

1 **Full title:**

2 Medication administration errors during general anesthesia – a systematic review of prospective
3 studies

4
5 **Short title:**

6 Medication errors during general anesthesia

7
8 **Authors:**

9 Bradley P Murphy^{1¶*}, Gayatri Sivaratnam^{2¶}, Jean Wong^{3,4&}, Frances Chung^{3,4&}, Amir
10 Abrishami^{1,5&}

11
12 ¹Michael G. DeGroote School of Medicine, McMaster University, Hamilton, Ontario, Canada

13 ²Department of Pediatrics, McMaster University, Hamilton, Ontario, Canada

14 ³Toronto Western Hospital, University Health Network, Toronto, Ontario, Canada

15 ⁴University of Toronto, Toronto, Ontario, Canada

16 ⁵Niagara Health, St. Catharines, Ontario, Canada

17
18 *Bradley Murphy

19 E-mail: bradley.murphy@medportal.ca (BPM)

20 **Abstract**

21 **Introduction**

22 The incidence of medication error in anesthesia can be variable among different studies likely due
23 to recall bias in retrospective studies. In prospective survey studies, questionnaires are sent to
24 anesthesia care providers to facilitate self-reports of medication errors during a pre-planned
25 follow-up period. This systematic review investigates all prospective survey studies of medication
26 errors in adult patients undergoing general anesthesia. Our objective is to identify the incidence
27 and characteristics of the common medication errors during general anesthesia. We also want to
28 determine the contributing factors and outcomes of these errors.

29

30 **Methods**

31 We conducted database searches of Embase and Medline for medication errors in anesthesia
32 between 1980 to 2019 and 2020 to 2021. Ten prospective survey studies detailing medication
33 errors involving adult patients under general anesthesia were included. Data on response rate,
34 incidence of errors, types of error and medications, patient outcomes, and contributing factors were
35 collected.

36

37 **Results**

38 Ten studies were included of which six studies provided a response rate ranging from 53% to
39 97.5%. The incidence of medication errors ranged from 0.02% to 1.12% or 1 in every 90 to 5000
40 anesthetics. A total of 1,676 medication errors during general anesthesia were analyzed. The most
41 reported error was the substitution error (31.6% [530/1676]), followed by incorrect dose (28.4%

42 [476/1676]). The class of medication most associated with administration errors were muscle
43 relaxants, opioids, and antibiotics. Most patient outcomes were of no harm. Inexperience of the
44 anesthesiologist, nurse or student was the most reported contributing factor, followed by haste or
45 pressure to proceed, and communication problems.

46

47 **Conclusion**

48 The incidence of medication errors during general anesthesia were as high as 1.12% and the most
49 common errors were substitution error and incorrect dose. Inexperience, time pressure, and
50 communication problems were contributing factors. This information can be used to inform safety
51 practices in anesthesia.

52

54 **1 – Introduction**

55
56 During administration of anesthesia, multiple drugs are given from different classes via various
57 routes in fast-paced and high intensity environments.(1) Given the nature of anesthesia, in which
58 most anesthesiologists administer over 250,000 drugs during their career,(2) medication errors are
59 of significant concern. Anesthesiologists are likely to make one or more errors or near errors over
60 the span of their careers.(3–5)

61
62 Cognizant of this increased potential for harm, anesthesia is a leading specialty in patient safety.
63 The error rate in anesthesia has decreased over the last few decades, such that operative mortality
64 due to anesthesia is 1 per 100,000.(6) Many studies have shown medication errors to be one of the
65 main causes of adverse events in anesthesia.(7–17) These errors cause iatrogenic harm and
66 increase healthcare costs through increased length of stay (LOS) and surgery times.(4)
67 Recognizing these implications, a recent study highlights the work to develop and disseminate
68 consensus-based recommendations for perioperative medication safety.(18) Of note, many of the
69 existing recommendations that aim to prevent perioperative medication errors are not feasible in
70 middle-income and low-income countries.(18) Thus, the recommendations are tailored to income
71 level of each country.

