

Phase 3: May 2011–September 2011:

A Training package was introduced/spread and Ward Posters and Handover sheet were developed.

Phase 4: October 2011–August 2012:

Monthly run charts of results were shared with senior managers. Pink order slips and orange leaflets were introduced.

Results We achieved our target for 2010/11. The 1.95% target for 2011/2012 was more difficult but was achieved as shown in the table.

Conclusions In achieving our targets we improved communication and changed the culture from staff not unduly concerned with missed doses to staff taking action to reduce missed doses and improve patient care.

Abstract GRP-157 Table 1

Date	% Missed Doses (Target 1.95%)
Nov 2011	2.37%
Jan 2012	1.88%
Feb 2012	1.47%
Mar 2012	1.05%

No conflict of interest.

GRP-158 **REPORTING AND ANALYSIS OF ERRORS IN CANCER TREATMENT IN THE ANTIBLASTIC DRUGS LABORATORY OF THE EUROPEAN INSTITUTE OF ONCOLOGY**

doi:10.1136/ejhp-2013-000276.158

M Milani, V Sirna, I Cò, E Omodeo Salè. *European Institute of Oncology, Pharmacy, Milan, Italy*

Background The lack of management software for patients undergoing chemotherapy suggested to us that we should investigate errors that have occurred at all stages of the process: prescription, transcription, preparation, distribution and administration of treatment.

Purpose To encourage reports and classify the errors, in order to develop a computerised system of internal management of chemotherapy which can reduce the risk of error at all stages.

Materials and Methods Two reporting channels were established: one for major errors, such as prescriptions or preparations containing incorrect drugs or dosages, improper units of measurement, diluents incompatible with the active ingredient, improper administration. These errors are shared in corporate software with the Risk Management Office.

The second concerns minor errors, prescriptions containing compilation errors, incomplete compilation of the treatment regimen, incomplete administration of treatment; these errors are reported in an internal Excel file.

Results From January to September 2012, 73 major errors were reported from a total of 30406 preparations. Some of these were: prescription of paclitaxel instead of docetaxel, vinorelbine written as vinblastine; preparation of a 5-fluorouracil weekly dose in a two-day infusor, administration of paclitaxel bag to the wrong patient. In 85% of these cases the intervention of pharmacist avoided the error. 468 minor errors were reported, including 447 prescription errors, 3 transcription errors, 8 for lack of a cheque of the output treatment and 10 for incomplete delivery of the treatment.

Conclusions This analysis allowed us to draw a picture of the most frequent types of error. Most of them concerned the prescription stage, which we hope to minimise with the implementation of a computerised prescribing system. This will also cut down the transcription and administration errors by reading the barcode of the preparation with a patient wristband. The reduced number of

preparation errors can be attributed to the use of an automated system for chemotherapy preparation.

No conflict of interest.

GRP-159 **RETROSPECTIVE ANALYSIS OF MOST FREQUENT RISK ERRORS RELATED TO INFORMATIZATION SYSTEM FOR PRESCRIBING AND ADMINISTERING MEDICATION**

doi:10.1136/ejhp-2013-000276.159

¹N Bensalah, ²G Jabaud-Gazin, ¹M Badin, ¹M Camus. ¹CH Marc Jacquet, Department of medical informatization, Melun, France; ²CH Marc Jacquet, Pharmacy, Melun, France

Background Although implementing an electronic system shows significant functional effects associated with saving time, reducing costs and contributes to a safe medication process by improving patient safety and quality of service, it can also cause confused actions leading to new types of medication errors (MEs).

Purpose To identify and classify the most frequently observed MEs generated by the computerised tool when prescribing (physician order) and administering drugs (nurses' work).

Materials and Methods In June 2011, Orbis Medical (Agfa-Healthcare) software was introduced in our hospital for the medication process including integrated electronic prescription, pharmaceutical analysis and administration (4 clinical units representing 107 beds). Different risks of error were identified during pharmaceutical interventions (PIs) recorded between June 2011 and October 2012 and classified according to the French Society of Clinical Pharmacy recommendations. The focus is on MEs related to computerisation.

Results 605 PIs were made on 3933 prescriptions supplied over 466 days. Among these notifications, 1/3 were attributable to the use of the electronic system. Most MEs reported were due to: 1-regarding the prescription: incorrect dose regimen due to selecting the wrong units, incorrect schedule for dose administration, misuse of the commentary zone (free full text related to specific information), redundancy of 2 lines of the same prescribed drug, false interpretation of alert message; 2-regarding administration: failure to record administration, wrong drugs selected to be administered, misuse of the philtre function, single validation for different schedules.

It was noticed that MEs decreased after the staff had used the software for a period of time.

Conclusions Introducing an electronic tool may have an impact on professional practise. Although making healthcare processes safer, it generates new types of iatrogenic harm (other studies have revealed 5–35% MEs were attributable to computerisation). The introduction of new technology should be accompanied by regular training and evaluation to prevent misuse and potential adverse events.

No conflict of interest.

GRP-160 **REUSE OF STERILE IV LIDOCAINE 2% VIALS IN BERGMANN'S INFUSION IN AN ORTHOPAEDIC DEPARTMENT IN STIP CLINICAL HOSPITAL**

doi:10.1136/ejhp-2013-000276.160

¹B Lazarova, ¹L Mihailova, ²M Lazarova, ³I Lozanovska Pancevska. ¹Clinical Hospital, Hospital Pharmacy, Stip, FYROM; ²Pliva DOOEL, Drug Department, Skopje, FYROM; ³Worwgan Pharm, Drug Department, Skopje, FYROM

Background Single-use vials should be used clinically only for one dose for one patient and then discarded or reused under strictly controlled conditions. Certain conditions may justify repacking of single-use vials into smaller doses each intended for a single patient. This process must be performed under aseptic conditions by properly trained operators.