of non-injectable opioids and narcotics prescribed to adults with or without specific conditions, concomitant medications, or laboratory monitoring with concerns about the potential safety risk of harm. Retrieved indicators were split by each opioid and merged for the same drugs. Identified indicators were categorised by the type of problem, medication, patient condition/disease, and the risk of the indicators.

Results

Of the 107 indicators retrieved from 48 included articles, 71 were included. Thirty-five (49.3%) opioid prescribing indicators focused on a specific class of opioids, i.e., 'opioids' (n=30, 42.3%) and 'strong opioids' (n=5, 7.0%); tramadol and fentanyl were the most commonly reported drug (n=6, 8.5%). The indicators account for six types of problems: medication inappropriate to the population (n=16), omission (n=7), inappropriate duration (n=4), inadequate monitoring (n=7), drug-disease interaction (n=16), and drug-drug interaction (n=27). Of all indicators, older age (over 65) is the most common risk factor (n=34, 47.9%). Central nervous system-related adverse effects are the risk of concern for the 27 indicators associated with drug-drug interaction (n=24, 88.9%). Besides, five of the six 'omission' indicators are related to 'without using laxatives'.

Conclusion

This review identified a comprehensive list of indicators that can be applied to flag patients with a high risk of opioid-related harm to facilitate complex decision-making in optimising

opioids for pain management. Further research is needed to validate and determine the feasibility of identifying hazardous prescribing in various care settings.

Keywords: opioid safety, prescribing quality indicator, inappropriate prescribing, drug-drug interaction

1 **Introduction**

2 Opioids, one type of potent analgesic, remain the mainstay approach for treating moderate
3 to severe pain used acutely after surgery and for cancer-related pain (1, 2). However, in
4 recent decades, opioid analgesics have been increasingly used in patients with chronic non-
5 cancer pain in Western countries (3). Chronic pain, commonly referred to as pain lasting for
6 three or more months affects between one-third and one-half of the United Kingdom (UK)
7 population (4, 5). Due to the complex mechanisms of pain physiology and pathology,
8 multimodal biopsychosocial treatments, including non-pharmacological options, are
9 recommended for managing chronic primary pain rather than analgesics alone (6). Yet the
10 marked increase in opioids used for chronic pain has become a public health concern (7).

11
12 There is a lack of evidence to support the long-term effectiveness of opioids for managing
13 chronic pain (8); instead, much literature has revealed dose-dependent adverse effects and
14 the risk of severe harm, including the potential of drug abuse and addiction associated with
15 long-term opioid use (8, 9). Opioid safety is of particular concern in some vulnerable patient
16 groups (10), such as older people, because age-related pharmacokinetic and
17 pharmacodynamic changes may increase the sensitivity to adverse drug effects (11).
18 Besides, older patients with chronic pain may also have multiple co-morbidities and become
19 potential polypharmacy candidates, consequently having a higher risk of adverse drug-drug
20 interactions (11, 12). Therefore, it is judicious to have a system to identify and review
21 patients on long-term opioids to manage chronic pain.

22
23 Prescribing quality indicators are widely used in identifying the effectiveness of prescribing
24 problematic or inappropriate polypharmacy as part of the quality indicators of healthcare
25 services by allowing relevant stakeholders, e.g., health boards, primary care clusters,
26 general practices and prescribers, to compare their current prescribing practice against an
27 agreed quality standard (13, 14). Furthermore, prescribing safety indicators focusing on

28 potentially hazardous prescribing and inadequate medication monitoring practices that place
29 patients at risk of harm can be used to monitor prescribing safety and prevent prescribing-
30 related harm (14). The development of prescribing indicators should be evidence-based,
31 transparent, easily understood, and ideally, validated by a group of experts using consensus
32 methodology (15).

33

34 Although numerous sets of prescribing quality and safety indicators and inappropriate
35 prescribing criteria have been developed for different populations and settings there is no
36 consensus on opioid safety prescribing indicators to prevent potentially hazardous
37 consequences. Therefore, to develop evidence-based opioid safety prescribing indicators,
38 this systematic review aimed to identify explicit indicators or criteria in the existing literature
39 related to opioid prescribing that could potentially be used to assess prescribing safety in
40 adults.

41

42 **Materials and methods**

43 This review followed the principles of Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and
44 Meta-analyses (PRISMA) guidance (16). The protocol for this systematic review was
45 registered with PROSPERO (CRD42022343776).

46

47 **Eligibility criteria**

48 This review included studies that reported developing, validating or updating a set of explicit
49 indicators or criteria that assess prescribing safety. After that, studies that reported
50 prescribing indicators of non-injectable opioids and narcotics prescribed to adults (18 years
51 and over) with or without specific conditions, concomitant medications, or laboratory
52 monitoring with concerns about the potential risk of harm were included. The prescribing
53 safety indicators should explicitly include terms related to opioids prescribed to the target
54 population or drug-drug or drug-disease oriented terms with concerns about the risk of harm
55 (17). Three drug product databases, the American Society of Health-System Pharmacists

56 Drug Information (18), British National Formulary (19) and Martindale (20), were referred to
57 in order to define opioid and narcotics medications.

58

59 Studies were excluded if they exclusively focused on children and adolescents (under 18
60 years), patients with cancer-related pain or receiving palliative care, or injectable opioids.

61 Besides, studies that exclusively reported the incidence of existing prescribing indicators in
62 the clinical setting or reported older versions for included indicators were excluded.

63 Furthermore, studies that reported implicit indicators (i.e., not drug-specific) only or quality
64 indicators not explicitly focused on the risk of harm (e.g., patients older than 65 years

65 already on long-acting opioids with breakthrough pain and not on short-acting opioids) were
66 also excluded.

67

68 **Information sources and literature search strategy**

69 Firstly, literature that reported explicit prescribing indicators from 1990-2019 was retrieved
70 from a systematic review published by Khawagi *et al.* (2019) (13), and then a subsequent
71 update review was conducted to identify studies that reported prescribing indicators from
72 2019 to 30 September 2022.

73

74 Khawagi *et al.*'s search strategy aimed to identify explicit prescribing indicators of any kind.

75 They used a combination of three sets of search terms: medication safety terms, quality
76 measure terms and indicators development/validation terms. The authors retrieved 79

77 articles that reported any prescribing indicators published from 1990 to 2019 with no
78 restrictions on the publication language, type of study design, focused country, targeted

79 setting, or targeted population (13). Khawagi *et al.*'s review is a good data source for
80 identifying the studies from 1990-2019 since the Beers criteria, one of the earliest criteria to

81 describe inappropriate prescribing was published in 1991 (21).

82

83 An update of the systematic review was conducted by applying the same search strategy
84 and search terms used by Khawagi *et al.* (13) on the electronic databases, including
85 Medline, Embase, PsycINFO, Web of Science, Health Management Information Consortium
86 (HMIC), International Pharmaceutical Abstracts (IPA), and Cumulative Index to Nursing and
87 Allied Health Literature (CINAHL) to identify articles published from 2019 to 30 September
88 2022 (Appendix 1). The identified records were imported into the reference management
89 programme (EndNote 20, Calrivate), where the duplications were moved. The remaining
90 records were screened and selected in the following processes.