72
73 Medication errors refer to situations in which a drug is erroneously administered and can occur at
74 any point throughout the anesthetic process.(1) While the many causes and types of medication
75 errors within anesthesia have been investigated, there is considerable variation among studies,
76 leading to uncertainty regarding its magnitude.(19) There are studies with different designs such

77 as case report/series, databases reviews, and retrospective or prospective survey studies that
78 investigated the occurrence and outcomes of medication errors in anesthesia. These studies have
79 been mostly conducted at an institutional or national level. In survey studies, questionnaires are
80 sent to anesthesia care providers to facilitate self-reports of any medication errors that occurred in
81 the past (retrospective recall) or during a follow up period (prospective survey).

82
83 To date, there have been minimal efforts to summarize the current evidence on this topic likely
84 due to complexity and abundancy of the literature. A recent integrated review by Bratch et al.,(20)
85 included a variety of study designs to analyze the incidence and type of medication errors during
86 anesthesia. The combination of diverse methodologies can lead to inaccurate results and
87 difficulties in drawing conclusions in reviews.(21) Including retrospective studies within their
88 report raises concern for recall and reporting bias. Although there may be an overestimate with
89 prospective studies, this emphasizes the need for forming a standardized definition of medication
90 errors to properly capture this data in future studies.

91
92 As per the 2017 WHO Medication Without Harm patient safety initiative, their vision was to
93 reduce the level of severe, avoidable harm related to medications by 50% over 5 years.(22)
94 However, given the heterogeneity between studies, the true rate of medication errors in anesthesia
95 is not fully known. The objectives of our systematic review are to gather data from prospective
96 studies to investigate the response rate, incidence of errors, common medication errors, implicated
97 medications, outcomes of medications errors, and their contributing factors. Determining the most
98 common causes of medication errors reveal error-prone practices, allowing us to develop strategies
99 to avoid mistakes, ultimately improving safety of anesthetic practice.

100

101 **2 – Methods**

102 **2.1 – Protocol**

103 This systematic review was created and conducted in accordance with the Preferred Reporting
104 Items for Systematic Review and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) guidelines.

105

106 **2.2 – Search strategy**

107 The Embase and Medline databases were searched using a search strategy in collaboration with
108 our librarian at McMaster University. The keywords were “anesthesia”, “anesthetic agent” and
109 “medication errors”, “patient safety” and its related keywords. The citation lists of included articles
110 were thoroughly reviewed to capture any articles that were potentially missed from the original
111 search. The search was limited to English language and humans. The search strategy is attached in
112 S1 Table.

113

114 **2.3 – Study selection and data extraction**

115 The search was conducted from January 1, 1980, to December 31, 2019 by authors GS and AA,
116 with an updated search from January 1, 2020 to December 11, 2021 completed by authors BM and
117 AA. Continued surveillance of literature was done up to November 2022. After duplicates were
118 removed, the title, abstracts, and full text of the eligible studies were reviewed in a stepwise fashion
119 and irrelevant studies were excluded.

120

121 Studies were included in this review if they met the following criteria: 1) All prospective studies
122 on medication errors related to the anesthetic process, 2) patients aged 18 years and older having
123 surgery under general anesthesia, and 3) publications in English. We excluded case reports, case
124 series, quality improvement studies, systematic reviews, meta-analyses, review articles, database
125 reviews, retrospective surveys, cohort studies, and cross-sectional studies.

126

127 **2.4 – Data analysis**

128 Data on the response rate and incidence of errors, error and near miss frequency, types of error,
129 involved medications, patient outcomes, and contributing factors were collected. Due to the
130 heterogeneity in patient outcomes across studies, the following categorization system was used to
131 allow uniformity in data collection and presentation across studies.(23) No harm refers to an error
132 that did not cause harm; error resulted in the need for additional monitoring or tests but no harm.
133 Mild harm refers to a harmful effect that was mild, temporary, and short-term; no treatment or
134 only minor treatment was required. Moderate harm refers to a harmful effect that required more
135 than minor treatment (including procedural treatment) or required an unplanned hospital admission
136 or prolonged hospital stay. Severe harm refers to symptoms that required major treatment to save
137 the patient’s life or caused major permanent or long-term harm.

138

139 Quality assessment was not done as there were no critical appraisal tools available to assess the
140 quality of the prospective survey studies.

