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**Background and importance** Medication reconciliation (MR) is the process of providing an exact and accurate list of all medications a patient is taking. This process is necessary to ensure that patients get the correct medications when admitted to hospital, thus preventing drug-related problems. The pharmacists in the emergency department at Stavanger University Hospital use a method based on IMM-methodology (Integrated Medicines Management) when executing MR. This is time-consuming, partly due to asking patients open questions and the lack of electronic resources available at the time IMM-methodology was developed.

**Aim and objectives** This thesis aims to make the pharmacist’s method for MR at the emergency department more efficient, thus obtaining correct medicine lists as early as possible for more patients.

**Materials and methods** An observation study surveyed possible improvements in the established method for MR at Stavanger University Hospital. This subsequently led to implementing a revised method for MR through an intervention study, comparing the methods with efficiency (time usage/patient) and quality (proportion of patients with discrepancies and number of discrepancies per patient). The revised method was deemed not qualitatively inferior to the established method if the proportion of discrepancies had a maximum deviation of 10%.

**Results** In total two hundred patients (78 years ± 10, 58% women) were included in the control group and currently hundred patients (79 years ± 9, 50% women) in the intervention group. The time usage for completing a MR in the intervention group was reduced by 34% compared to the control group. There was no difference in the proportion of patients with discrepancies/number of discrepancies per patient (respectively 79%/1.9 in the control group and 80%/1.9 in the intervention group).

**Conclusion and relevance** Data from the first 100 patients in the intervention group shows that the revised method for MR through an intervention study, comparing the methods with efficiency (time usage/patient) and quality (proportion of patients with discrepancies and number of discrepancies per patient). The revised method was deemed not qualitatively inferior to the established method if the proportion of discrepancies had a maximum deviation of 10%.
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**Background and importance** Neonatal pharmacotherapy is challenging and often based on little evidence. Off-label use of drugs is common practice and patients are at a high risk of medication errors and drug-related problems. Prescription-screening tools are used in geriatrics, internal medicine and pediatrics to optimize drug prescribing.

**Aim and objectives** Our aim was to develop a prescription-screening tool specific to neonatology.

**Materials and methods** Clinical guidelines on neonatal pharmacotherapy were identified by a literature review and synthesized into short statements. A 2-rounds Delphi consensus method was used to establish the content validity of NeonCheck. The statements were submitted to a group of 23 experts in 10 Swiss neonatology centers. The level of agreement was evaluated on a 5-point Likert scale (1 being the highest level of agreement). Statements for which more than 65% of pharmacist agreed to were retained in the final version of NeonCheck.
experts gave the statement a rating of 1 or 2 were selected at round 1. This cut off was raised to >75% at round two.

**Results** A total of 1375 clinical guidelines were identified from the literature search. After synthesis, 158 statements were submitted to the group of 23 Swiss experts. The mean agreement rating was 1.62 (95% CI 1.55 to 1.70) during the 1st round of Delphi and 1.32 (95% CI 1.28 to 1.37) during the 2nd round. The final Neocheck tool is composed of 141 statements on 11 medical domains and 49 neonatal diseases. On average, 95% (95% CI 94%-96%) of experts either totally agreed or slightly agreed with the validated statements.

**Conclusion and relevance** A prescription-screening tool specific to neonatology was developed and validated by a group of 23 Swiss experts. The impact of Neocheck on the optimization of drug use in neonates and its potential interest as a teaching tool for young physicians and clinical pharmacists need to be evaluated in the future.
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**What was done?** The process for distribution of paid pharmaceuticals (PPs) to outpatients in Central Denmark Region (13053 km², 1.3 million inhabitants) is made uniform and more flexible for the patients. Going forward, the patients will pick up their PPs in medicine boxes.

**Why was it done?** In Denmark, some expensive medications are provided without cost to a selected group of patients (paid pharmaceuticals, PPs). Approximately 35000 patients are receiving PPs from the hospitals in Central Denmark Region, 40% from the hospital pharmacy, the rest directly from hospital wards. Going forward, the hospital pharmacy will take over a larger percentage of these patients. The reasoning behind this decision is to free up time at the hospital wards, increase quality and patient safety and create a model that meets patient needs.

**How was it done?** During development of the new model for distribution, patients and hospital staff were asked to identify important factors when handling and picking up PPs. A task-force has assessed different models, and decided to test a medicine box. When picking up PPs from the medicine box, the patient will receive a personal code delivered by SMS. They will enter the code in the medicine box to unlock the box and pick up their PPs.

**What has been achieved?** The medicine box was evaluated by patients in a questionnaire (n=71). 87% checked ‘very satisfied’ or ‘satisfied’ when evaluating distribution of PPs by the medicine box, while only 64% chose either of these categories for distribution by the hospital wards. An impressive 94% checked ‘very satisfied’ or ‘satisfied’ for operation of the medicine box.

The medicine box seems to address patient needs in a sufficient manner and fulfill the chosen standards for a future distribution model for PPs.

**What next?** 90% of patients receiving PPs from the hospital are expected to use the medicine box as a means of distribution in the future. 15 medicine boxes are being installed at 11 different locations in Central Denmark Region.

In the trial period, only pharmaceuticals suitable for keeping at room temperature were used in the medicine box. When implemented full scale, medicine boxes with cooling are also being installed.