91

92 **Study selection**

93 Titles and abstracts of the literature identified from the electronic database search were
94 screened independently by two reviewers (WK, NS) to identify literature for developing,
95 validating, or evaluating any prescribing indicators or criteria. If there were discrepancies in
96 the inclusion decision of a study, then it was progressed to full-text screening. Two reviewers
97 (WK, NS) further reviewed the full texts of eligible articles independently according to
98 inclusion and exclusion criteria and reviewers' clinical knowledge to identify the eligible
99 studies that reported any prescribing indicators. Any discrepancy was resolved by discussing
100 with a third reviewer (LCC or NB) to reach a consensus. The reasons for exclusion were
101 documented. Finally, the full-text articles identified from Khawagi *et al.*'s review (n=79) and
102 the updated systematic review were scrutinised to include studies that reported opioid-
103 specific prescribing safety indicators.

104

105 **Data extraction**

106 The data of included studies were extracted by two reviewers (NS, WK) using an electronic
107 data collection form and double-checked by two reviewers (NB, LCC). Three major
108 categories of data were extracted from the literature, including (1) literature information: title,
109 leading author, country, and year; (2) methodology: study design, setting, targeted
110 population, indicators sources, and validation methods; and (3) opioid-related prescribe

111 indicators: total number of indicators, opioids name of the medication, duration of
112 medication, disease condition, concomitant medication, risk of the prescribing.

113

114 **Data synthesis and analysis**

115 Several principles were imposed to transform each indicator extracted from the included
116 literature into a statement in the following standard format.

117 *"Prescribing opioids [class or medicine] +/- with other drugs [class or medicine] +/- to a*
118 *patient +/- aged [age in years] +/- with disease [disease condition] (+/- for the risk of*
119 *conditions [potential opioid-related harm])."*

120 Afterwards, duplicate indicators were removed. In addition, if an indicator included more than
121 one opioid, it was split into multiple indicators. For example, "Prescribing propoxyphene or
122 pentazocine to patients over 65 years" was split into two indicators.

123

124 In addition, the indicators were categorised into six prescribing problem categories.
125 (Medication inappropriate to population, drug-disease interaction, drug-drug interaction,
126 inappropriate duration, inadequate monitoring, and omission) (Table 1). These categories
127 were adapted from previous studies (13, 22-24). A summarised compact version of the
128 included indicators was also provided, combining similar overlapped indicators. A descriptive
129 analysis of the above items was selected, and numbers and portions were calculated when
130 appropriate.

132 **Table 1. Definitions of the six types of prescribing problems**

Type of indicator	Prescribing problem
Medication inappropriate to the population	Medication that is potentially prescribed inappropriately to a specific population.
Omission	Medication should be prescribed with a specific diagnosis, condition, or prescription.
Inappropriate duration	Medication that was prescribed with an inappropriate duration.
Inadequate monitoring	Medications that were not monitored adequately.
Drug-disease interaction	Medication that is potentially prescribed inappropriately with a specific diagnosis or condition.
Drug-drug interaction	Medication that potentially interacts with another medication.

133 (Note) Seventy-one indicators were identified. The complete list can be found in Appendix 2.

134

135 **Results**

136 **Selection of studies**

137 Of the 9,387 records identified from the electronic database search, 3,353 duplicate and 921
138 ineligible records (older than 2019 were removed) (Figure 1). After screening the titles and
139 abstracts of 5,113 records, 5,047 were excluded for not including prescribing indicators and
140 the remaining 66 records were considered for full-text review. Overall, 32 articles published
141 from 2019 to 2022 that reported any prescribing indicators were selected after excluding 34
142 articles. The reasons for exclusion included studies that did not develop prescribing
143 indicators (n=20), studies that applied published indicators (n=7), adapted, or translated one
144 tool to another country (n=2), reported duplicate data (n=1) or were not published in full text
145 (i.e., conference abstract; n=4).

146

147 <Insert Figure 1>

148

149 In total, 111 articles were included after combining the 32 articles with 79 studies from
150 Khawagi *et al.*'s review (13). The full texts of these 111 articles reported any prescribing
151 indicators were reviewed, and 48 articles that reported opioid-related prescribing indicators

152 were included in this systematic review. The 63 articles were excluded as these studies did
153 not include opioid-related indicators (n=50), reported the older version of indicators (n=6),
154 did not report any safety indicators (n=2), or exclusively focused on paediatric (n=4) or
155 patients with palliative care (n=1).

156

157 **Characteristics of the included articles**

158 ***Publication year and countries***

159 The 48 included studies which reported at least one opioid-related prescribing indicator (2, 9,
160 24-69) were published during the period 2010-2019 (n=24)(13, 27, 28, 30-33, 35, 37-39, 41,
161 43, 45, 46, 49, 50, 54, 55, 57, 60, 63, 65, 66) followed by 2000-2009 (n=13) (9, 24, 29, 34,
162 42, 44, 48, 56, 58, 59, 62, 67, 68) and 2020-2022 (n=10) (2, 25, 26, 36, 40, 51-53, 61, 69)
163 and only one published in 1990-1999 (47) (Table 2).. Furthermore, except for one study that
164 developed indicators for international use (31), most studies (n=23) aimed to develop
165 indicators to be used in Europe (2, 9, 25, 26, 30, 33, 35-40, 43, 46, 48, 50, 53, 54, 57-59, 62,
166 65) followed by North America (n=12) (24, 27, 32, 42, 44, 47, 52, 55, 56, 64, 66, 68), Asia
167 (n=7) (29, 41, 51, 60, 61, 67, 69), Australia (n=3) (28, 34, 63) and South America (n=2)(45,
168 49).

Table 2. Summary of included studies

Author, year	Country	Setting	Population	Information source	Validation method	Number of Indicators
Abuzour, 2021 (2)	UK	Prison	NS	Electronic health records, literature review, guidelines	Expert panel	2
AGS Beers panel, 2019 (27)	USA	Multiple settings	Elderly	Literature review, older version of AGS, Beers Criteria	Modified Delphi	8
Anrrys, 2021 (25)	Belgium, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Netherlands, Spain, Switzerland, and UK	NS	Elderly	Literature, clinical experts, textbooks	Delphi	2
Bahat, 2021 (26)	Eastern Europe	Healthcare	Elderly	Older version of STOPP/START and the CRIME criteria	Delphi	3
Caughey, 2014 (28)	Australia	Hospitals	NS	Literature review	Modified RAM	1
Chen, 2005 (29)	Taiwan	Multiple settings	NS	Textbooks	NR	1
Cooper, 2014 (30)	UK and Ireland	NS	Middle age (45-64 years old)	Selected previously published studies, clinical experts	Delphi	1
Desnoyer, 2017 (31)	International	Hospitals	Adults	Literature review, clinical experts	Delphi	7
Desrochers, 2011 (32)	Canada	Pharmacies	CKD patients	Literature review, clinical experts	RAM	1
Dreischulte, 2012 (33)	UK	Community	NS	Literature review	Modified RAM	2
Elliott, 2001 (34)	Australia	Hospitals	Elderly	Selected previously published studies, clinical experts	Expert panel	1
Fialova, 2013 (35)	Czech	NS	Elderly	Literature review	Modified Delphi	6
Foubert, 2021 (36)	Ghent	Primary Care	Elderly	Older version of GheOP3S-tool, literature review, guidelines	Modified Delphi	6
Galán Retamal, 2014 (37)	Spain	Hospitals	Elderly	Selected previously published studies	Delphi	1
Guerreiro, 2007 (9)	Portugal	Community	NS	Selected previously published studies	Delphi	1
Harmand, 2019 (38)	Spanish	NS	Elderly	Literature review, FEDRA and Vigibase, AEMPS	Delphi	6
Holt, 2010 (39)	Germany	NS	Elderly	Literature review, selected previously	Modified Delphi	1