141

142

143 3 – Results

144 3.1 – Search strategy

145 The literature search yielded 15,998 citations (Fig 1). After we removed duplicates, 14,262 studies
 146 remained. After we screened titles and abstracts, we found 72 articles to be eligible for full-text
 147 review. Of these articles, three studies met the inclusion criteria. We identified an additional seven
 148 records through the citation search (Table 1). A total of ten studies were included for final
 149 review.(2,23–31)

150

151 **Fig 1. Search protocol for including and excluding studies within this systematic review.**

152

153 **Table 1. Characteristics of the ten prospective surveys.**

Citation	Country	Study Duration	Study Population	Practice Setting	Total Number of Anesthetics	Response Rate (%)	Incidence of Errors (%)
Kim 2022	Australia, New Zealand	6 Years	Physicians	Hospitals (Not specified)	4,000*	-	-
Bowdle 2018	USA	14 Years	Physicians, nurses	University hospital	51,846	97.5	0.44
Zhang 2013	China	6 Months	Physicians	Tertiary hospital	24,380	67.7	0.73
Cooper 2012	USA	6 Months	Physicians, nurses	Tertiary teaching hospital	10,574	83	0.49
Webster 2010	New Zealand	4-5 Years	Physicians	Tertiary teaching hospitals	74,478	79.6	0.44
Llewellyn 2009	South Africa	6 Months	Physicians	Tertiary teaching hospitals	30,412	53	0.36
Yamamoto 2008	Japan	8 Years	Physicians	University hospital	27,454	-	0.17
Hintong 2005	Thailand	18 Months	Physicians, nurses, students	University, tertiary, secondary, and primary care hospitals	202,699	-	0.02

Webster 2001	New Zealand	4-18 Months	Physicians	Tertiary teaching hospitals	10,806	72.1	1.12
Fasting 2000	Norway	3 Years	Physicians, nurses	University hospital	55,426	-	0.11

*Over 4000 incident reports were received in this study duration, however, this study only analyzed the first 4000 reports.

154

155 **3.2 – Study characteristics**

156 Ten prospective studies published between 2000 to 2022 were included for the final review (Table
157 1). In these studies, anesthesia care providers were asked to complete and return a study form (i.e.,
158 medication error survey or incident forms) anonymously for every anesthetic performed during a
159 set period. They were asked to indicate whether a drug administration error, or in some studies, a
160 near miss (an incident with the potential to become an error) had occurred or not, and if the prior
161 was affirmed, further details were elicited. These studies were conducted in different settings and
162 multiple regions: New Zealand (n = 3), United States (n = 2), Australia (n = 1), China (n=1), Japan
163 (n = 1), Norway (n = 1), South Africa (n = 1), and Thailand (n = 1). Of the ten studies, six provided
164 a response rate which ranged from 53% to 97.5%. The incidence of medication errors ranged from
165 0.02% to 1.12% or 1 in every 90 to 5000 anesthetics.

166

167 **3.3 – Medication errors**

168 A total of 1,676 anesthesia medication errors were analyzed, which included both errors and near
169 misses (Table 2). Both errors and near misses were combined together when delineating the type
170 of medication error. We found that the most common type of errors were substitution, incorrect
171 dose, omission, incorrect route, repetition, insertion, and other (Table 3). Three studies listed these
172 types of error and defined each type in their study form. (25,27,30) The most reported medication
173 error in ten studies is the substitution error (31.6% [530/1676]), followed by incorrect dose (28.4%

174 [476/1676]) (Table 3). The third most common error is the error of omission being reported in nine
175 out of ten studies.

