the PE. The total benefit was calculated as the sum of the drug cost difference and the ADE-CA. Personnel costs were estimated and subtracted from the estimated benefit to assess the final cost-benefit. A sensitivity analysis was added to determine the impact of assumptions on PEs, CA and employer's expenses.

Results In 3040 prescriptions, 94 interventions were registered. Posology-related DRPs were the most common (59%). Sixty-two per cent of the errors were assigned a PE of medium (30%) or high (32%) level. Total drug cost savings amounted to € 395.30 (median € 1.47/intervention, range -€ 21.01 to € 67.23). After adding ADE-CA, we found a total benefit of € 8,559.92 (cost-benefit ratio: 2.32). Mostly variations in the ADE-CA affected the outcome. A lower and upper limit of respectively -€ 1,386.56 and € 27,307.49 were calculated.

Conclusion This is the first Belgian study to evaluate the POV of opioids as a profitable service for the hospital. Because of some limitations in the method, further refinements are required for more accurate results. These findings demonstrate that hospital management should also take into account the potential savings induced by clinical pharmacists and cannot only rely on limited government funding.

REFERENCES AND/OR ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

None.

No conflict of interest.

4CPS-171 THE CHOICE OF ANTIEPILEPTIC DRUG TREATMENT AFTER STATUS EPILEPTICUS

[1]L Horváth*, [2]I Fekete, [3]S Márton, [2]K Fekete. *[1]University of Debrecen, Department of Pharmaceutical Surveillance and Economics, Debrecen, Hungary; [2]University of Debrecen, Department of Neurology, Debrecen, Hungary; [3]University of Debrecen, Faculty of Art-Institute of Political Science and Sociology, Debrecen, Hungary*

10.1136/ejhpharm-2019-eahpconf.320

Background Status epilepticus (SE) is a life-threatening situation, which urges prompt antiepileptic treatment and intensive care. In the past few years, newer types of antiepileptic drugs (AEDs) have become available for SE treatment as second- or third-line drugs. AEDs should be prescribed for patients surviving SE as maintenance therapy in order to prevent further seizures.

Purpose To assess the prescription pattern of older and newer types of AEDs and their probable influence on the outcome of treatment (mortality and seizure freedom) after SE.

Material and methods Patients' data were retrieved from patients' files covering the period 1 January 2013 to 31 December 2017 in a retrospective study of patients who were treated and coded with SE diagnoses in accordance with the International Classification of Diseases by the WHO at the neurointensive unit of a tertiary teaching hospital. The end of follow-up was 30 June 2018.

Results In total 135 episodes (male: 68, 50.4%) were evaluated. The mean age was 64.1±13.9 years. The mean follow-up time was 39.9±14.2 months. Patients who survived SE (101 patients) took one (48.5%), two (36.6%) and three or more (14.9%) AEDs (49, 37 and 15 patients, respectively) at discharge to maintain freedom from seizures. The most common prescribed older type AEDs were carbamazepine and valproate. The prescriptions of newer type AEDs (60.3%; e.g. levetiracetam, oxcarbazepine, lamotrigine and lacosamide) were significantly higher at discharge than at admission ($p<0.005$). The mean seizure-free period was 6.8±6.9 months (the shortest seizure-free time was 1 day and the longest one was 5 years). In the case of patients taking carbamazepine (20.9%; OR: 0.37, 95% CI: 0.16 to 0.82; $p=0.018$), levetiracetam (27.5%; OR: 0.51, 95% CI: 0.27 to 0.97; $p=0.041$) or valproate (11.1%; OR: 0.18, 95% CI: 0.05 to 0.61; $p=0.0043$) had the highest probability of achieving seizure freedom among our patients. The choice of AED at discharge had no significant effect on mortality. Twenty-five patients had no seizure until the end of this study. Thirty-one patients (30.7%) died after the discharge period primarily due to co-morbidities.

Conclusion The administration of newer type AEDs *in SE* treatment may have an impact on the prescription pattern after discharge, however older type AEDs (carbamazepine, valproate) are a reasonable choice in achieving seizure freedom after SE.

REFERENCES AND/OR ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

N/A.

No conflict of interest.

4CPS-172 IMPACT OF MEDICATION RECONCILIATION IN PATIENTS ON ADMISSION TO AN EXPERT CENTRE FOR PARKINSON'S DISEASE

[1]V Nail*, [1]C Dubrou, [1]M Dulac, [2]JP Azulay, [1]G Hache. *[1]University Hospitals of Marseille, Pharmacy, Marseille, France; [2]University Hospitals of Marseille, Neurology, Marseille, France*

10.1136/ejhpharm-2019-eahpconf.321

Background Parkinson's disease (PD) is a long-term neurodegenerative disorder, whose onset appears usually after 60 years' old. Patients often suffer from co-morbidities and have a complex medication regimen. Thus, iatrogenic risk is very high in these patients. In France, there are 25 expert tertiary centres for PD but no data about medication reconciliation (MR) for the patients hospitalised in these centres are currently available.

Purpose To implement the MR process at admission to an expert centre for PD and to assess its impact.

Material and methods The study was conducted prospectively from January 2017 to June 2018. We included all patients over 65 years' old, admitted in an expert centre for PD in southern France. At admission, we obtained a complete and accurate list of each patient's current home medications (name, dosage, frequency, route) i.e. the best possible medication history (BPMH). Then we compared the BPMH to the patient's admission order, identified discrepancies, qualified them as intentional or unintentional with the prescriber, and suggested changes in the prescription, if appropriate. The primary endpoint was to determine the number of patients with at least one unintentional medication discrepancy (UMD). Secondary objectives were to characterise and estimate the severity of potential consequences of UMDs according to Dufay *et al*[1] and assess the rate of acceptance of suggested modifications.

Results We included 266 patients. Two-hundred and eighty-two UMDs were identified and 114 patients (43%) had at least one UMD. The most frequent UMD was omission of medication (68%). Interestingly, 34% of UMDs affected neurology drugs, including 8% for anti-Parkinson's drugs. The severity of potential consequences was estimated 'serious' in 10% of UMDs. Seventy-six per cent of the modifications suggested were accepted by prescribers.