Author, year	Country	Setting	Population	Information source	Validation method	Number of Indicators
				published studies		
Jayasinghe, 2022 (40)	UK and Ireland	NS	Middle age (45-64 years old)	Selected previously published studies, electronic health records	Delphi, cross-sectional study	1
Kim, 2018 (41)	Korea	Multiple settings	Elderly	Selected previously published studies; older version of Beers criteria, STOPP, PRISCUS; PIMs list for the Korean elderly	Modified Delphi	5
Lindblad, 2006 (42)	USA	Community	Elderly	Literature review	Delphi	1
Maio, 2010 (43)	Italy	Community	Elderly	Older version of Beers Criteria	Nominal Group Technique	1
Malone, 2004 (44)	USA	Pharmacies	NS	Literature review, DDI resources	Modified Delphi	1
Marzi, 2018 (45)	Argentina	NS	Elderly	Literature review, selected previously published studies	Delphi	4
Mast, 2015 (46)	Netherlands	Community	Elderly	Literature review, guidelines, clinical experts	Delphi	1
McLeod, 1997 (47)	Canada	NS	Elderly	Textbooks, older version of Beers Criteria	Modified Delphi	2
Morris, 2003 (48)	UK	Community	NS	Selected previously published studies	Delphi	1
Motter, 2019 (49)	Brazil	Clinical	Elderly	Older version of Beers Criteria and EU(7)-PIM list, guidelines	Modified Delphi	3
O'Mahony, 2015 (50)	Europe	Multiple settings	Elderly	Older version of STOPP/START, literature review, clinical experts	Delphi	5
Pazan, 2018 (54)	Europe	NS	Elderly	Older version of the US-FORTA (Fit FOR The Aged) List	Delphi	4
Pazan, 2020 (51)	Japan	Clinical	Elderly	Older version of the US-FORTA (Fit FOR The Aged) List	Delphi	5
Pazan, 2020 (52)	USA	Clinical	Elderly	Older version of the US-FORTA (Fit FOR The Aged) List	Delphi	3
Pazan, 2022 (53)	Germany	Clinical	Elderly	Older version of the US-FORTA (Fit FOR The Aged) List, literature	Delphi	5
Phansalkar, 2011 (55)	USA	Pharmacies	NS	Selected previously published studies,	NS consensus	1

Author, year	Country	Setting	Population	Information source	Validation method	Number of Indicators
				Partners Healthcare System Medication Knowledge Base, Micromedex, First Data Bank		
Rancourt, 2004 (24)	Canada	Long-term care	Elderly	Literature review	Modified Delphi	1
Raebel, 2007 (26)	USA	Community	Elderly	FDA black-box warnings, guidelines, clinical experts	Expert panel	1
Renom-Guiteras, 2015 (57)	Europe	NS	Elderly	Selected previously published studies	Delphi	5
Rognstad, 2009 (58)	Norway	Community	Elderly (≥70 years)	Literature Review, clinical experts	Modified Delphi	1
Ruths, 2003 (59)	Norway	Long-term care	Elderly	Literature Review, guidelines, clinical experts	Expert panel	2
Samaranayake, 2019 (60)	Sri Lanka	Hospitals	Elderly	Older version of STOPP/START criteria	Delphi	2
Sato, 2022 (61)	Japan	Primary care	Elderly, particularly those aged ≥75	National guidance	Modified Delphi study	9
Solberg, 2004 (62)	UK	Community	NS	Literature review, textbooks, DRUG-REAX® System	RAM	1
Spinks, 2019 (63)	Australian	Hospitals	Elderly	Medication databases	Modified Delphi	5
Tija, 2010 (64)	USA	Community	Adults	Literature review, FDA black-box warnings, guidelines	Modified Delphi	2
Van der Linden, 2014 (65)	Belgium	NS	Elderly	Older version of the RASP list and STOPP	RAM	1
Vyas, 2019 (66)	USA	Pharmacies	Elderly	Older version of Beers, ACOVE, START/STOPP; literature review, guidelines	NS consensus	2
Winit Watjana, 2008 (67)	Thailand	NS	Elderly	Literature review, textbooks	Delphi	1
Zhan, 2001 (68)	USA	Community	Elderly	Older version of Beers Criteria	Modified Delphi	3
Zhang, 2021 (69)	Hong Kong	Clinical	Elderly	Literature review, guidelines	Modified Delphi	3

170 (Note) ACOVE: The Assessing Care of Vulnerable Elderly Quality Indicators. AEMPS: Online Information Center of Medicines of the Spanish Agency of Medicines and Health
171 Products. AGS: The American Geriatrics Society Criteria. CKD: chronic kidney disease. CRIME: CRIteria to assess appropriate Medication use among Elderly complex
172 patients. DDI: drug-drug interaction. EU-PIM list: a European list of potentially inappropriate medications. FDA: Food and Drug Administration. FEDRA: Spanish
173 Pharmacovigilance Database. GheOP3S tool: The Ghent Older People's Prescriptions Community Pharmacy Screening. NS: not specified. PRISCUS criteria: German
174 Potentially Inadequate Medications in the Elderly. RAM: RAND/UCLA Appropriateness Method. RASP list: Rationalization of Home Medication by an Adjusted STOPP list in

175 Older Patients. UK: United Kingdom. USA: United States of America. START: Screening Tool to Alert doctors to Right Treatment. STOPP: Screening Tool of Older Person's
176 Prescriptions.

177

178 ***Target population and setting***

179 Although nine (21%) of the 48 studies did not specify the target population(2, 9, 28, 29, 33,
180 44, 48, 55, 62), older people were the most common target population (n=34; 71%). The
181 elderly population was primarily defined as age ≥ 65 years old (n=32) (24-27, 34-39, 41-43,
182 45-47, 49-54, 56, 57, 59, 60, 63, 65-69) except for one study that defined elderly as age ≥ 70
183 (57) and another as ≥ 75 years old (58). In addition, although adults (n=2) (31, 64), middle-
184 aged patients (n=2) (30, 40) or patients with chronic kidney disease (n=1) (32) were also
185 investigated, these studies did not specify the age in defining the study population, except
186 for two studies defined the middle age as 45-64 years old (30, 40).

187

188 Of the 48 studies, 18 (38%) did not specify the setting to apply the indicators (25, 26, 30, 35,
189 38-40, 45, 47, 49, 51-54, 57, 65, 67, 69) and four (8.3%) implemented the indicators in
190 multiple settings (27, 29, 41, 50). The remaining 26 studies focused on applying the
191 indicators in various settings, including hospitals (n=6) (28, 31, 34, 37, 60, 63), primary care
192 (general practices) (n=2, 4.2%) (36, 61), community pharmacy (n=4) (32, 44, 55, 66), long-
193 term care setting (care home or nursing home) (n=2) (24, 59), prison (n=1, 2.9%) (2), and
194 any patients in the community (n=11, 22.9%) (9, 33, 42, 43, 46, 48, 56, 58, 62, 64, 68).