176 **Table 2. Reported medication errors.**

177

Citation	Omission	Substitution	Repetition	Insertion	Incorrect Dose	Incorrect Route	Inappropriate Choice of Medication	Incorrect Time	Incorrect Patient	Incorrect Side	Leakage Out of Vein	Incorrect Concentration	Incorrect Label	Unattended Drug	Other	Near Miss	Total Incidents
Kim 2022	31 (6.1%)	152 (30.1%)	25 (5%)	19 (3.8%)	151 (29.9%)	35 (6.9%)	29 (5.7%)	16 (3.2%)	7 (1.4%)	7 (1.4%)	-	-	-	-	33 (6.5%)	43 (8.5%)	505
Bowdle 2018	24 (10.4%)	53 (23%)	12 (5.2%)	20 (8.7%)	56 (24.3%)	8 (3.5%)	-	13 (5.7%)	-	-	-	-	7 (3%)	-	37 (16.1%)	44 (19.1%)	230
Zhang 2013	48 (26.8%)	36 (20.1%)	19 (10.6%)	8 (4.5%)	42 (23.5%)	3 (1.7%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	23 (12.8%)	-	179
Cooper 2012	10 (19.2%)	13 (25%)	1 (1.9%)	8 (15.4%)	19 (36.5%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1 (1.9%)	-	17 (32.7%)	52
Webster 2010	61 (18.7%)	97 (29.8%)	30 (9.2%)	-	105 (32.2%)	11 (3.4%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	22 (6.7%)	-	326
Llewellyn 2009	4 (3.6%)	67 (60.4%)	7 (6.3%)	-	26 (23.4%)	7 (6.3%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	45 (40.5%)	111
Yamamoto 2008	10 (20.8%)	11 (22.9%)	-	-	14 (29.2%)	5 (10.4%)	-	4 (8.3%)	-	-	2 (4.2%)	-	-	-	2 (4.2%)	-	48
Hintong 2005	2 (4.9%)	20 (48.8%)	-	-	12 (29.3%)	3 (7.3%)	-	1 (2.4%)	1 (2.4%)	-	-	1 (2.4%)	1 (2.4%)	-	-	4 (9.8%)	41
Webster 2001	19 (15.7%)	44 (36.4%)	11 (9.1%)	-	33 (27.3%)	3 (2.5%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	2 (1.7%)	-	9 (7.4%)	40 (33.1%)	121
Fasting 2000	-	37 (58.7%)	-	-	18 (28.6%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	8 (12.7%)	-	63

Omission: drug not given. Substitution: incorrect drug instead of the desired drug; a swap. Repetition: extra dose of an intended drug. Insertion: a drug that was not intended to be given at a particular time or at any time. Incorrect dose: wrong dose of an intended drug. Incorrect route: wrong route of an intended drug. Inappropriate choice of medication: a medication given as intended that is not appropriate for the indication. Incorrect time: a correct dose of an intended medication given at an incorrect time. Incorrect patient: a medication intended for one patient given to another. Incorrect side: an injection intended for one side of a patient administered into the other side (usually for a regional block). Leakage out of vein: extravasation of medication. Incorrect concentration: wrong concentration of medication used. Incorrect label: wrong label used to identify medication. Unattended drug: medication left unattended. Other: usually a more complex event not fitting the categories listed prior. Near miss: an event that had the potential to develop into a medication error, but was prevented by chance or intervention.

178

179

180 **Table 3. Ranges of most reported errors by error type.**

181

Error Type	No. of studies reported this error	No. studies reported this error as most common error	Range (%)
Substitution	10	5	20.1 – 60.4
Incorrect Dose	10	4	23.4 – 36.5
Omission	9	1	3.6 – 26.8
Incorrect Route	8	0	1.7 – 10.4
Repetition*	7	0	1.9 – 10.6
Insertion*	6	0	3.8 – 15.4
Other	7	0	4.2 – 16.1
Near Miss	6	0	8.5 – 40.5

*Given that two studies grouped these categories together, they were not accounted for in this range.

183 Of the ten studies, only seven reported the types of medication classes (S2 Table). The types of
184 medication classes involved in errors varied. If a study listed only the medication names, these
185 were categorized based on their medication class to present the data in a similar format. The
186 medication class most associated with medication errors are muscle relaxants, opioids, and
187 antibiotics (Fig 2). The incidence of errors related to the different classes of medication is as
188 follows: (22.9% [8/35]), opioids (20% [7/35]), antibiotics (17.1% [6/35]), inhalational agents
189 (11.4% [4/35]), local anesthetics (8.6% [3/35]), non-opioid analgesics (8.6% [3/35]),
190 anticholinergics (5.7% [2/35]), induction agents (2.9% [1/35]), and sympathomimetics (2.9%
191 [1/35]).

192

193 **Fig 2. Most common type of medications involved in medication errors versus type of errors.**
194 **Number of studies where medication class is listed as most common type of error is listed**
195 **within each block.**

196

197 When analyzing the most common types of error and medication classes (Fig 2), we found that
198 substitution errors (20% [7/35]) and incorrect dosing errors (20% [7/35]) were the most common
199 error type. Of the eight reported errors for muscle relaxants, three were substitution errors, two
200 insertion errors, two incorrect dosing errors, and one a repetition error. Of the seven reported errors
201 for opioids, three were incorrect dosing errors, one error each for omission, substitution, repetition,
202 and incorrect route.

