



Improvement of Knowledge, Attitude and Perception of health care workers about ADRs, a pre and post clinical pharmacists' interventional cohort study

Journal:	<i>BMJ Open</i>
Manuscript ID:	bmjopen-2011-000367
Article Type:	Research
Date Submitted by the Author:	02-Sep-2011
Complete List of Authors:	Khalili, Hossein; Tehran University of Medical Sciences, Clinical Pharmacy Mohebbi, Niayesh hendoiee, Narjes Keshtkar, Abbas-Ali
Primary Subject Heading:	Pharmacology & therapeutics
Keywords:	Medication safety,, Patient safety, Pharmacists, Pharmacoepidemiology

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

Title:

Improvement of Knowledge, Attitude and Perception of health care workers about ADRs, a pre and post clinical pharmacists' interventional cohort study

Short title: ADR and KAP study

Authors:

Hossein Khalili¹, Niayesh Mohebbi¹, Narjes Hendoiee¹, Abbas-Ali Keshtkar²

1-Clinical Pharmacist, Department of Clinical Pharmacy, Faculty of Pharmacy, Tehran University of Medical Sciences, Tehran, Iran

2-Epidemiologist, Endocrinology and Metabolism Research Center, Tehran University of Medical Sciences- Gasterology and hepatology Research Center, Golestan University of Medical Sciences, Tehran, Iran

Corresponding Author:

Hossein Khalili

Department of Clinical Pharmacy, Faculty of pharmacy, Tehran University of Medical Sciences, Enghelab Ave, Tehran, Iran

Postal Code:1417614411

P.O.Box:14155/6451

Tel: +98-912-2979329

Fax: +98-21-66461178

E-mail: khalilih@tums.ac.ir

Key words: ADR, KAP, Clinical Pharmacy Interventions

Word count: 2131

Abstract

Purpose: Health care workers have an essential role in detection, assessment and spontaneous reporting of adverse drug reactions and accordingly improvement of their related knowledge, attitudes and perception is essential. The goal of this study was evaluation of clinical pharmacists' interventions in improvement of knowledge, attitude and perception about adverse drug reactions in a teaching referral hospital, Tehran, Iran.

Method: Changes in knowledge, attitude and perception of health care workers of Imam teaching hospital, were evaluated before and after clinical pharmacists interventions including workshops, meetings and education.

Results: From the 100 participated subjects, 82 of them completed the study. Fifty one percent of the health workers have been aware of Iranian Pharmacovigilance Center at ministry of health before intervention and after that all of the participants knew this center. About awareness and detection of adverse drug reactions in patients, 69(84.1%) of health care workers recognized at least one and following interventions it was improved to 73 (89%). Only 7 (8.5%) subjects of participants have reported adverse drug reactions in before intervention phase that were increased significantly to 18 (22%) after intervention.

Conclusion: Clinical Pharmacists' interventions were successful in improvement of health care workers' knowledge, attitude, and practice about adverse drug reactions and spontaneous reporting, in Imam teaching hospital.

Article Summery

Article focus: The goal of this study was evaluation of clinical pharmacists' interventions in improvement of knowledge, attitude and perception about adverse drug reactions in a referral teaching hospital, Tehran, Iran.

Key messages:

-Our results showed that 91.5% of health care workers of Imam teaching hospital that participated in the study never reported any ADR, and 49% were not even aware of Iranian Pharmacovigilance Center.

-Identifying previously unrecognized ADRs was the most important goal for ADR reporting in before and after the interventions phases of the study.

- Regarding this study results, it was suggested that health systems must to have training programs for their workers about importance and how to detect, gather, analyze, report and fallow-up ADRs in the hospital and Provide online and telephone line accesses to facilitate ADRs reporting system.

Strengths and limitation of this study:

-To the best of our knowledge this is the first survey in Iran that have evaluated clinical pharmacists' interventions in improvement of the health care professionals' knowledge, attitudes and perceptions regarding ADR.

- The most important limitation of our survey was incomplete filled questionnaires.

Introduction

Adverse drug reactions (ADR) are a major cause of morbidity and mortality around the world[1]. These also have enormous economic burden on health care systems [2, 3]. Pharmacovigilance studies are more important for evaluating medication safety following drugs marketing [4]. Spontaneous ADR reporting by yellow cards is the corn stone of national and international drug safety evaluation in the post marketing phase. Health care workers, especially medical practitioners are the principal contributors of ADR reports[5]. Health care professionals' knowledge, attitudes and perception about ADR spontaneous reporting systems have central role in improvement of medication safety[1,5,-6]. There are some concerns about ADR spontaneous reporting by health care workers including ADR importance, do not know how to report and fill the yellow cards, doubt about adverse effect and suspicious drug ,lack of time, fear of legal problems, avoiding paper works and unavailable yellow card[1,5-7]. World Health Organization standards show that the best spontaneous reporting rate is over 200 reports per 1,000,000 populations per year. Consequently, in Iran with a population of over 70 million, it is expected to have at least 14,000 reports per year that unfortunately only 4,967 reports per year were sent to the Iranian Pharmacovigilance Center (IPC)[6]. The goal of this study was evaluation of clinical pharmacists' interventions in improvement of knowledge, attitude and perception about adverse drug reactions in a referral teaching hospital, Tehran, Iran.

Method

In this study, changes in knowledge, attitude and perception of health care workers of Imam teaching hospital, were evaluated before and after clinical pharmacists interventional cohort study in the Imam Khomeini Complex hospital during one year period. To assess knowledge, attitude and perception of

1
2
3 health care workers about ADR a validate questionnaire [1] was used. In the
4 first phase of the study, the clinical pharmacists (3 persons) attended in different
5 medical wards and asked health care workers to participate in the study and fill
6 the questionnaire. Clinical pharmacists' interventions included training
7 workshops (providing lectures and group discussion) and continuous providing
8 information at the hospital general morning report section (every other day)
9 about ADRs, their importance, seriousness, preventability, necessity of
10 reporting, and spontaneous reporting system and its advantages. In the
11 workshop they learned to fill a yellow card and emphasized on reporting any
12 suspected reaction regardless of uncertainty about the causality. After three
13 months the same questionnaire were filled again. Then all the data analyzed by
14 Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) software version 16.0 for
15 Windows. Results were reported as frequency and for comparing the before and
16 after intervention's data, we used Crosstabulation and Chi- Squire. Values less
17 than 0.05 were considered as significant.
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33

34 35 **Results**

36
37
38 From 100 participated health care workers, 82 questionnaires were filled out
39 both before and after intervention with same name. The questionnaires that were
40 filled only in one phases of the study were excluded. Thirty five men and 47
41 women including 7 (8.5%) physicians, 31 (37.8%) residents, 26 (31.7%) interns,
42 17 (20.7%) nurses and one (1.2%) pharmacist participated in the study. Average
43 age of them was 30.9 years with standard deviation of 6.7 years. Mean and
44 median of practice experience of health care workers included in the study were
45 9.9 and 9 years, respectively.
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54

55
56 Fifty one percent (n=42) of the health care workers were aware of IPC at Iranian
57 ministry of health before interventions and after that all of the participants knew
58 this center. Four people (4.9%) had attended in an ADR workshop prior to this
59
60

1
2
3
4 study. Sixty nine (84.1%) of subjects had recognized at least one ADR in their
5
6 practice period and following interventions 73 (89%) of cases have identified
7
8 ADR. Only 7 (8.5%) people have reported ADR in first step that increased
9
10 significantly to 18 (22%) by the interventions ($P < 0.001$).

