

their colleagues (up to 56.10%) rather than asking pharmacists for information concerning antibiotic reconstitution/dilution (up to 36.90%). More than 53% of 565 healthcare professionals considered the database within the hospital information system to be the most trusted source of information. Electronic resources, such as e-journals, online databases and websites, were the least trusted information source by more than 61% of healthcare professionals. The study revealed that knowledge depends on the educational level, since physicians had a higher percentage of correct answers (52.05%–88.10%) in comparison to medical nurses/technicians (33.33%–68.42%). Furthermore, there was a statistically significant difference in knowledge level among healthcare professionals from different hospitals.

Conclusion and relevance The study indicates the need for a database within the hospital information system regarding antibiotic reconstitution/dilution in order to decrease the inappropriate preparation and administration of parenteral antibiotics in hospitalised patients. Moreover, it is important to raise awareness about this issue as a part of the everyday practice of hospital pharmacists. There is a need to introduce specific training on preparation and administration of parenteral antibiotics among healthcare professionals in hospitals.

REFERENCES AND/OR ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

1. Sutherland A, Canobbio M, Clarke J, et al. Incidence and prevalence of intravenous medication errors in the UK: a systematic review. *Eur J Hosp Pharm*. 2020;**27**(1):3–8. doi:10.1136/ejhp-2018-001624

Conflict of interest No conflict of interest

4CPS-013 MERGING THE MEDICATION RECONCILIATION AND THE HOSPITALISATION REPORT TO FORM THE LIAISON LETTER IN A DEPARTMENT OF OTOLARYNGOLOGY

W Ammor*, C Fennat, P Gendre, P Nizet, E Clapeau, N Serandour, J Saillard, E Corbineau, B Troussier. *Internal Use Pharmacy, Clinical Pharmacy Sector, Nantes University Hospital, Nantes, France*

10.1136/ejhp-2022-eahp.65

Background and importance Since 1 January 2017, the liaison letter (LL) has been mandatory (Decree No. 2016–995, 2016). To optimise patient care and allow better coordination between health professionals we wanted to merge the hospitalisation report (HR) and the medication reconciliation (MR) to form a common document LL. We first implemented this document in May 2020 for digestive surgery and in December 2020 for orthopaedic surgery. Since March 2021 we continued this implementation in otolaryngology.

Aim and objectives The objective was to assess changes in practice and satisfaction among hospital staff (HS) in the otolaryngology department.

Material and methods A prospective observational study was conducted from 1 March to 1 April 2021, including all otolaryngology patients with an overnight hospital stay, to identify which document (MR, HR or LL) was created. Information about the patients was also collected in a table. A survey with eight questions was distributed to collect knowledge, use and satisfaction with the HS.

Results The data collection included 42 patients: 21 males and 21 females. The median age was 61.5 range (17–89) years.

The average length of stay was 4.77 (range 1–16) days. Surgeries were scheduled in 10% of cases. The main reasons for hospitalisation were parotidectomy, laryngectomy and thyroidectomy. For these 42 patients, 18 HR, 1 MR and 33 LL were created.

Of the 45 questionnaires sent to HS, we received 30 responses. 90% of the HS stated that they knew about the MR, and 47% used it. 90% had been aware of the LL (by verbal and written communication). 43% of them were informed by a pharmacist. 90% considered that the presentation of the LL is satisfactory. 87% of HS were satisfied with this creation and 83% said they had not encountered any difficulties.

59% of doctors found this implementation very useful, 27% indispensable and 14% somewhat useful. 75% of doctors said they use the LL frequently; 17% rarely consider using it and 8.5% said they never use it.

Conclusion and relevance HS are mostly satisfied by this new communication tool. However, this study shows the difficulty in changing practice since duplication of documents was observed. A remote assessment would allow a conclusion to be reached about the robustness of the use of the LL.

REFERENCES AND/OR ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Conflict of interest No conflict of interest

4CPS-014 CLINICAL RELEVANCE OF PHARMACISTS' INTERVENTIONS IN THE ACUTE WARD

M Pavelics von Hallas*, TR Andersen. *Region Zealand Hospital Pharmacy, Clinical Pharmacy, Roskilde, Denmark*

10.1136/ejhp-2022-eahp.66

Background and importance Clinical pharmacists assist physicians in the medication process when performing Clinical Pharmacist Services. Clinical pharmacist interventions (PI) to medication-related problems are conveyed to the physician through pharmacist notes in the patient record. The attending physician will accept and act on the interventions found to be clinically relevant. Previous studies have measured the acceptance rate of PI, and found varying rates from low to high, but not always reflecting on the reason for the resulting rates.

Aim and objectives The purpose of this study was to investigate the clinical relevance of the PI assessed by the attending physician.

Material and methods Clinical pharmacists at acute wards in Region Zealand, Denmark perform Clinical Pharmacy Services including medication history, medication reconciliation and medication review.¹ Data for this study were collected during the period January–February 2020. After concluding the pharmacist note in the patient record, the written interventions were copied to a separate sheet of paper, excluding patient- or physician-specific data. The attending physician was asked to assess each intervention for clinical relevance/significance using the Eadon score.² The Eadon classification ranges from 1 (Intervention is harmful to the patient's well-being) to 6 (Intervention is potentially life-saving). The physician made the assessment in private and returned the sheet in a sealed mailbox for later analysis. The analysis took place after the end of data collection to avoid affecting the PI during the project period. At the end of the study period, the mailbox was opened and data manually transferred to Microsoft Excel for descriptive statistics.