203 3.4 – Patient outcomes

204 Patient outcomes that were contributed to medication errors ranged from no harm to severe harm
 205 (Table 4). The moderate and severe harm made up the minority of outcomes, ranging from 0.9%
 206 to 28.3%. Most errors resulted in no harm, ranging from 35% to 100%. Examples of severe harm
 207 reported included cardiac arrest, shock, respiratory depression, major morbidity, and death.

208
 209 **Table 4. Outcomes of medication errors.**

Citation	Total Errors	No Harm	Mild Harm	Moderate Harm	Severe Harm	Unknown
Kim 2022	505	177 (35%)	96 (19%)	143 (28.3%)	33 (6.5%)	56 (11.1%)
Bowdle 2018	230	192 (83.5%)	0	0	0	38 (16.5%)
Zhang 2013	179	95 (53.1%)	54 (30.2%)	0	30 (16.8%)	-
Cooper 2012	52	24 (46.2%)	15 (28.8%)	13 (25%)	0	-
Webster 2010	326	315 (96.6%)	2 (0.6%)	6 (1.8%)	3 (0.9%)	-
Llewellyn 2009	111	111 (100%)	0	0	0	-
Yamamoto 2008	48	43 (89.6%)	3 (6.3%)	2 (4.2%)	0	-
Hintong 2005	41	27 (65.9%)	13 (31.7%)	0	1 (2.4%)	-
Webster 2001	121	96 (79.3%)	18 (14.9%)	0	7 (5.8%)	-
Fasting 2000	63	33 (52.4%)	27 (42.9%)	0	3 (4.8%)	-

211 212 3.5 – Contributing factors

213
 214 The contributing factors for these medication errors were listed in nine of the ten studies. S3 Table
 215 lists each study and their associated contributing factors. Each contributing factor was given a
 216 single point value and were totalled to determine which factors were most associated with a
 217 medication error (Fig 3). Inexperience was found to be the most reported factor, followed by haste
 218 or pressure to proceed and communication problems.

219

220 **Fig 3. Contributing factors associated with medication errors.**

221

222 **4 – Discussion**

223 In this systematic review of ten prospective studies on medication errors in adults undergoing
224 general anesthesia, we found that substitution errors and incorrect dosing errors were the most
225 reported errors. The medication class most associated with administration errors were muscle
226 relaxants, opioids, and antibiotics. Most patient outcomes were of no harm; however, several
227 studies did report severe harm. Inexperience of the anesthesiologist, nurse or student was the most
228 reported contributing factor, followed by haste or pressure to proceed, and communication
229 problems.

230

231 Retrospective surveys and database reviews have previously identified substitution and incorrect
232 dosing errors as the most commonly reported error type.(4,7,32–36) To date, the literature
233 examining the involved medications, patient outcomes, and contributing factors of these
234 medication errors are limited.(20)

235

236 Standardizing anesthetic procedures has often been suggested as a method of error reduction. The
237 study completed by Maximous et al.(37) identified that multimodal interventions and improved
238 labelling practices reduce medication errors in anesthetized patients. Multimodal interventions
239 included a barcode reader that provided automatic auditory and visual verification of the drug
240 selected, improved anesthetic carts, and other components in the bundle, such as colour-coded
241 syringes, pre-filled syringes, reorganization of the workspace, and improved guidelines.(37) Of
242 the six studies that reported using various combinations of these interventions into bundles, there

243 was a significant reduction in the rate of errors post-intervention, ranging from 21% to 100%.(37)
244 With respect to improved labelling systems, one study showed a 37% reduction in rate of errors,
245 but this did not reach statistical significance.(37) Although multimodal interventions are becoming
246 more common, globally many of these interventions, such as prefilled syringes or scanned labels,
247 are not available for anesthesia practice. Additionally, many of these interventions come with a
248 significant cost to implement.