11
12 Two (2.4%) responders have sent the reported ADR to IPC in Tehran, 1 (1.2 %)
13
14 to Food and Drug Organization in another city of Iran, 1 (1.2 %) to the
15
16 manufacture, and 4 (4.9%) to hospital's ADR center before the interventions and
17
18 after that reporting to IPC increased to 17 (20.7%) of cases ($P < 0.001$).

19
20 Doubt about occurrence of an ADR that was caused underreporting, didn't alter
21
22 with the interventions significantly (63.4% vs. 69.5%). Sources of suspected
23
24 ADR without reporting were shown in table 1. The interventions had
25
26 considerable impact to reduce causes of underreporting including did not know
27
28 how to report ($p = 0.002$), yellow card not available ($p = 0.039$), lack of enough
29
30 information about the patient ($p < 0.0001$).

31
32 All types of ADR that might promote health care professionals for reporting
33
34 them were improved significantly after clinical pharmacists' interventions
35
36 (Table 2).

37
38 The next question was about health care workers' perception of ADR and
39
40 spontaneous ADR reporting goals. As it was indicated in table 3 our
41
42 interventions had a significant effect on the participants' total perception about
43
44 ADR spontaneous reporting.

45
46 Responders' idea about spontaneous reporting was not improved significantly
47
48 following the clinical pharmacists' interventions (Table 4). Fifty five (67.1%)
49
50 and 60 (73.2%) of subjects believed that it is a professional responsibility at pre
51
52 and post interventional phases of the study respectively.

53
54 Regarding their attitude for reporting ADRs the question was; in which of the
55
56 following conditions (carbamazepine induced agranulocytosis, hypoglycemia
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 following use of a new hypoglycemic agent, a new statin induced myalgia,
4 weight loss following fluoxetine therapy in a young women, amoxicillin induced
5 skin rash, pedal edema following amlodipine therapy, bronchospasm following
6 use of new beta blocker, and a new antiepileptic induced paresthesias) you will
7 fill the yellow card? Only reporting of serious reactions such as carbamazepine
8 induced agranulocytosis was improved by clinical pharmacists' interventions.
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16

17 The options for ADR reporting have been indicated in table 5. Yellow card,
18 online, telephone and fax were frequent preferred methods in that order for
19 ADRs reporting in this study (Table 6). Clinical pharmacists' interventions
20 improved participants' perception in cases which had no idea about ADRs
21 reporting methods.
22
23
24
25
26

27 Discussion

28 To the best of our knowledge this is the first survey in Iran that have evaluated
29 clinical pharmacists' interventions in improvement of the health care
30 professionals' knowledge, attitudes and perceptions regarding ADR. ADR
31 under-reporting among health care workers is a problem in this regard.
32
33
34
35
36
37

38 Our results showed that 91.5% of health care workers of Imam teaching hospital
39 that participated in the study never reported any ADR, and 49% were not even
40 aware of IPC being at first phase of the study and obviously improved after
41 interventions. Iranian pharmacists are more aware about IPC (6) that may be
42 related to pharmacists more information about drugs and whole ADR point.
43
44
45
46
47

48 Before the clinical pharmacists' interventions a little (2.4%) of responders sent
49 ADR reports to IPC at the Ministry of Health and after that all of reports have
50 set to this center. It shows that interventions improve participant information
51 regarding the center responsible for analyzing and managing of their reports. In
52 previous research in Shiraz, Iran[1], 11% of the reports were sent to this center.
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60 The majority of health care workers in present survey never reported an ADR
that is comparable with other studies [4,6,8]. In the first phase the main reasons

1
2
3 of under reporting were in order of had not enough information from the patient,
4 too well known to report, did not know how to report, uncertain association, and
5 being unaware of the existence of a national ADR reporting system.
6
7
8

9
10 Although there are many studies [9-15] that assess causes of under reporting
11 ADRs, there are not many of them which evaluating these barriers in hospitals.
12 In a study performed in a tertiary teaching hospital in Barcelona / Spain results
13 have been similar to our study that have illustrated lack of time to report due to
14 the workload of clinical practitioners as the most important reason to ADR
15 under-reporting. Other causes of under-reporting in that study were lack of
16 information about the spontaneous reporting system, unavailability of yellow
17 cards, doubt of ADR causality assessment and lack of patient confidentiality
18 [9]. The main problems in other studies are similar to these data and included
19 uncertain association, too trivial to report, too well known to report, yellow card
20 unavailability, lack of time, and not knowing how to report[10-15]. In this
21 regard clinical pharmacists of Imam Hospital decided to have interventions to
22 improve these problems.
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37

38 This is clear that all kind of ADR related to all drugs have not been reported
39 sufficiently. In present study serious and unusual reactions, unrecognized ADR,
40 and reactions to a new product were expressed more important ADR for
41 reporting by the participants. This was as the same as other studies' results[16-
42 20]. We found only one study in Turkey that the idea of reporting all kind of
43 ADRs was more often among pharmacist than reporting only serious and
44 unexpected reactions [21]. After the study's interventions as was shown in the
45 result section, believe of all kind of reactions reporting have been increased
46 significantly.
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56

57 Identifying previously unrecognized ADRs was the most important goal for
58 ADR reporting in before and after the interventions phases of the study. This
59
60

1
2
3 was also reported by other studies [22,23]. Regarding the influence of the
4 clinical pharmacists' interventions on modifying health care workers' practice,
5 just reporting carbamazepine induced agranulocytosis shown a significant
6 change, that is indicated reporting of a serious reaction.
7
8
9
10

11
12 The preferred method to report ADRs was yellow card followed by online
13 report in both before and after the interventions, while in previous study in Iran,
14 Phone was the ideal method following yellow cards for pharmacists[1].
15
16
17