195

196 ***Method to identify and validate prescribing indicators***

197 Most of the studies (n=29, 60.4%) retrieved the indicators from multiple sources or strategies
198 (2, 25, 27, 30-32, 34, 36, 38-41, 44-50, 53, 55, 56, 58, 59, 62, 64, 66, 67, 69) and 19 (39.6%)
199 studies only adapted one information source or strategy (9, 24, 26, 28, 29, 33, 35, 37, 42,
200 43, 51, 52, 54, 57, 60, 61, 63, 65, 68). Literature review (n=25, 52.1%)(2, 24, 25, 27, 28, 31-
201 33, 35, 36, 38, 39, 42, 44-46, 50, 53, 58, 59, 64, 66, 67, 69, 70) or referring to an old version
202 of indicators (n=17, 35.4%) (26, 27, 36, 41, 43, 47-54, 60, 65, 68, 70) were the most used
203 strategies to retrieve opioid-related indicators.

204

205 Except for one (2.9%) study (29), all studies reported the validation method of prescribing
206 indicators, and the most used is the Delphi method (n=34, 70.8%). The remaining studies
207 used the RAND/UCLA appropriateness method (RAM) (n=5, 10.4%) (28, 32, 33, 65, 70)
208 expert panel method (n=4, 8.3%) (2, 34, 56, 59), non-specific consensus method (n=2, 4.2%)
209 (55, 66) combined Delphi and cross-sectional study (n=1, 2.1%) (40) and nominal group
210 technique (n=1, 2.1%) (43).

211
212 In addition, various types of consensus methodologies were applied. For example, of the 34
213 studies that adopted a Delphi consensus approach, 20 studies reported a Delphi method (9,
214 25, 26, 30, 31, 37, 38, 40, 42, 45, 46, 48, 50-54, 57, 60, 67) and 15 applied a modified
215 Delphi method (24, 27, 35, 36, 39, 41, 44, 47, 49, 58, 61, 63, 64, 68, 69), Similarly, of the
216 five studies that reported using the RAM method, two applied a modified RAM (2/5=40.0%)
217 (28, 32, 33, 62, 65).

218

219 **Categories of opioid-related prescribing indicators**

220 Overall, 107 original opioid prescribing indicators were identified from the 48 studies. Of
221 these, 14 indicators (13.1%) that involved more than one opioid medicine were split by each
222 opioid, resulting in 132 indicators. After merging indicators for the same drugs or items of the
223 same drug class, 71 opioid-related prescribing indicators were identified. Of the 71 indicators,
224 35 (49%) focused on the classification of opioids using the terms 'opioids' (n=30, 42%) and
225 'strong opioids' (n=5, 7%). In the remaining 36 indicators, 16 opioid medications, tramadol,
226 fentanyl, and pethidine, were the most reported drugs, each for six indicators (8.5%) (Table
227 3).

228

229 When classifying the 71 indicators into six types of prescribing problems, drug-drug
230 interaction was the most common type (n=27; 38.0%), followed by drug-disease interaction
231 (n=16; 22.5%), prescribing to an inappropriate population (n=16; 22.5%), omission (n=7;
232 9.9%), inadequate monitoring (n=7; 9.9%) and inappropriate duration (n=4; 5.6%). Within

233 each group, similar indicators were further grouped to provide a simplified summary of the
 234 pivotal characteristics of the indicators (Table 4).

235

236 **Table 3. Opioid analgesics and categories reported across six types of prescribing**
 237 **problems**

Opioid drug	A	B	C	D	E	F	Subtotal
Opioids	1	5		1	7	16	30
Strong opioids	1	2	2				5
Buprenorphine	1						1
Codeine			1				1
Dextromethorphan/quinidine	1						1
Dextropropoxyphene	1					1	2
Fentanyl	1				2	3	6
Methadone	1						1
Morphine	1				2		3
Narcotic antitussives	1						1
Oxycodone/naloxone	1						1
Oxycodone						1	1
Pentazocine	1		1				2
Pethidine	1				3	2	6
Propoxyphene	1					1	2
Tapentadol	1						1
Tilidine/naloxone	1						1
Tramadol	1				2	3	6
Subtotal	16	7	4	1	16	27	71

238 (Note) A: medication inappropriate to the population, B: omission, C: inappropriate duration, D:
 239 inadequate monitoring, E: drug-disease interaction, F: drug-drug interaction.

240

241

Table 4. Summary of opioid safety prescribing indicators

Type of indicators	Summary of opioid safety prescribing indicators
Medication inappropriate to the population (n=1 from 16 indicators)	1. Prescribing an opioid to a patient older than 65 years
Omission (n=2 from 7 indicators)	1. Prescribing an opioid analgesic without concurrent use of a laxative 2. Prescribing long-acting opioids to a patient older than 65 years without short-acting opioids for breakthrough pain
Inappropriate duration (n=4)	1. Long-term prescribing of strong opioids to a patient older than 65 years with mild to moderate pain

		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Regular prescribing of a strong opioid analgesic. 3. Long-term prescribing of pentazocine to a patient older than 65 years 4. Prescribing codeine for >2 weeks to a patient older than 65 years
Inadequate monitoring (n=1 from 7 indicators)		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Prescribing opioids to a patient over 65 years without monitoring renal function
Drug-disease interaction (n=6 from 16 indicators)		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Prescribing opioids to a patient with constipation, cirrhosis, renal failure, history of benign prostatic hyperplasia or bladder atony 2. Prescribing opioids to a patient older than 65 with a history of constipation, COPD, fractures, syncope, or postural hypotension 3. Prescribing tramadol to a patient older than 65 with a history of epilepsy 4. Prescribing pethidine to a patient older than 65 years with a history of delirium 5. Prescribing pethidine to a patient with chronic kidney disease (creatinine clearance <60 mL/min.) 6. Prescribing pethidine, morphine, or fentanyl to a patient older than 65 years with a history of dementia or cognitive impairment
Drug-drug interaction (n=13 from 27 indicators)		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Prescribing opioids with methadone, buprenorphine, gabapentin or pregabalin 2. Prescribing opioids with benzodiazepines or barbiturates to a patient older than 65 years 3. Prescribing opioids with anticholinergics to a patient older than 65 years 4. Prescribing opioids with another fall-risk-increasing drug to a patient older than 65 years 5. Prescribing opioids with another drug that acts on the central nervous system to a patient older than 65 years 6. Combine prescribing two immediate-released/modified-released opioids 7. Combine prescribing the pure agonist and partial agonist opioids 8. Prescribing two opioid analgesics to a middle-aged "45-64 years old" patient 9. Prescribing tramadol or fentanyl with other serotonergic agents 10. Prescribing tramadol concomitantly with antiepileptics 11. Prescribing fentanyl or oxycodone with CYP3A4 inhibitors to a patient over 65 years 12. Prescribing dextropropoxyphene concurrently with paracetamol to a patient older than 65 years 13. Prescribing propoxyphene with carbamazepine

243 **Drug-drug interaction**

244 The 27 drug-drug interaction indicators identified in this review can be summarised into 16
 245 groups (
 246 Table 4). These indicators described opioids as a class or specific drug interacting with
 247 another therapeutic class (e.g., prescribing opioids with a *tricyclic antidepressant* to patients
 248 over 65 years), with medications that pose the same risk (e.g., prescribing opioids with

249 another *fall-risk-increasing drug* to patients aged >65 years), with specific medications (e.g.,
250 prescribing an opioid with *gabapentin* or *pregabalin*) or with another opioid (e.g., combine
251 prescribing of *pure agonist* and *partial agonist* opioids). Most drug-drug interactions are due
252 to the concern of pharmacological effects on the central nervous system.