249
250 We found that muscle relaxants, opioids, and antibiotics were most associated with medication
251 errors during general anesthesia. This highlights an important finding, especially errors related to
252 muscle relaxants. Errors with muscle relaxants can lead to important consequences, such as
253 awareness, delayed recovery, or postoperative residual paralysis. While two-person checks for
254 antibiotic administration is a common practice in many operating rooms, opioids and muscle
255 relaxants are mainly administrated by anesthesia care providers. Therefore, other strategies such
256 as barcode read outs at the time of administration could potentially reduce risk of errors.(24)
257 Adding barcode labels to pre-filled syringes so computers can scan and “read out” labels, would
258 provide the anesthesiologist information via audition, rather than simply reading the medication
259 name.(16) While this heuristic can be timesaving, it can also be harmful when medications have
260 similar names that can be misinterpreted by pattern recognition. Additionally, using barcodes
261 would aid documentation of medication administration.(16)

262
263 Although most studies reported that the medication errors resulted in no harm, several studies
264 reported severe harm such as death, cardiac arrest, shock, respiratory depression, and major

265 morbidity. This highlights the importance of continuing to improve anesthesia safety practices to
266 minimize any potential for severe harm to patients undergoing general anesthesia.

267
268 In our systematic review, the most significant contributing factor was inexperience of the
269 anesthesiologist, nurse, or student. Haste or pressure to proceed and communication problems were
270 other contributing factors. Our findings are in contrary to those in retrospective surveys in which
271 the most common contributing factor was syringe swap, followed by misidentification.(4,7,36)
272 This highlights the potential recall bias that occurs when data is collected retrospectively in
273 comparison to a prospective manner.

274

275 **Future direction**

276 Future research should elucidate further which drugs are most often implicated in medication
277 errors, as this could inform safety practices. Near errors should be elucidated to determine what
278 prevented these incidents developed into completed errors. Importantly, the cause of errors,
279 whether active or latent human error should be studied. The former would indicate changes to
280 training of anesthesiologists, while the latter would inform system level changes within hospitals.

281
282 Future studies should utilize a standardized definition of medication errors, as this will allow for
283 more comprehensive data analysis between studies and provide a more accurate representation on
284 medication error rates.

285

286 **Strengths and limitations of study**

287 Our study is the first to examine only prospective studies. In comparison to Bratch et al.,(20) where
288 a variety of study designs were analyzed, we examined prospective surveys to minimize recall bias
289 and provide an accurate picture of the true incidence of medication errors. There are some
290 limitations in this review. Limitations stem from the large variance in data presentation within the
291 studies. This large variability raises the need for standardized definitions of medications errors.
292 Many studies did not link medications or medication class with error type. Also, some studies
293 combined the medication errors and near misses together before delineating the type of error.
294 Surveys rely on self-reporting, a biased modality of data collection. Additionally, anesthesia may
295 only partially contribute to an incident, but may not be solely responsible. Near misses may not be
296 recognized. Reluctance to report or inability to admit error can lead to underreporting.

297

298 **5 – Conclusion**

299 Our systematic review found that anesthesiologists, as well as nurses and students, are most prone
300 to errors of substitution. During general anesthesia, muscle relaxants, opioids, and antibiotics are
301 the medication classes most associated with medication errors. Inexperience was the most reported
302 contributing factor to medication errors. Using these information, new safety endeavors can be
303 created to further ensure patient safety within the practice of anesthesia.

304 **References**

- 305 1. Paix AD, Bullock MF, Runciman WB, Williamson JA. Crisis management during
306 anaesthesia: problems associated with drug administration during anaesthesia. *BMJ Qual*
307 *Saf.* 2005;14:e15.
- 308 2. Llewellyn RL, Gordon PC, Wheatcroft D, Lines D, Reed A, Butt AD, et al. Drug
309 administration errors: a prospective survey from three South African teaching hospitals.
310 *Anaesth Intensive Care.* 2009;37(1):93–8.
- 311 3. Merry AF, Peck DJ. Anaesthetists, errors in drug administration and the law. Vol. 108,
312 *New Zealand Medical Journal.* 1995. p. 185–7.
- 313 4. Gordon PC, Llewellyn RL, James MFM. Drug administration errors by South African
314 anaesthetists – a survey. *South African Medical Journal.* 2006;96(7):630–2.
- 315 5. Annie SJ, Thirilogasundry MR, Hemanth Kumar VR. Drug administration errors among
316 anesthesiologists: The burden in India - A questionnaire-based survey. *J Anaesthesiol Clin*
317 *Pharmacol.* 2019;35(2):220–6.
- 318 6. Mellin-Olsen J, Staender S, Whitaker DK, Smith AF. The Helsinki Declaration on Patient
319 Safety in Anaesthesiology. *Eur J Anaesthesiol.* 2010;27(7):592–7.
- 320 7. Orser BA, Chen RJB, Yee DA. Medication errors in anesthetic practice: a survey of 687
321 practitioners. *Canadian Journal of Anesthesia.* 2001;48(2):139–46.
- 322 8. Nanji KC, Patel A, Shaikh S, Seger DL, Bates DW. Evaluation of Perioperative
323 Medication Errors and Adverse Drug Events. *Anesthesiology.* 2016;124(1):25–34.
- 324 9. Glavin RJ. Drug errors: consequences, mechanisms, and avoidance. Vol. 105, *British*
325 *Journal of Anaesthesia.* 2010. p. 76–82.