18
19 The most important limitation of our survey was incomplete filled
20 questionnaires; consequently we couldn't enroll all 100 questionnaires for the
21 analysis.
22
23
24
25

26
27 Regarding this study results, it was suggested that health systems must to have
28 training programs for their workers about importance and how to detect,
29 gather, analyze, report and fallow-up ADRs in the hospital and Provide online
30 and telephone line accesses to facilitate ADRs reporting system.
31
32
33

34
35 In conclusion clinical pharmacists' interventions can improve knowledge,
36 attitude, and perception of health car workers about ADR spontaneous
37 reporting, that is a great issue of importance regarding pharmacovigilance and
38 public health.
39
40
41
42

43 44 **Authorship:**

45
46 Hossein khalili: Clinical pharmacist of the hospital and provided educational
47 programs for the participants to the study and manuscript revision.
48
49
50

51
52 Niayesh Mohebbi: Data gathering and manuscript preparation.
53
54

55
56 Narjes Hendoiee: Data gathering.
57

58
59 Abbas-Ali Keshtkar: Study design and statistical analysis.
60

1
2
3 **Acknowledgements:** This study was supported by a grant from Office of Vice-Chancellor
4 for Research of Tehran University of Medical Sciences.
5
6

7 **Conflict of interest:** There is not any competing interest for all authors about present work.
8
9

10 **Founding:** We have not any founding resource.
11

12 **Reference:**

- 13 1. Vessal G, Mardani Z, Mollai M. Knowledge, attitudes, and perceptions of pharmacists to
14 ADR reporting in Iran. *Pharm World Sci* 2009;**31**:183–187.
15
- 16 2. Lazarou J, Pomeranz BH, Corey PH. Incidence of ADR in hospitalized patients: a meta-
17 analysis of prospective studies. *JAMA*1998;**279**:1200-1205.
18
- 19 3. Millar JS. Consultation owing to ADR in a single practice. *Br J Gen Pract* 2001;**51**:130-1.
20
- 21 4. Figueiras A, Tato F, Fontaiñas J, et al. Physicians' attitudes towards voluntary reporting of
22 adverse drug events. *J Eval Clin Pract* 2001;**7**:347-54.
23
- 24 5. Rawlins MD. Pharmacovigilance: paradise lost, regained or postponed? The William
25 Withering Lecture 1994. *J R Coll Physicians Lond* 1995;**29**:41-9.
26
- 27 6. Vallano A, Cereza G, Pedròs C, et al. Obstacles and solutions for spontaneous reporting of
28 ADRs in the hospital. *Br J Clin Pharmacol* 2005;**60**:653–658.
29
- 30 7. Salehifar E., Ala SH., Gholami KH., Knowledge, attitudes, and perceptions of pharmacists
31 and Nurses ADR reporting in Mazandaran ,Iran. *Mazandaran university of medical science*
32 *journal* 2007;**56**:115-125.
33
- 34 8. Cosentino M, Leoni O, Oria C, et al. Hospital-based Survey of Doctors' Attitudes to ADRs
35 and Perception of Drug-related Risk for Adverse Reaction Occurrence. *Pharmacoepidemiol*
36 *Drug Safety* 1999;**8**:S27-S35.
37
- 38 9. Evans SM, Berry JG, Smith BJ, et al. Attitudes and barriers to incident reporting: a
39 collaborative hospital study. *Qual Saf Health Care* 2006;**15**:39–43.
40
- 41 10. Bateman DN, Sanders GL, Rawlins MD. Attitudes to ADR reporting in the Northern
42 Region. *Br J Clin Pharmacol* 1992;**34**: 421–6.
43
- 44 11. Belton KJ, Lewis SC, Payne S, et al. Attitudinal survey of ADR reporting by medical
45 practitioners in the United Kingdom. *Br J Clin Pharmacol* 1995;**39**:223–6.
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

12. Eland IA, Belton KJ, van Grootheest AC, et al. Attitudinal survey of voluntary reporting of ADR. *Br J Clin Pharmacol* 1999;**48**:623–7.
13. Bäckström M, Mjorndal T, Dahlqvist R, et al. Attitudes to reporting ADR in northern Sweden. *Eur J Clin Pharmacol* 2000;**56**:729–32.
14. McGettigan P, Feely J. ADR reporting: opinions and attitudes of medical practitioners in Ireland. *Pharmacoepidemiol Drug Saf* 1995;**4**:355–8.
15. Belton KJ. Attitude survey of adverse drug-reaction reporting by health care professionals across the European Union. The European Pharmacovigilance Research Group. *Eur J Clin Pharmacol* 1997;**52**:423–7.
16. Green CF, Mottram DR, Rowe PH, et al. Attitudes and knowledge of hospital pharmacists to ADR reporting. *Br J Clin Pharmacol* 2001;**51**:81–6.
17. Lee KK, Chan TY, Raymond K, et al. Pharmacists' attitudes toward ADRs reporting in Hong Kong. *Ann Pharmacother* 1994;**28**:1400–3.
18. Sweis D, Wong IC. A survey on factors that could affect ADR reporting according to hospital pharmacists in Great Britain. *Drug Saf* 2000;**23**:165–72.
19. Generali JA, Danish MA, Rosenbaum SE. Knowledge of and attitudes about ADR reporting among Rhode Island pharmacists. *Ann Pharmacother* 1995;**29**:365–9.
20. Figueiras A, Tato F, Fontainas J, et al. Physicians' attitudes towards voluntary reporting of adverse drug events. *J Eval Clin Pract* 2001;**7**:347–54.
21. Zerrin Toklu H, Uysal MK. The knowledge and attitude of the Turkish community pharmacists toward pharmacovigilance in the Kadikoy district of Istanbul. *Pharm World Sci* 2008;**30**:556– 62.
22. Belton KJ, Lewis SC, Payne S, et al. Attitudinal survey of ADR reporting by medical practitioners in the United Kingdom. *Br J Clin Pharmacol* 1995;**39**:223–6.
23. Cosentino M, Leoni O, Banfi F, et al. Attitudes to ADR reporting by medical practitioners in a northern Italian district. *Pharmacol Res* 1997;**35**:85–8.