253

254 <Insert Figure 2>

255

256 ***Drug-disease interaction***

257 The 16 indicators focused on drug-disease interactions were summarised in six groups (
258 Table 4). These referred to opioids prescribed to patients with varying conditions, such as
259 current constipation, history of constipation, or benign prostatic hyperplasia (Figure 2).
260 Besides, four of the six indicators' groups specified prescribing for patients over 65 (
261 Table 4).

262

263 ***Prescribing to inappropriate population***

264 All the 16 indicators of “prescribing to an inappropriate population” were related to
265 prescribing opioids to patients older than 65 years (Table 4). Of which, only one indicator
266 referred to opioids being prescribed as *a class* for patients over 65 years. The remaining 14
267 indicators referred to a specific opioid prescribed to the same elderly population (Appendix
268 2).

269

270 ***Omission***

271 Six of the seven omission indicators described patients being prescribed opioids as a class
272 without being prescribed a laxative. The remaining indicator described prescribing long-
273 acting opioids to patients older than 65 years without short-acting opioids for breakthrough
274 pain (Table 4). Of the six indicators related to omitting a laxative, four specified that the
275 prescribing was for patients over the age of 65 years, two specified prescribing the opioid

276 over two weeks, more than four or long-term, and two specified prescribing strong opioids
277 (Appendix 2).

278

279 ***Inappropriate duration***

280 Of the four indicators focused on inappropriate duration, two described patients being
281 prescribed strong opioids as a class, concerning the long-term prescribing of strong opioids
282 to patients over 65 years with mild to moderate pain or regular prescribing of strong opioid
283 analgesics (Table 4). The remaining two indicators referred to prescribing a specific opioid,
284 including prescribing codeine for more than two weeks to patients over 65 years or long-term
285 prescribing of pentazocine to patients older than 65 years (Table 4).

286

287 ***Inadequate monitoring***

288 Only one indicator described Inadequate monitoring. This indicator described prescribing
289 opioids to patients over 65 years without monitoring their renal function.

290

291 **Discussion**

292 This study reported published opioid prescribing indicators that could potentially be used to
293 assess prescribing safety for adults. These indicators can be further validated to assess
294 hazardous prescribing across clinical settings. Most of the indicators identified are based on
295 expert consensus and clinical guidelines, reflecting the implicit knowledge and best practices
296 that healthcare professionals have developed. One notable advantage of these indicators is
297 their ability to flag all potential hazardous risks. However, it is crucial to consider their
298 limitations. Some indicators may lack robust supporting evidence, such as the prevalence of
299 adverse consequences linked to specific scenarios. Consequently, this may lead to
300 challenges in implementation, for example, persuading practitioners or patients to change
301 their practices. Furthermore, quantifying the risk of poor outcomes remains difficult,
302 presenting challenges in measuring the effectiveness of implementing these indicators (71).

303

304 The risk associated with opioids concerning these indicators is not remarkably different from
305 general considerations for other medications. However, the risk and severity of the
306 consequences may vary when comparing opioids with other drugs. It is prudent to note that
307 advanced age alone is not necessarily a cause of concern. Nevertheless, older adults may
308 pose an increased risk due to the pharmacodynamic changes associated with ageing, pre-
309 existing co-morbidities and polypharmacy, which can be an issue in this age group (10).
310 Specific patient populations, such as those with chronic pain, warrant special attention, as
311 the prevalence of chronic pain is notably higher amongst older adults, alongside other co-
312 existing medical conditions(72). In the case of patients managing chronic pain, they often
313 find themselves contending with other symptoms, leading to the potential for polypharmacy
314 (73).

315

316 Among the identified prescribing problems, drug-drug interactions were identified as the
317 most common prescribing problem, emphasising the need for vigilance in identifying and
318 managing potential interactions when prescribing opioids. Within this category, various
319 opioids (either as a class or specific drugs) should be highlighted. This finding aligns with
320 previous studies highlighting the risk of adverse events associated with polypharmacy,
321 particularly in the older population, due to multimorbidity, polypharmacy, and age-related
322 changes in pharmacokinetics and pharmacodynamics (74). Prescribing indicators targeting
323 drug-drug interactions can serve as valuable tools to guide healthcare professionals in
324 optimising medication regimes and minimising harm (70).

325

326 Most concerns related to polypharmacy primarily revolve around central nervous system
327 (CNS) implications, emphasising the need to prioritise vigilance regarding severe
328 consequences such as CNS depression (75). This finding reflects the well-known potential of
329 opioids to cause central nervous system-related adverse effects such as sedation,
330 respiratory depression, and cognitive impairment (76) Nevertheless, the complexity of pain

331 conditions calls for individualised risk management and optimisation of decision-making,
332 rooted in a patient-centred approach rather than solely relying on pre-defined indicators (77).
333 Similarly, drug-disease interactions raise concerns regarding the potential risks for patients
334 with a history of certain diseases. Interpreting the risk and formulating appropriate responses
335 poses a challenge, necessitating a consensus approach to applying these indicators
336 appropriately (78).

337

338 In addition to class-specific indicators, many indicators considered the patient's
339 accompanying conditions, diseases, or medical history. The most prevalent condition-related
340 indicator was "opioids prescribed without laxatives", highlighting the significance of
341 considering potential adverse effects with detrimental impacts on patients' quality of life and
342 medication safety when prescribing opioids to patients with specific conditions. Compared to
343 drug-drug, drug-disease interaction, and inappropriate population, the indicators for the
344 omission, inappropriate duration and monitoring are more specific and seem more
345 straightforward to implement (as the mitigation response to those scenarios). Nevertheless,
346 the most common omission, whether to prescribe a laxative, should still be based on
347 patients' conditions, so a patient-centred care approach and shared decision-making should
348 be considered (79). Shared decision-making relies on patients and clinicians using the best
349 available evidence (79). This finding also suggests the importance of a patient-centred
350 approach to prescribing, accounting for individual patient characteristics and medical
351 histories to optimise opioid safety.

352

353 The development and use of prescribing quality and safety indicators are crucial in improving
354 healthcare quality and preventing prescribing-related harm (80). However, the absence of
355 consensus on opioid safety prescribing indicators for primary care settings highlights the
356 need for evidence-based indicators to guide prescribing practices and enhance patient
357 safety. The findings of this review provide a valuable starting point for developing evidence-

358 based opioid safety prescribing indicators that can be further validated and implemented in
359 clinical practice.

