Counter (OTC) drugs, supplements and herbal products. An educational brochure had been created and was sent to the elderly patients during the interviews.

Results The average age of patients in the study was 72.7 years and 70% (42/60) of patients were males. 95% (57/60) of the patients were expected for outpatient visits and the remaining 5% (3/60) were hospitalised. The most common reason for hospitalisation was cardiovascular diseases 46.6% (28/60). There was an average of two comorbidities and 78.3% (47/60) of patients were in polytherapy (≥ 4 drugs). Antihypertensives were the most frequently used drugs 63.3% (38/60). 6/60 (10%) patients reported a drug allergy, in particular Betamethasone, Iopromide, Ranolazine, Levofloxacin, Cefuroxime and Amoxicillin clavulanate. 16/60 (26.6%) of patients reported the use of paracetamol as an OTC when needed, 10/60 (16.6%) patients reported the use of supplements and only 2/60 (3.3%) patients the use of herbal products. A good adherence therapy and knowledge of ADR reporting methods emerged from the interviews. 2/60 (3.3%) patients reported ADR, respectively diarrhoea and procrastination related to Nintedanib and head and hand tremor related to Tacrolimus. These ADRs have been reported in the pharmacovigilance system.

Conclusion This direct approach with elderly patients has been important in focusing on their particular needs, and multidisciplinary teamwork has improved the risk/benefit ratio of the therapies. Further data will be recorded.

REFERENCES AND/OR ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

No conflict of interest.

5PSQ-120 APPLICATION OF INTERNATIONAL GERIATRIC CRITERIA ACCORDING TO EAHF POLICY STATEMENT ON AN AGEING SOCIETY

E Di Martino*, A Provenzano, P Polidori. *Ismett, Clinical Pharmacy, Palermo, Italy*

10.1136/ejhp-2019-eahpconf.553

Background Inappropriate prescribing in the elderly is a critical issue in primary care, causing a higher risk of adverse drug events and resulting in major patient safety concerns. At international level, many tools have been developed to cope with this problem and to identify Potentially Inappropriate Medications (PIMs).

Purpose The aim of this study was the application of Beers, Screening Tool of Older People's Prescriptions (STOPP)/Screening Tool to Alert to Right Treatment (START) and Improving Prescribing in the Elderly Tool (IPET) criteria by the tracer pharmacist (TP), as a key tool in reducing PIMs and improving the quality of prescribing.

Material and methods A retrospective cohort study was conducted by the TP using Beers, STOPP/START and IPET criteria. The cohort comprised 370 elderly patients hospitalised from January to May 2015, with at least three prescriptions.

Results The average age of patients in the study was 73 years and 54.5% (209/370) of patients were males. The most common reasons for hospitalisation were cardiovascular disease (183/370) and cancer (72/370). There was an average of 4.4 comorbidities and 83.8% (310/370) of patients were in polytherapy (≥ 4 drugs). The prevalence of PIMs in the sample was 85.7% (317/370) according to Beers criteria, 76.5% (283/370) using STOPP criteria and 39.2% (145/370) using IPET criteria. According to Beers criteria, the most prevalent PIM,

with a percentage of 72.1% (267/370), was the use of a proton-pump inhibitor, which exposes patients to *Clostridium difficile* infection, bone loss and fractures. According to STOPP criteria, we reported potentially constipating drugs (antimuscarinics, Fe, opioids) in 51.3% (190/370). According to IPET criteria, the use of δ -blocker in patients with obstructive pulmonary disease was the predominant PIM, with a percentage of 27.3% (101/370). On the other hand, the use of START criteria allowed the detection of appropriate prescriptions, which were 151/370: the most common was the use of inhaled δ_2 -agonists in the treatment of asthma or obstructive pulmonary disease.

Conclusion Regardless of the criteria used, our data showed that, according to Beers criteria, more than 80% of patients were exposed to PIMs. To make health professionals aware of the use of these tools and to improve care for the elderly patients, an educational brochure has been created.

REFERENCES AND/OR ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

No conflict of interest.

5PSQ-121 QUALITY ASSESSMENT WITHIN FRENCH FIRE AND RESCUE SERVICES PHARMACIES IN THE NORTH OF FRANCE: DEVELOPMENT AND EVALUATION OF A SELF-ASSESSMENT TOOL

¹V Ducatez*, ¹C Gerard, ²V Legrand de Ginji, ³M Le Jouan, ¹E Alavoine. ¹French Fire and Rescue Services of North County, Pharmacy, Lille, France; ²French Fire and Rescue Services of Oise County, Pharmacy, Beauvais, France; ³Public Hospitals of Paris Ap-Hp, Omedit, Paris, France

10.1136/ejhp-2019-eahpconf.554

Background The organisation of Pharmacies of French Fire and Rescue Department Services (FFRDS) progressively switches to an operating mode currently applied in hospital pharmacies. FFRDS pharmacies have very specific activities and, currently, there is no self-assessment tool available that enables assessment of the quality system (QS).

Purpose Primary aim of this study was to develop a QS self-assessment tool compatible with healthcare products (HP) management. Another goal was to set up a state of QS within the different pharmacies of FFRDS in the north of France.

Material and methods The first step was to create an expert group. It was composed of 15 members in different professions. Then, an audit checklist made up of 194 items was constructed. Each item was rated according to a risk level (from 0 'no risk' to 3 'unacceptable risk') and to an effort level required to control this risk (from 0 'no effort' to 3 'major effort'). Finally, computer modelling was done (Excel file).

Results A quantitative analysis was made from the results of five FFRDS pharmacies. This analysis revealed a high risk linked particularly to: pharmaceutical analysis and validation of medical prescriptions (70%), HP preparation and dispensation (67%). However, the risk related to HP purchase was low (20%). Furthermore, 16% of all the studied items showed a risk higher than 80%, whereas 32% showed a risk below 20%.

The qualitative analysis demonstrated a fair balance between the proportion of items categorised as 'unacceptable' and 'bearable'. The result range for the proportion of items classified as 'unacceptable' spans 3% to 34%.

As for the effort level required to control the risk, most items that have not been validated required a 'low intensity'