Table 1 - Causes of suspected ADR without reporting

Reason	Before intervention	After intervention	P value
Uncertain association between reaction and drug	18(22)	17(20.7)	1
Unimportant to report	13(15.9)	11(9)	0.30
Well known that don't need to be reported	21(25.6)	16(19.5)	0.23
Unaware of the existence of a national ADR reporting system	17(20.7)	15(18.3)	0.62
Did not know importance of reporting	12(14.6)	10(12.2)	0.69
Did not know how to report	20(24.4)	12(14.6)	0.02
Lack of time	11(13.4)	16 (19.50)	0.18
Lack of financial reimbursement	2(2.4)	2(2.4)	1
Fear of legal liability	2(2.4)	2(2.4)	1
Yellow card not available	16(19.5)	9(11)	0.04
Reporting system is too technical	18(9.8)	14(4.9)	0.12
Not enough information from the patient	82(100)	3(3.7)	0.0001

Table 2 - Reactions characteristics that might encourage health care professionals to report

Factor	Before intervention	After intervention	P value
A serious reaction	53(64.6)	74(90.2)	<0.001
Unusual reaction	38(46.3)	66(80.5)	<0.001
Reaction of a new product	36(43.9)	46(56.1)	0.02
Reaction not reported before for a particular drug	36(43.9)	66(80.5)	<0.001
Reaction is well recognized for a particular drug	8(9.8)	31(37.8)	<0.001
Any reaction (serious or non-serious, well-known or new) to an old or new product	7(20.7)	26(31.7)	0.004

Table 3 - Health care workers' perception of ADR and spontaneous reporting purposes, before and after intervention.

Purpose	Before intervention	After intervention	P value
To enable safe drugs to be identified	36(43.9)	46(56.1)	0.02
To measure the incidence of ADR	39(47.6)	57(69.5)	<0.001
To identify factors which might predispose to ADR	35(42.7)	58(70.7)	<0.001
To identify previously unrecognized ADRs	56(68.3)	70(85.4)	<0.001
To compare ADRs for drugs in similar therapeutic classes	36(43.9)	52(63.4)	<0.001
To compare ADRs of same drug from different drug companies	44(53.7)	44(53.7)	1

Table 4- Believes about spontaneous reporting, before and after intervention

Believes about spontaneous reporting	Before intervention	After intervention	P value
Professional responsibility	55(67.1)	60(73.2)	0.12
Felt that one report can not modify the health-care system	6(7.3)	6(7.3)	1
All serious ADRs were recognized before drug marketing	3(3.7)	1(1.2)	0.5
Completely aware of what should be reported	4(4.9)	8(9.8)	0.06
Yellow-cards are too complicated	19(23.2)	18(22)	1

Table 5 – Health care workers' attitude for reporting; some instances of ADR

Event	Category of reaction	Report before the intervention	Report after the intervention	P value
Carbamazepine induced agranulocytosis	serious	30(36.6)	74(90.2)	<0.001
Hypoglycemic coma of a new diabetes medication	Serious for a new drug	48(58.5)	45(54.9)	0.72
Myalgia with a new statin	New drug	19(23.2)	20(14.2)	1
Weight loss after 8 week of fluoxetine	well recognized for a particular drug	69(7.3)	13(15.9)	0.14
Rash with amoxicillin after 6 days	well recognized for a particular drug	18(22)	12(14.6)	0.33
Foot edema after 4 month amlodipine	well recognized for a particular drug	19(23.2)	18(22)	1
Pain and tingling of tongue after two weeks of a new anti- seizure	Reaction not reported before for a particular drug	33(40.2)	40(48.8)	0.34
Bronchospasm in an asmatic patient after the first administration of a beta-blocker	Serious well recognized for a particular drug	33(40.2)	29(35.4)	0.63

Table 6- Health care workers' preferred method of reporting

Preferred method	Before intervention	After intervention	P value
Yellow Card	29(32)	34(45.1)	0.09
Telephone	18(24.3)	16(21.6)	0.21
Fax	1(1.4)	0	0.33
Online	21(28.4)	23(31.1)	0.45
None	5(6.8)	1(1.4)	0.02

For peer review only

STROBE 2007 (v4) Statement—Checklist of items that should be included in reports of *cohort studies*

Section/Topic	Item #	Recommendation	Reported on page #
Title and abstract	1	(a) Indicate the study's design with a commonly used term in the title or the abstract	1
		(b) Provide in the abstract an informative and balanced summary of what was done and what was found	2
Introduction			
Background/rationale	2	Explain the scientific background and rationale for the investigation being reported	3
Objectives	3	State specific objectives, including any prespecified hypotheses	3
Methods			
Study design	4	Present key elements of study design early in the paper	3
Setting	5	Describe the setting, locations, and relevant dates, including periods of recruitment, exposure, follow-up, and data collection	3-4
Participants	6	(a) Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of selection of participants. Describe methods of follow-up	3-4
		(b) For matched studies, give matching criteria and number of exposed and unexposed	
Variables	7	Clearly define all outcomes, exposures, predictors, potential confounders, and effect modifiers. Give diagnostic criteria, if applicable	4
Data sources/ measurement	8*	For each variable of interest, give sources of data and details of methods of assessment (measurement). Describe comparability of assessment methods if there is more than one group	4
Bias	9	Describe any efforts to address potential sources of bias	
Study size	10	Explain how the study size was arrived at	4
Quantitative variables	11	Explain how quantitative variables were handled in the analyses. If applicable, describe which groupings were chosen and why	4
Statistical methods	12	(a) Describe all statistical methods, including those used to control for confounding	4
		(b) Describe any methods used to examine subgroups and interactions	4
		(c) Explain how missing data were addressed	4
		(d) If applicable, explain how loss to follow-up was addressed	4
		(e) Describe any sensitivity analyses	4
Results			4

Participants	13*	(a) Report numbers of individuals at each stage of study—eg numbers potentially eligible, examined for eligibility, confirmed eligible, included in the study, completing follow-up, and analysed	5
		(b) Give reasons for non-participation at each stage	5
		(c) Consider use of a flow diagram	
Descriptive data	14*	(a) Give characteristics of study participants (eg demographic, clinical, social) and information on exposures and potential confounders	5
		(b) Indicate number of participants with missing data for each variable of interest	5
		(c) Summarise follow-up time (eg, average and total amount)	5
Outcome data	15*	Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures over time	5-6
Main results	16	(a) Give unadjusted estimates and, if applicable, confounder-adjusted estimates and their precision (eg, 95% confidence interval). Make clear which confounders were adjusted for and why they were included	
		(b) Report category boundaries when continuous variables were categorized	
		(c) If relevant, consider translating estimates of relative risk into absolute risk for a meaningful time period	
Other analyses	17	Report other analyses done—eg analyses of subgroups and interactions, and sensitivity analyses	
Discussion			
Key results	18	Summarise key results with reference to study objectives	7
Limitations			
Interpretation	20	Give a cautious overall interpretation of results considering objectives, limitations, multiplicity of analyses, results from similar studies, and other relevant evidence	8
Generalisability	21	Discuss the generalisability (external validity) of the study results	8
Other information			
Funding	22	Give the source of funding and the role of the funders for the present study and, if applicable, for the original study on which the present article is based	8

*Give information separately for cases and controls in case-control studies and, if applicable, for exposed and unexposed groups in cohort and cross-sectional studies.

