an Excel® spreadsheet which logs a range of criteria, such as the patient’s sociodemographic background, the drug(s) involved, the type of error, the associated pharmaceutical intervention and many others.

**Results** 60 errors for 1000 patient days, that is 0.5 error per stay and 90 errors per 1000 prescriptions were detected for short stays. 1393 errors of all types were detected over 5 months, which is 0.9 error per month and per bed. The errors were spread over 3 categories: errors defined by the French Clinical Pharmacy Society criteria (67.3%), errors linked to the computerised tool (14.3%) and other types of error (18.4%). 5 drug classes were heavily involved. 59% of patients were affected by an error despite a prior pharmaceutical intervention. Errors rarely have drastic consequences on the patient: 4% prescriptions. Weaknesses in knowledge and malpractice represent an increasing risk (14%).

Weaknesses in knowledge and malpractice represent an increasing risk (14%).

**Conclusions** Most prescribing errors are avoidable. Although computerised physician order entry is a way of making the medication process safer, it also generates comments and has limitations. The prescription tool determines the type and frequency of errors. All these errors justify the analysis of all the prescriptions by a pharmacist, as s/he has a rounded knowledge of the patient beyond the medical prescription. The booming certification of various software packages dedicated to helping hospital prescription writing in a way acceptable to the High Authority for Health contributes to this step of making care safer and will hopefully lead to a decrease in errors.
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