360

361 Our comprehensive approach in including studies with published prescribing indicators that
362 cover all opioids and the most updated list of opioid-related indicators is a strength of this
363 study. Our rigorous review process, which involves researchers specialised in methodology
364 (WK and LCC) and a specialist practitioner (NB) reviewing identified indicators, adds
365 confidence to the validity and reliability of our results. However, we acknowledge this review
366 has some limitations. The search was limited to published English literature, which may
367 introduce publication bias and exclude relevant unpublished studies or grey literature.
368 Additionally, the inclusion criteria focused on implicit indicators and excluded studies that
369 reported indicators not focused on the risk of harm. Consequently, there is a possibility that
370 some potentially relevant indicators may have been overlooked. Nevertheless, this review
371 provides a comprehensive overview of the current literature on prescribing indicators for
372 opioid and serves as a valuable resource.

373

374 **Conclusion**

375 This systematic review identified a range of potential opioid safety prescribing indicators
376 from the published literature. These indicators can contribute to developing evidence-based
377 prescribing practices and preventing potential harm associated with opioid use. Further
378 validation using relevant healthcare data and implementation of these indicators in different
379 clinical settings are necessary to enhance patient safety and optimise opioid prescribing
380 practices. Future research should also explore the feasibility and effectiveness of these
381 indicators and consider their integration into clinical guidelines and decision-support systems
382 to support healthcare professionals in delivering safe and effective opioid therapy.

383

384 **Authors' contribution**

385 LCC conceptualised, oversaw, planned, and managed this project. WK and NB developed
386 the methodology and registered the protocol. NS and WK conducted the search, screening,
387 data extraction, management, and analysis. All authors are involved in data interpretation
388 and writing this manuscript.

References

1. Garimella V, Cellini C. Postoperative pain control. *Clin Colon Rectal Surg.* 2013;26(3):191-6.
2. Abuzour AS, Magola-Makina E, Dunlop J, O'Brien A, Khawagi WY, Ashcroft DM, et al. Implementing prescribing safety indicators in prisons: A mixed methods study. *Br J Clin Pharmacol.* 2022;88(4):1866-84.
3. Treede R-D, Rief W, Barke A, Aziz Q, Bennett MI, Benoliel R, et al. Chronic pain as a symptom or a disease: the IASP Classification of Chronic Pain for the International Classification of Diseases (ICD-11). *PAIN.* 2019;160(1):19-27.
4. Fayaz A, Croft P, Langford RM, Donaldson LJ, Jones GT. Prevalence of chronic pain in the UK: a systematic review and meta-analysis of population studies. *BMJ Open.* 2016;6(6):e010364.
5. National Institute of Health and Clinical Excellence (NICE) . Chronic pain (primary and secondary) in over 16s: assessment of all chronic pain and management of chronic primary pain 2021;NICE guideline [NG193]. Available at <https://www.nice.org.uk/guidance/ng193>. Last accessed 2nd November 2023.
6. World Health Organisation (WHO). Opioid overdose. August 2023. Available at <https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/opioid-overdose-trends-risk-factors-interventions-and-priorities-for-action>. Last accessed 2nd November 2023 [
7. Chou R, Turner JA, Devine EB, Hansen RN, Sullivan SD, Blazina I, et al. The effectiveness and risks of long-term opioid therapy for chronic pain: a systematic review for a National Institutes of Health Pathways to Prevention Workshop. *Ann Intern Med.* 2015;162(4):276-86.
8. Kosten TR, George TP. The neurobiology of opioid dependence: implications for treatment. *Sci Pract Perspect.* 2002;1(1):13-20.
9. Guerreiro MP, Cantrill JA, Martins AP. Morbilidade evitável relacionada com medicamentos: Validação de Indicadores para Cuidados Primários em Portugal. *Acta Med Port.* 2007;20(2):107-30.
10. Chau DL, Walker V, Pai L, Cho LM. Opiates and elderly: use and side effects. *Clin Interv Aging.* 2008;3(2):273-8.
11. Becker WC, O'Connor PG. The Safety of Opioid Analgesics in the Elderly: New Data Raise New Concerns: Comment on "The Comparative Safety of Opioids for Nonmalignant Pain in Older Adults". *Archives of Internal Medicine.* 2010;170(22):1986-8.
12. Ofori-Asenso R. A closer look at the World Health Organization's prescribing indicators. *J Pharmacol Pharmacother.* 2016;7(1):51-4.
13. Khawagi WY, Steinke DT, Nguyen J, Keers RN. Identifying potential prescribing safety indicators related to mental health disorders and medications: A systematic review. *PLoS One.* 2019;14(5):e0217406.
14. Thomas SK, McDowell SE, Hodson J, Nwulu U, Howard RL, Avery AJ, et al. Developing consensus on hospital prescribing indicators of potential harms amenable to decision support. *Br J Clin Pharmacol.* 2013;76(5):797-809.
15. Aubert CE, Kerr EA, Klamerus ML, Hofer TP, Wei MY. Focus and features of prescribing indications spanning multiple chronic conditions in older adults: A narrative review. *J Multimorb Comorb.* 2021;11:26335565211012876.
16. Page MJ, McKenzie JE, Bossuyt PM, Boutron I, Hoffmann TC, Mulrow CD, et al. The PRISMA 2020 statement: an updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. *Rev Esp Cardiol (Engl Ed).* 2021;74(9):790-9.
17. Elseviers M, Wettermark B, Almarsdóttir AB, Andersen M, Benko R, Bennie M, et al. Drug utilization research: methods and applications: John Wiley & Sons, Ltd; 2016.
18. AHFS Drug information. American Society of Health System Pharmacists Drug Information. Available at <https://ahfsdruginformation.com>
19. Joint Formulary Committee. British National Formulary (online) London: BMJ Group and Pharmaceutical Press; Available at <http://www.medicinescomplete.com>.