Note: An Explanation and Elaboration article discusses each checklist item and gives methodological background and published examples of transparent reporting. The STROBE checklist is best used in conjunction with this article (freely available on the Web sites of PLoS Medicine at <http://www.plosmedicine.org/>, Annals of Internal Medicine at <http://www.annals.org/>, and Epidemiology at <http://www.epidem.com/>). Information on the STROBE Initiative is available at www.strobe-statement.org.



Improvement of Knowledge, Attitude and Perception of health care workers about ADR, a pre and post clinical pharmacists' interventional cohort study

Journal:	<i>BMJ Open</i>
Manuscript ID:	bmjopen-2011-000367.R1
Article Type:	Research
Date Submitted by the Author:	20-Sep-2011
Complete List of Authors:	Khalili, Hossein; Tehran University of Medical Sciences, Clinical Pharmacy Mohebbi, Niayesh hendoiee, Narjes Keshtkar, Abbas-Ali Dashti-Khavidaki, Simin
Primary Subject Heading:	Pharmacology & therapeutics
Keywords:	Medication safety,, Patient safety, Pharmacists, Pharmacoepidemiology

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

STROBE 2007 (v4) Statement—Checklist of items that should be included in reports of cohort studies

Section/Topic	Item #	Recommendation	Reported on page #
Title and abstract	1	(a) Indicate the study’s design with a commonly used term in the title or the abstract	1
		(b) Provide in the abstract an informative and balanced summary of what was done and what was found	2
Introduction			
Background/rationale	2	Explain the scientific background and rationale for the investigation being reported	3
Objectives	3	State specific objectives, including any prespecified hypotheses	3
Methods			
Study design	4	Present key elements of study design early in the paper	3
Setting	5	Describe the setting, locations, and relevant dates, including periods of recruitment, exposure, follow-up, and data collection	3-4
Participants	6	(a) Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of selection of participants. Describe methods of follow-up	3-4
		(b) For matched studies, give matching criteria and number of exposed and unexposed	
Variables	7	Clearly define all outcomes, exposures, predictors, potential confounders, and effect modifiers. Give diagnostic criteria, if applicable	4
Data sources/ measurement	8*	For each variable of interest, give sources of data and details of methods of assessment (measurement). Describe comparability of assessment methods if there is more than one group	4
Bias	9	Describe any efforts to address potential sources of bias	
Study size	10	Explain how the study size was arrived at	4
Quantitative variables	11	Explain how quantitative variables were handled in the analyses. If applicable, describe which groupings were chosen and why	4
Statistical methods	12	(a) Describe all statistical methods, including those used to control for confounding	4
		(b) Describe any methods used to examine subgroups and interactions	4
		(c) Explain how missing data were addressed	4
		(d) If applicable, explain how loss to follow-up was addressed	4
		(e) Describe any sensitivity analyses	4
Results			4

Participants	13*	(a) Report numbers of individuals at each stage of study—eg numbers potentially eligible, examined for eligibility, confirmed eligible, included in the study, completing follow-up, and analysed	5
		(b) Give reasons for non-participation at each stage	5
		(c) Consider use of a flow diagram	
Descriptive data	14*	(a) Give characteristics of study participants (eg demographic, clinical, social) and information on exposures and potential confounders	5
		(b) Indicate number of participants with missing data for each variable of interest	5
		(c) Summarise follow-up time (eg, average and total amount)	5
Outcome data	15*	Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures over time	5-6
Main results	16	(a) Give unadjusted estimates and, if applicable, confounder-adjusted estimates and their precision (eg, 95% confidence interval). Make clear which confounders were adjusted for and why they were included	
		(b) Report category boundaries when continuous variables were categorized	
		(c) If relevant, consider translating estimates of relative risk into absolute risk for a meaningful time period	
Other analyses	17	Report other analyses done—eg analyses of subgroups and interactions, and sensitivity analyses	
Discussion			
Key results	18	Summarise key results with reference to study objectives	7
Limitations			
Interpretation	20	Give a cautious overall interpretation of results considering objectives, limitations, multiplicity of analyses, results from similar studies, and other relevant evidence	8
Generalisability	21	Discuss the generalisability (external validity) of the study results	8
Other information			
Funding	22	Give the source of funding and the role of the funders for the present study and, if applicable, for the original study on which the present article is based	8

*Give information separately for cases and controls in case-control studies and, if applicable, for exposed and unexposed groups in cohort and cross-sectional studies.

Note: An Explanation and Elaboration article discusses each checklist item and gives methodological background and published examples of transparent reporting. The STROBE checklist is best used in conjunction with this article (freely available on the Web sites of PLoS Medicine at <http://www.plosmedicine.org/>, Annals of Internal Medicine at <http://www.annals.org/>, and Epidemiology at <http://www.epidem.com/>). Information on the STROBE Initiative is available at www.strobe-statement.org.

Title:

Improvement of Knowledge, Attitude and Perception of health care workers about ADR, a pre and post clinical pharmacists' interventional study

Short title: ADR and KAP study

Authors:

Hossein Khalili¹, Niayesh Mohebbi¹, Narjes Hendoiee¹, Abbas-Ali Keshtkar², Simin Dashti-Khavidaki¹

1-Clinical Pharmacist, Department of Clinical Pharmacy, Faculty of Pharmacy, Tehran University of Medical Sciences, Tehran, Iran

2-Epidemiologist, Endocrinology and Metabolism Research Center, Tehran University of Medical Sciences- Gasterology and hepatology Research Center, Golestan University of Medical Sciences, Tehran, Iran

Corresponding Author:

Hossein Khalili

Department of Clinical Pharmacy, Faculty of pharmacy, Tehran University of Medical Sciences, Enghelab Ave, Tehran, Iran

Postal Code:1417614411

P.O.Box:14155/6451

Tel: +98-912-2979329

Fax: +98-21-66461178

E-mail: khalilih@tums.ac.ir

Key words: ADR, KAP, Clinical Pharmacy Interventions

Word count: 2454

Abstract

Purpose: Health care workers have a main role in detection, assessment and spontaneous reporting of adverse drug reactions and improvement of their related knowledge, attitudes and perception is essential. The goal of this study was evaluation of clinical pharmacists' interventions in improvement of knowledge, attitude and perception of health care workers about adverse drug reactions in a teaching referral hospital, Tehran, Iran.