- 326 10. Kothari D, Gupta S, Sharma C, Kothari S. Medication error in anaesthesia and critical
327 care: A cause for concern. Vol. 54, Indian Journal of Anaesthesia. 2010. p. 187–92.
- 328 11. Mahajan RP. Medication errors: Can we prevent them? Vol. 107, British Journal of
329 Anaesthesia. 2011. p. 3–5.
- 330 12. Hove LD, Steinmetz J, Christoffersen JK, Møller A, Nielsen J, Schmidt H. Analysis of
331 deaths related to anesthesia in the period 1996-2004 from closed claims registered by the
332 Danish Patient Insurance Association. *Anesthesiology*. 2007;106(4):675–80.
- 333 13. Sakaguchi Y, Tokuda K, Yamaguchi K, Irita K. Incidence of anesthesia-related
334 medication errors over a 15-year period in a university hospital. *Fukuoka Igaku Zasshi*.
335 2008;99(3):58–66.
- 336 14. Irita K, Tsuzaki K, Sawa T, Sanuki M, Makita K, Kobayashi Y, et al. Critical incidents
337 due to drug administration error in the operating room: An analysis of 4,291,925
338 anesthetics over a 4 year period. *Japanese Journal of Anesthesiology*. 2004;53(5):577–84.
- 339 15. Cooper JB, Newbower RS, Kitz RJ. An analysis of major errors and equipment failures in
340 anesthesia management: Considerations for prevention and detection. *Anesthesiology*.
341 1984;60(1):34–42.
- 342 16. Neily J, Silla ES, Sum-Ping SJT, Reedy R, Paull DE, Mazzia L, et al. Anesthesia Adverse
343 Events Voluntarily Reported in the Veterans Health Administration and Lessons Learned.
344 *Anesth Analg*. 2018;126(2):471–7.
- 345 17. Kurth CD, Tyler D, Heitmiller E, Tosone SR, Martin L, Deshpande JK. National pediatric
346 anesthesia safety quality improvement program in the United States. *Anesth Analg*.
347 2014;119(1):112–21.

- 348 18. Nanji KC, Merry AF, Shaikh SD, Pagel C, Deng H, Wahr JA, et al. Global PRoMiSe
349 (Perioperative Recommendations for Medication Safety): protocol for a mixed-methods
350 study. *BMJ Open*. 2020;10(6):e038313.
- 351 19. Nwasor EO, Sule ST, Mshelia DB. Audit of medication errors by anesthetists in North
352 Western Nigeria. *Niger J Clin Pract*. 2014;17(2):226–31.
- 353 20. Bratch R, Pandit JJ. An integrative review of method types used in the study of
354 medication error during anaesthesia: implications for estimating incidence. *Br J Anaesth*.
355 2021;127(3):458–69.
- 356 21. Hopia H, Latvala E, Liimatainen L. Reviewing the methodology of an integrative review.
357 *Scand J Caring Sci [Internet]*. 2016 Dec 1;30(4):662–9. Available from:
358 <https://doi.org/10.1111/scs.12327>
- 359 22. WHO, World Health Organization. Medication Without Harm. Medication Without Harm.
360 2022.
- 361 23. Kim JY, Moore MR, Culwick MD, Hannam JA, Webster CS, Merry AF. Analysis of
362 medication errors during anaesthesia in the first 4000 incidents reported to webAIRS.
363 *Anaesth Intensive Care*. 2022;50(3):204–19.
- 364 24. Bowdle TA, Jelacic S, Nair B, Togashi K, Caine K, Bussey L, et al. Facilitated self-
365 reported anaesthetic medication errors before and after implementation of a safety bundle
366 and barcode-based safety system. *Br J Anaesth*. 2018;121(6):1338–45.
- 367 25. Zhang Y, Dong YJ, Webster CS, Ding XD, Liu XY, Chen WM, et al. The frequency and
368 nature of drug administration error during anaesthesia in a Chinese hospital. *Acta*
369 *Anaesthesiol Scand*. 2013;57(2):158–64.