20. Brayfield A. Martindale: The Complete Drug Reference 38th Edition ed: Pharmaceutical Press, London; 2014.
21. Beers MH, Ouslander JG, Rollinger I, Reuben DB, Brooks J, Beck JC. Explicit criteria for determining inappropriate medication use in nursing home residents. UCLA Division of Geriatric Medicine. Arch Intern Med. 1991;151(9):1825-32.
22. Wessell AM, Litvin C, Jenkins RG, Nietert PJ, Nemeth LS, Ornstein SM. Medication prescribing and monitoring errors in primary care: a report from the Practice Partner Research Network. Quality & Safety in Health Care. 2010;19(5).
23. Fick DM, Cooper JW, Wade WE, Waller JL, Beers MH, et al. Updating the beers criteria for potentially inappropriate medication use in older adults - Results of a US consensus panel of experts. Archives of Internal Medicine. 2003;163(22):2716-24.
24. Rancourt C, Moisan J, Baillargeon L, Verreault R, Laurin D, Gregoire JP. Potentially inappropriate prescriptions for older patients in long-term care. BMC Geriatr. 2004;4:9.
25. Anrys P, Petit AE, Thevelin S, Sallevelt B, Drenth C, Soiza RL, et al. An International Consensus List of Potentially Clinically Significant Drug-Drug Interactions in Older People. J Am Med Dir Assoc. 2021;22(10):2121-33 e24.
26. Bahat G, Ilhan B, Erdogan T, Oren MM, Karan MA, Burkhardt H, et al. International Validation of the Turkish Inappropriate Medication Use in the Elderly (TIME) Criteria Set: A Delphi Panel Study. Drugs Aging. 2021;38(6):513-21.
27. By the American Geriatrics Society Beers Criteria Update Expert P. American Geriatrics Society 2019 Updated AGS Beers Criteria(R) for Potentially Inappropriate Medication Use in Older Adults. J Am Geriatr Soc. 2019;67(4):674-94.
28. Caughey GE, Kalisch Ellett LM, Wong TY. Development of evidence-based Australian medication-related indicators of potentially preventable hospitalisations: a modified RAND appropriateness method. BMJ Open. 2014;4(4):e004625.
29. Chen YF, Avery AJ, Neil KE, Johnson C, Dewey ME, Stockley IH. Incidence and possible causes of prescribing potentially hazardous/contraindicated drug combinations in general practice. Drug Saf. 2005;28(1):67-80.
30. Cooper JA, Ryan C, Smith SM, Wallace E, Bennett K, Cahir C, et al. The development of the PROMPT (PRescribing Optimally in Middle-aged People's Treatments) criteria. BMC Health Serv Res. 2014;14:484.
31. Desnoyer A, Blanc AL, Pourcher V, Besson M, Fonzo-Christe C, Desmeules J, et al. PIM-Check: development of an international prescription-screening checklist designed by a Delphi method for internal medicine patients. BMJ Open. 2017;7(7):e016070.
32. Desrochers J-F, Lemieux J-P, Morin-Bélanger C, Paradis FS-M, Lord A, Bell R, et al. Development and validation of the PAIR (Pharmacotherapy Assessment in Chronic Renal Disease) criteria to assess medication safety and use issues in patients with CKD. American journal of kidney diseases. 2011;58(4):527-35.
33. Dreischulte T, Grant AM, McCowan C, McAnaw JJ, Guthrie B. Quality and safety of medication use in primary care: consensus validation of a new set of explicit medication assessment criteria and prioritisation of topics for improvement. BMC Clin Pharmacol. 2012;12:5.
34. Elliott RA, Woodward MC, Osborne CA. Indicators of prescribing quality for elderly hospital inpatients. The Australian Journal of Hospital Pharmacy. 2001;31(1):19-25.
35. Fialová D, Topinkova E, Balloková A, Matejovska-Kubesova H. 2012 CZ expert consensus for potentially inappropriate medication use in old age: appropriate choice of drugs and drug dosing in geriatric patients (section I.), drug-disease interactions in the old age (section II.). Klin Farmakol a Farm. 2013;27:18-28.
36. Foubert K, Capiou A, Mehuys E, De Bolle L, Somers A, Petrovic M, et al. Ghent Older People's Prescriptions Community Pharmacy Screening (GheOP3S)-Tool Version 2: Update of a Tool to Detect Drug-Related Problems in Older People in Primary Care. Drugs & aging. 2021;38(6):523-33.
37. Galán Retamal C, Garrido Fernández R, Fernández Espínola S, Ruiz Serrato A, Ordóñez G, Padilla Marín V. Prevalencia de medicación potencialmente inapropiada en

- pacientes ancianos hospitalizados utilizando criterios explícitos. *Farmacia Hospitalaria*. 2014;38(4):305-16.
38. Gonzalez-Colaco Harmand M, Aldea-Perona AM, Boada-Fernandez Del Campo C, Areosa-Sastre A, Rodriguez-Jimenez C, Garcia Sanchez-Colomer M, et al. Spanish list of potentially inappropriate drugs in the elderly (ES-PIA project). *Eur J Clin Pharmacol*. 2019;75(8):1161-76.
 39. Holt S, Schmiedl S, Thürmann PA. Potentially inappropriate medications in the elderly: the PRISCUS list. *Deutsches Ärzteblatt International*. 2010;107(31-32):543.
 40. Jayasinghe R, Moriarty F, Khatter A, Durbaba S, Ashworth M, Redmond P. Cost outcomes of potentially inappropriate prescribing in middle-aged adults: A Delphi consensus and cross-sectional study. *British Journal of Clinical Pharmacology*. 2022.
 41. Kim M-Y, Etherton-Beer C, Kim C-B, Yoon JL, Ga H, Kim HC, et al. Development of a consensus list of potentially inappropriate medications for Korean older adults. *Annals of geriatric medicine and research*. 2018;22(3):121.
 42. Lindblad CI, Hanlon JT, Gross CR, Sloane RJ, Pieper CF, Hajjar ER, et al. Clinically important drug-disease interactions and their prevalence in older adults. *Clinical therapeutics*. 2006;28(8):1133-43.
 43. Maio V, Del Canale S, Abouzaid S, Investigators GAP. Using explicit criteria to evaluate the quality of prescribing in elderly Italian outpatients: a cohort study. *J Clin Pharm Ther*. 2010;35(2):219-29.
 44. Malone DC, Armstrong EP, Abarca J, Grizzle AJ, Hansten PD, Van Bergen RC, et al. Identification of serious drug–drug interactions: results of the partnership to prevent drug–drug interactions. *Journal of the American Pharmacists Association*. 2004;44(2):142-51.
 45. Marzi MM, Pires MS, Quaglia NB. Ingredientes Farmaceuticos Activos Potencialmente Inapropiados en Adultos Mayores: Lista IFAsPIAM: Panel de Consenso Argentino. *Value Health Reg Issues*. 2018;17:38-55.
 46. Mast R, Ahmad A, Hoogenboom SC, Cambach W, Elders PJ, Nijpels G, et al. Amsterdam tool for clinical medication review: development and testing of a comprehensive tool for pharmacists and general practitioners. *BMC Res Notes*. 2015;8:642.
 47. McLeod PJ, Huang AR, Tamblyn RM, Gayton DC. Defining inappropriate practices in prescribing for elderly people: a national consensus panel. *Cmaj*. 1997;156(3):385-91.
 48. Morris C, Cantrill J. Preventing drug -related morbidity—the development of quality indicators. *Journal of clinical pharmacy and therapeutics*. 2003;28(4):295-305.
 49. Motter FR, Hilmer SN, Paniz VMV. Pain and Inflammation Management in Older Adults: A Brazilian Consensus of Potentially Inappropriate Medication and Their Alternative Therapies. *Front Pharmacol*. 2019;10:1408.
 50. O'Mahony D, O'Sullivan D, Byrne S, O'Connor MN, Ryan C, Gallagher P. STOPP/START criteria for potentially inappropriate prescribing in older people: version 2. *Age Ageing*. 2015;44(2):213-8.
 51. Pazan F, Gercke Y, Weiss C, Wehling M, Raters F. The JAPAN-FORTA (Fit fOR The Aged) list: Consensus validation of a clinical tool to improve drug therapy in older adults. *Arch Gerontol Geriatr*. 2020;91:104217.
 52. Pazan F, Gercke Y, Weiss C, Wehling M, Raters F. The U.S.-FORTA (Fit fOR The Aged) List: Consensus Validation of a Clinical Tool to Improve Drug Therapy in Older Adults. *J Am Med Dir Assoc*. 2020;21(3):439 e9- e13.
 53. Pazan F, Weiss C, Wehling M, Forta. The FORTA (Fit fOR The Aged) List 2021: Fourth Version of a Validated Clinical Aid for Improved Pharmacotherapy in Older Adults. *Drugs Aging*. 2022;39(3):245-7.
 54. Pazan F, Weiss C, Wehling M, Forta. The EURO-FORTA (Fit fOR The Aged) List: International Consensus Validation of a Clinical Tool for Improved Drug Treatment in Older People. *Drugs Aging*. 2018;35(1):61-71.