Method: Changes in knowledge, attitude and perception of health care workers of Imam teaching hospital about adverse drug reactions were evaluated before and after clinical pharmacists' interventions including workshops, meetings and presentations.

Results: From the 100 participated subjects, 82 of them completed the study. Fifty one percent of the health workers have been aware of Iranian Pharmacovigilance Center at ministry of health before intervention and after that all of the participants knew this center. About awareness and detection of adverse drug reactions in patients, 69(84.1%) of health care workers recognized at least one and following interventions it was improved to 73 (89%). Only 7 (8.5%) subjects of participants have reported adverse drug reactions in before intervention phase that were increased significantly to 18 (22%) after intervention.

Conclusion: Clinical Pharmacists' interventions were successful in improvement of health care workers' knowledge, attitude, and perception about adverse drug reactions and spontaneous reporting, in our hospital.

Article Summary

Article focus: The goal of this study was evaluation of clinical pharmacists' interventions in improvement of knowledge, attitude and perception about adverse drug reactions in a referral teaching hospital, Tehran, Iran.

Key messages:

-Our results showed that 91.5% of health care workers of the hospital never reported any ADR, and 49% were not even aware of Iranian Pharmacovigilance Center.

-Identifying previously unrecognized ADRs was the most important goal for ADR reporting in before and after the interventions phases of the study.

- Regarding the study results, it was suggested that health systems must to have training programs for their workers about importance, detection, analysis, reporting and fallow-up of ADRs in the hospital and Provide online and telephone line accesses to facilitate ADRs reporting system.

Strengths and limitation of this study:

-To the best of our knowledge this is the first survey in Iran that have evaluated clinical pharmacists' interventions in improvement of the health care professionals' knowledge, attitudes and perceptions regarding ADR.

- Our study was done in a single center with small sample size and short duration between pre and post interventions participants' assessment.

Introduction

Adverse drug reactions (ADR) are a major cause of morbidity and mortality around the world and have high economic burden on health care systems [1-3]. Pharmacovigilance studies are more important for evaluating medication safety following drugs marketing [4]. Health care workers, especially medical practitioners are the principal contributors of ADR reports [5]. Health care professionals' knowledge, attitudes and perception about ADR have central role in improvement of patients' safety [1,5,6]. There are some concerns about ADR spontaneous reporting by health care workers including ADR importance, do not know how to report and fill the yellow cards, doubt about adverse effect and suspicious drug, lack of time, fear of legal problems, avoiding paper works and unavailable yellow card [1,5-7]. World Health Organization standards show that the best spontaneous reporting rate is over 200 reports per 1,000,000 populations per year. Consequently, in Iran with a population of over 70 million, it is expected to have at least 14,000 reports per year that unfortunately only 4,967 reports per year were sent to the Iranian Pharmacovigilance Center (IPC) [6].

Continuous education of health care workers about pharmacovigilance by oral presentations, verbal reminders, providing ADR newsletters by e-mail, mailing and direct distribution for hospital staff, advertisement, increased accessibility

1
2
3 of Yellow Cards, attending of pharmacist in the medical wards and involving
4
5
6 actively in education and training of health care workers especially nurses and
7
8
9 physicians were proposed for improvement of knowledge and attitude of health
10
11
12 care workers about ADRs (8-10).

13
14
15 The goal of this study was evaluation of clinical pharmacists' interventions in
16
17 improvement of knowledge, attitude and perception about adverse drug
18
19 reactions in a referral teaching hospital, Tehran, Iran.

22 Method

23
24
25 In this study, changes in knowledge, attitude (perspective toward ADR and way
26
27 of understanding or awareness of saying and doing about that) and perception (
28
29 the ADR) of health care workers of Imam Khomeini Complex Hospital (a
30
31 tertiary referral hospital with 1200 beds that is affiliated to Tehran university of
32
33 Medical sciences, Tehran, Iran), about ADRs were evaluated before and after
34
35 clinical pharmacists' interventional study. Based on WHO definition ADR was
36
37 considered as any noxious, unintended, and undesired effect of a drug that
38
39 occurs at doses used in humans for prophylaxis, diagnosis, or therapy. To assess
40
41 knowledge, attitude and perception of health care workers about ADR a validate
42
43 questionnaire [1] was used. The questionnaire consisted of a total of 15
44
45 Questions (5 questions for each of the knowledge, attitude and perception).
46
47 Multiple choice questions about ADR definition, goals and importance of
48
49 pharmacovigilance, and types of drugs induced reactions that must be reported
50
51 was used for evaluation of the participants' knowledge. For evaluation of
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 attitude and perception some cases with drug induced ADRs were designed and
4
5
6 asked from the participants to determine which of them must be reported.
7
8

9
10 In the first phase of the study, the clinical pharmacists (3 persons) attended in
11 different medical wards of the hospital and invited from all health care workers
12 (medical students, nurses, physicians and pharmacist) to participate in the study.
13
14 From whom those had enough time and were happy with our program schedule
15 asked to fill the questionnaire. Then the participants were invited to attend in an
16 educational program (clinical pharmacists' interventions) in the hospital.
17
18 Clinical pharmacists' interventions included training workshops (providing
19 lectures and group discussion, 3 hours per week for 4 consecutive weeks) and
20 continuous providing information at the hospital morning case report section
21 (every other day for one month) about ADR importance, seriousness,
22 preventability, necessity of reporting, and spontaneous reporting system and its
23 advantages. In the workshop they learned to fill a yellow card and emphasized
24 on reporting any suspected reaction regardless of uncertainty about the
25 causality. After three months the same questionnaire were filled again by the
26 participants in the educational programs. Effects of clinical pharmacists'
27 interventions in improvement of knowledge, attitude and perception of the
28 participants about ADR were evaluated by comparing their responses to the
29 questions before and after interventions. All data were analyzed by Statistical
30 Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) software version 16.0. Results were
31 reported as frequency and for comparing the before and after intervention's
32 results, we used Crosstabulation and Chi- Square test. Values less than 0.05
33 were considered as significant.
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54

55 56 Results

57
58
59 From 136 health care workers that were positive for our invitation, only 100
60 persons attended in the educational programs regularly and from them 82

1
2
3
4 questionnaires were filled out both before and after intervention with same
5 name. The questionnaires that were filled only in one phases of the study were
6 excluded. Thirty five men and 47 women including 7 (8.5%) physicians, 31
7 (37.8%) residents, 26 (31.7%) interns, 17 (20.7%) nurses and one (1.2%)
8 pharmacist participated in the study. We had not any intention to invite senior or
9 junior of the wards and based on the demographic data of the study we had
10 participants from the both groups. Average age of the participants was 30.9
11 years with standard deviation of 6.7 years.