- 370 26. Cooper L, DiGiovanni N, Schultz L, Taylor AM, Nossaman B. Influences observed on
371 incidence and reporting of medication errors in anesthesia. *Canadian Journal of*
372 *Anesthesia*. 2012;59(6):562–70.
- 373 27. Webster CS, Larsson L, Frampton CM, Weller J, McKenzie A, Cumin D, et al. Clinical
374 assessment of a new anaesthetic drug administration system: a prospective, controlled,
375 longitudinal incident monitoring study. *Anaesthesia*. 2010;65(5):490–9.
- 376 28. Yamamoto M, Ishikawa S, Makita K. Medication errors in anesthesia: An 8-year
377 retrospective analysis at an urban university hospital. *J Anesth*. 2008;22(3):248–52.
- 378 29. Hintong T, Chau-In W, Thienthong S, Nakcharoenwaree S. An analysis of the drug error
379 problem in the Thai Anesthesia Incidents Study (THAI Study). *Journal of the Medical*
380 *Association of Thailand*. 2005;88(Suppl 7):S118–27.
- 381 30. Webster CS, Merry AF, Larsson L, Mcgrath KA, Weller J. The Frequency and Nature of
382 Drug Administration Error During Anaesthesia. *Anaesth Intensive Care*. 2001;29(5):494–
383 500.
- 384 31. Fasting S, Gisvold SE. Adverse drug errors in anesthesia, and the impact of coloured
385 syringe labels. *Canadian Journal of Anesthesia*. 2000;47(11):1060–7.
- 386 32. Charuluxananan S, Sriraj W, Lapisatepun W, Kusumaphanyo C, Ittichaikulthol W,
387 Suratsunya T. Drug errors from the Thai anesthesia incidents monitoring study: Analysis
388 of 1,996 incident reports. *Asian Biomedicine*. 2017;6(4):541–7.
- 389 33. Chopra V, Bovill JG, Spierdijk J. Accidents, near accidents and complications during
390 anaesthesia. A retrospective analysis of a 10-year period in a teaching hospital.
391 *Anaesthesia*. 1990;45(1):3–6.

- 392 34. Freestone L, Bolsin SN, Colson M, Patrick A, Creati B. Voluntary incident reporting by
393 anaesthetic trainees in an Australian hospital. *International Journal for Quality in Health*
394 *Care*. 2006;18(6):452–7.
- 395 35. Khan FA, Hoda MQ. Drug related critical incidents. Vol. 60, *Anaesthesia*. 2005. p. 48–52.
- 396 36. Labuschagne M, Robbette W, Rozmiarek J, Strydom M, Wentzel M, Diedericks BJS, et
397 al. Errors in drug administration by anaesthetists in public hospitals in the Free State.
398 *South African Medical Journal*. 2011;101(5):324–7.
- 399 37. Maximous R, Wong J, Chung F, Abrishami A. Interventions to reduce medication errors
400 in anesthesia: a systematic review. Vol. 68, *Canadian Journal of Anesthesia*. Springer;
401 2021. p. 880–93.

402

403 **Supporting information**

404

405 **S1 Table. Search strategy for anesthetic medication errors in the Embase and Medline**
406 **databases.**

407 **S2 Table. Medication classes involved by error type (medication class occurring at the highest**
408 **frequency listed first).**

409 **S3 Table. Contributing factors listed by study.**

410

411




Fig1

■ Omission ■ Substitution ■ Repetition ■ Insertion ■ Incorrect Dose ■ Incorrect Route




Fig2




Fig3