55. Phansalkar S, Desai AA, Bell D, Yoshida E, Doole J, Czochanski M, et al. High-priority drug-drug interactions for use in electronic health records. *J Am Med Inform Assoc*. 2012;19(5):735-43.
56. Raebel MA, Charles J, Dugan J, Carroll NM, Korner EJ, Brand DW, et al. Randomized trial to improve prescribing safety in ambulatory elderly patients. *J Am Geriatr Soc*. 2007;55(7):977-85.
57. Renom-Guiteras A, Meyer G, Thurmann PA. The EU(7)-PIM list: a list of potentially inappropriate medications for older people consented by experts from seven European countries. *Eur J Clin Pharmacol*. 2015;71(7):861-75.
58. Rognstad S, Brekke M, Fetveit A, Spigset O, Wyller TB, Straand J. The Norwegian General Practice (NORGE) criteria for assessing potentially inappropriate prescriptions to elderly patients. A modified Delphi study. *Scand J Prim Health Care*. 2009;27(3):153-9.
59. Ruths S, Straand J, Nygaard HA. Multidisciplinary medication review in nursing home residents: what are the most significant drug-related problems? The Bergen District Nursing Home (BEDNURS) study. *BMJ Quality & Safety*. 2003;12(3):176-80.
60. Samaranayake NR, Balasuriya A, Fernando GH, Samaraweera D, Shanika LGT, Wanigasuriya JKP, et al. 'Modified STOPP-START criteria for Sri Lanka'; translating to a resource limited healthcare setting by Delphi consensus. *BMC Geriatr*. 2019;19(1):282.
61. Sato N, Fujita K, Kushida K, Chen TF. Development and consensus testing of quality indicators for geriatric pharmacotherapy in primary care using a modified Delphi study. *International journal of clinical pharmacy*. 2022;44(2):517-38.
62. Solberg LI, Hurley JS, Roberts MH, Nelson WW, Frost FJ, Crain AL, et al. Measuring patient safety in ambulatory care: potential for identifying medical group drug-drug interaction rates using claims data. *Am J Manag Care*. 2004;10(11 Pt 1):753-9.
63. Spinks JM, Ellett LMK, Spurling G, Theodoros T, Williamson D, Wheeler AJ. Adaptation of potentially preventable medication-related hospitalisation indicators for Indigenous populations in Australia using a modified Delphi technique. *BMJ open*. 2019;9(11):e031369.
64. Tjia J, Field TS, Garber LD, Donovan JL, Kanaan AO, Raebel MA, et al. Development and pilot testing of guidelines to monitor high-risk medications in the ambulatory setting. *The American Journal of Managed Care*. 2010;16(7):489-96.
65. Van der Linden L, Decoutere L, Flamaing J, Spriet I, Willems L, Milisen K, et al. Development and validation of the RASP list (Rationalization of Home Medication by an Adjusted STOPP list in Older Patients): A novel tool in the management of geriatric polypharmacy. *European Geriatric Medicine*. 2014;5(3):175-80.
66. Vyas A, Patry E, Owens N, Belviso N, Kogut SJ. Development and Application of a Measurement Framework to Evaluate Safe, Effective and Efficient Medication Use Among Older Adults. *Drugs Real World Outcomes*. 2019;6(4):173-81.
67. Winit-Watjana W, Sakulrat P, Kespichayawattana J. Criteria for high-risk medication use in Thai older patients. *Archives of gerontology and geriatrics*. 2008;47(1):35-51.
68. Zhan C, Sangl J, Bierman AS, Miller MR, Friedman B, Wickizer SW, et al. Potentially inappropriate medication use in the community-dwelling elderly: findings from the 1996 Medical Expenditure Panel Survey. *JAMA*. 2001;286(22):2823-9.
69. Zhang H, Wong EL, Yeoh E-k, Ma BH. Development of an explicit tool assessing potentially inappropriate medication use in Hong Kong elder patients. *BMC geriatrics*. 2021;21(1):1-12.
70. Spencer R, Bell B, Avery AJ, Gookey G, Campbell SM. Identification of an updated set of prescribing-safety indicators for GPs. *British Journal of General Practice*. 2014;64(621):e181-e90.
71. Avery AJ, Dex GM, Mulvaney C, Serumaga B, Spencer R, Lester HE, et al. Development of prescribing-safety indicators for GPs using the RAND Appropriateness Method. *Br J Gen Pract*. 2011;61(589):e526-36.
72. Reid MC, Eccleston C, Pillemer K. Management of chronic pain in older adults. *BMJ : British Medical Journal*. 2015;350:h532.

73. Domenichiello AF, Ramsden CE. The silent epidemic of chronic pain in older adults. *Prog Neuropsychopharmacol Biol Psychiatry*. 2019;93:284-90.
74. Zerah L, Henrard S, Wilting I, O'Mahony D, Rodondi N, Dalleur O, et al. Prevalence of drug-drug interactions in older people before and after hospital admission: analysis from the OPERAM trial. *BMC Geriatr*. 2021;21(1):571.
75. Maust DT, Strominger J, Kim HM, Langa KM, Bynum JPW, Chang CH, et al. Prevalence of Central Nervous System-Active Polypharmacy Among Older Adults With Dementia in the US. *Jama*. 2021;325(10):952-61.
76. Paul AK, Smith CM, Rahmatullah M, Nissapatorn V, Wilairatana P, Spetea M, et al. Opioid Analgesia and Opioid-Induced Adverse Effects: A Review. *Pharmaceuticals (Basel)*. 2021;14(11).
77. Fink R. Pain assessment: the cornerstone to optimal pain management. *Proc (Bayl Univ Med Cent)*. 2000;13(3):236-9.
78. Lavan AH, Gallagher P. Predicting risk of adverse drug reactions in older adults. *Ther Adv Drug Saf*. 2016;7(1):11-22.
79. Elwyn G, Dehlendorf C, Epstein RM, Marrin K, White J, Frosch DL. Shared decision making and motivational interviewing: achieving patient-centered care across the spectrum of health care problems. *Ann Fam Med*. 2014;12(3):270-5.
80. Khan NF, Booth HP, Myles P, Mullett D, Gallagher A, Evans C, et al. Use of prescribing safety quality improvement reports in UK general practices: a qualitative assessment. *BMC Health Services Research*. 2021;21(1):394.

Figure 2. Indicators concerning the prescription problems of drug-disease or drug-drug interactions





Figure 2

Figure 1. PRISMA flow diagram on process of selecting literature and retrieving opioid prescribing indicators



medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.12.07.23299686>; this version posted December 9, 2023. 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](#) .