12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21 Fifty one percent (n=42) of the health care workers were aware of IPC at Iranian
22 ministry of health before interventions and after that all of the participants knew
23 this center. Four people (4.9%) had attended in an ADR workshop prior to this
24 study. Sixty nine (84.1%) of subjects had recognized at least one ADR before
25 and following interventions 73 (89%) of cases have identified ADR. Only 7
26 (8.5%) people have reported ADR before intervention that was increased
27 significantly to 18 (22%) by the interventions (P<0.001).

28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36 One of question was designed to determine center that ADRs were reported
37 previously by the participants. Two (2.4%) responders had sent the ADR reports
38 to IPC in Tehran, 1(1.2 %) to Food and Drug Organization in another city of
39 Iran, 1 (1.2 %) to the manufacture, and 4 (4.9%) to hospital's ADR center before
40 the interventions and after that, reporting to IPC increased to 17 (20.7%) of
41 cases (P<0.001).

42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576
577
578
579
580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
590
591
592
593
594
595
596
597
598
599
600
601
602
603
604
605
606
607
608
609
610
611
612
613
614
615
616
617
618
619
620
621
622
623
624
625
626
627
628
629
630
631
632
633
634
635
636
637
638
639
640
641
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
670
671
672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
720
721
722
723
724
725
726
727
728
729
730
731
732
733
734
735
736
737
738
739
740
741
742
743
744
745
746
747
748
749
750
751
752
753
754
755
756
757
758
759
760
761
762
763
764
765
766
767
768
769
770
771
772
773
774
775
776
777
778
779
780
781
782
783
784
785
786
787
788
789
790
791
792
793
794
795
796
797
798
799
800
801
802
803
804
805
806
807
808
809
810
811
812
813
814
815
816
817
818
819
820
821
822
823
824
825
826
827
828
829
830
831
832
833
834
835
836
837
838
839
840
841
842
843
844
845
846
847
848
849
850
851
852
853
854
855
856
857
858
859
860
861
862
863
864
865
866
867
868
869
870
871
872
873
874
875
876
877
878
879
880
881
882
883
884
885
886
887
888
889
890
891
892
893
894
895
896
897
898
899
900
901
902
903
904
905
906
907
908
909
910
911
912
913
914
915
916
917
918
919
920
921
922
923
924
925
926
927
928
929
930
931
932
933
934
935
936
937
938
939
940
941
942
943
944
945
946
947
948
949
950
951
952
953
954
955
956
957
958
959
960
961
962
963
964
965
966
967
968
969
970
971
972
973
974
975
976
977
978
979
980
981
982
983
984
985
986
987
988
989
990
991
992
993
994
995
996
997
998
999
1000

Doubt about occurrence of an ADR didn't alter with the interventions significantly (63.4% vs. 69.5%). Reasons that caused the participants did not report ADR were shown in table 1. The interventions had considerable impact to reduce causes of underreporting including did not know how to report (p = 0.002), yellow card not available (p = 0.039), lack of enough information about the patient (p < 0.0001).

1
2
3
4 All types of ADR that might promote health care professionals for reporting
5 them were improved significantly after clinical pharmacists' interventions
6 (Table 2).
7
8
9

10 The next questions were about health care workers' perception about ADR and
11 spontaneous ADR reporting goals. As it was indicated in table 3 our
12 interventions had a significant effect on the participants' total perception about
13 ADR spontaneous reporting.
14
15
16
17

18 Responders' perception about spontaneous reporting was not improved
19 significantly following the clinical pharmacists' interventions (Table 4). Fifty
20 five (67.1%) and 60 (73.2%) of subjects believed that it is a professional
21 responsibility at pre and post interventional phases of the study respectively.
22
23 Regarding the participants' attitude for reporting ADRs the question was; in
24 which of the fallowing conditions (carbamazepine induced agranulocytosis,
25 hypoglycemia following use of a new hypoglycemic agent, a new statin induced
26 myalgia, weight loss following fluoxetine therapy in a young women,
27 amoxicillin induced skin rash, pedal edema following amlodipine therapy,
28 bronchospasm following use of new beta blocker, and a new antiepileptic
29 induced paresthesia) you will fill the yellow card? Only reporting of serious
30 reactions such as carbamazepine induced agranulocytosis was improved by
31 clinical pharmacists' interventions.
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45

46 The participants' preferred systems to report an ADR have been indicated in
47 table 5. Yellow card, online, telephone and fax were frequent preferred methods
48 for ADRs reporting in this study respectively (Table 6).
49
50
51

52 Discussion

53 To the best of our knowledge this is the first survey in Iran that have evaluated
54 clinical pharmacists' interventions in improvement of the health care workers'
55 knowledge, attitudes and perceptions regarding ADR.
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 Our results showed that 91.5% of health care workers of our hospital that
5 participated in the study never reported any ADR, and 49% of them were not
6 even aware of IPC at first phase of the study and obviously improved after
7 interventions. Iranian pharmacists are more aware about IPC (6) that may be
8 related to pharmacists' more education about drugs' safety.

9
10 Before the clinical pharmacists' interventions a little (2.4%) of responders sent
11 ADR reports to IPC at the Ministry of Health and after that all of reports have
12 set to this center. It shows that interventions improve participant information
13 regarding the center that is responsible for analyzing and managing of their
14 reports. In previous research in Shiraz, Iran [1], 11% of the reports were sent to
15 IPC.

16
17 The considerable numbers of health care workers in present study never
18 reported an ADR that is comparable with other studies [4,6,11]. In the first
19 phase of the study the main reasons of under reporting of ADR were in order of
20 had not enough information from the patient, too well known to report, did not
21 know how to report, uncertain association, and being unaware of the existence
22 of a national ADR reporting system.

23
24 Although there are many studies [12-18] that assess some causes of under
25 reporting ADR, a little of them have evaluated these barriers in hospitals.
26 Results of a study performed in a tertiary teaching hospital in Barcelona / Spain
27 are similar to our study and lack of time to report an ADR due to the workload
28 of clinical practitioners was detected as the most important reason to ADR
29 under- reporting. Other causes of under-reporting in that study were lack of
30 information about the spontaneous reporting system, unavailability of yellow
31 cards, doubt of ADR causality assessment and lack of patient confidentiality
32 [12]. Other reasons for under-reporting of an ADR in other studies were
33 diagnosed as uncertain association, too trivial to report, too well known to
34

1
2
3 report, yellow card unavailability, lack of time, and not knowing how to report
4 [13-18].
5
6
7

8
9 In present study serious and unusual reactions, unreported ADR at before, and
10 reactions to a new product were selected as more important ADR for reporting
11 by the participants. These are as the same as other studies' results [19-23]. We
12 found only one study in that the idea of reporting all kind of ADRs was more
13 often selected by pharmacist than reporting only serious and unexpected
14 reactions [24]. After the study's interventions, believe of reporting of all drug
15 related reactions have been increased significantly.
16
17
18
19
20
21
22

23
24 Identifying previously unreported ADR was the most important goal for ADR
25 reporting in before and after the interventions of the study. This was also
26 reported by other studies [25,26]. Regarding the influence of the clinical
27 pharmacists' interventions on modifying health care workers' perception about
28 ADR, just reporting carbamazepine induced agranulocytosis showed a
29 significant change, which indicated reporting of a serious reaction.
30
31
32
33
34
35
36

37 The preferred method to report an ADR was yellow card followed by online
38 report in both before and after the interventions. In previous study in Iran,
39 Phone was the selected method for ADR reporting by pharmacists [1].
40
41
42
43

44 Our study was a single center study with small sample size and short duration
45 between pre and post clinical pharmacists' interventions participants'
46 evaluation. It seems that the consequence of the interventions will be pale over
47 time. Another limitation of our survey was incomplete filled questionnaires that
48 consequently we couldn't enroll all 100 questionnaires for the analysis.
49
50
51
52
53
54

55 Educational program including workshops, oral presentations, group discussion,
56 designing ADR newsletters in hospitals, providing information about
57 pharmacovigilance for health care workers by mail, e-mail, verbal reminders,
58 advertisement, and continuous education of nurses, physicians and pharmacists
59
60

1
2
3 about ADRs, regular attending of pharmacists in the medical wards and
4 involving actively in patient's pharmaceutical care are essential for improving
5 health care workers knowledge, attitude and perception about ADRs (7-10).
6
7
8
9

10 In conclusion clinical pharmacists' interventions can improve knowledge,
11 attitude, and perception of health care workers about ADR that is a great issue
12 of importance regarding pharmacovigilance and public health.
13
14
15

16
17 **Authorship:**

18
19
20 Hossein khalili and Simin Dashti-Khavidaki: Clinical pharmacists of the
21 hospital and provided educational programs for the participants to the study and
22 manuscript revision.
23
24
25

26
27 Niayesh Mohebibi: Data gathering and manuscript preparation.
28
29

30 Narjes Hendoiee: Data gathering and provided educational program for the
31 participants to the study.
32
33
34

35 Abbas-Ali Keshtkar: Study design and statistical analysis.
36
37

38 **Acknowledgements:** This study was supported by a grant from Office of Vice-
39 Chancellor for Research of Tehran University of Medical Sciences.
40
41

42
43 **Conflict of interest:** There is not any competing interest for all authors about
44 present work.
45
46
47

48 **Funding:** We have not any founding resource.
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

References:

1. Vessal G, Mardani Z, Mollai M. Knowledge, attitudes, and perceptions of pharmacists to ADR reporting in Iran. *Pharm World Sci* 2009;**31**:183–187.
2. Lazarou J, Pomeranz BH, Corey PH. Incidence of ADR in hospitalized patients: a meta-analysis of prospective studies. *JAMA* 1998;**279**:1200-1205.
3. Millar JS. Consultation owing to ADR in a single perception. *Br J Gen Pract* 2001;**51**:130-1.
4. Figueiras A, Tato F, Fontañás J, et al. Physicians' attitudes towards voluntary reporting of adverse drug events. *J Eval Clin Pract* 2001;**7**:347-54.
5. Rawlins MD. Pharmacovigilance: paradise lost, regained or postponed? The William Withering Lecture 1994. *J R Coll Physicians Lond* 1995;**29**:41-9.
6. Vallano A, Cereza G, Pedròs C, et al. Obstacles and solutions for spontaneous reporting of ADRs in the hospital. *Br J Clin Pharmacol* 2005;**60**:653–658.
7. Salehifar E., Ala SH., Gholami KH., Knowledge, attitudes, and perceptions of pharmacists and Nurses ADR reporting in Mazandaran ,Iran. *Mazandaran university of medical science journal* 2007;**56**:115-125.
8. Fincham JA. Statewide program to stimulate reporting of adverse drug reactions. *J Pharm Pract* 1989;**2**: 239-244.
9. McGettigan P, Golden J, Conroy RM, Arthur N, Feely J. Reporting of adverse drug reactions by hospital doctors and the response to intervention. *Br J Clin Pharmacol* 1997; 44: 98-100.
10. Nazario M, Feliu JF, Rivera GC. Adverse drug reactions: the San Juan Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Center experience. *Hosp Pharm* 1994; 244: 249-250.
11. Cosentino M, Leoni O, Oria C, et al. Hospital-based Survey of Doctors' Attitudes to ADRs and Perception of Drug-related Risk for Adverse Reaction Occurrence. *Pharmacoepidemiol Drug Safety* 1999;**8**:S27-S35.

12. Evans SM, Berry JG, Smith BJ, et al. Attitudes and barriers to incident reporting: a collaborative hospital study. *Qual Saf Health Care* 2006;**15**:39–43.
13. Bateman DN, Sanders GL, Rawlins MD. Attitudes to ADR reporting in the Northern Region. *Br J Clin Pharmacol* 1992;**34**: 421–6.
14. Belton KJ, Lewis SC, Payne S, et al. Attitudinal survey of ADR reporting by medical practitioners in the United Kingdom. *Br J Clin Pharmacol* 1995;**39**:223–6.
15. Eland IA, Belton KJ, van Grootheest AC, et al. Attitudinal survey of voluntary reporting of ADR. *Br J Clin Pharmacol* 1999;**48**:623–7.
16. Bäckström M, Mjorndal T, Dahlqvist R, et al. Attitudes to reporting ADR in northern Sweden. *Eur J Clin Pharmacol* 2000;**56**:729–32
17. McGettigan P, Feely J. ADR reporting: opinions and attitudes of medical practitioners in Ireland. *Pharmacoepidemiol Drug Saf* 1995;**4**:355–8.
18. Belton KJ. Attitude survey of adverse drug-reaction reporting by health care professionals across the European Union. The European Pharmacovigilance Research Group. *Eur J Clin Pharmacol* 1997;**52**:423–7.
19. Green CF, Mottram DR, Rowe PH, et al. Attitudes and knowledge of hospital pharmacists to ADR reporting. *Br J Clin Pharmacol* 2001;**51**:81–6.
20. Lee KK, Chan TY, Raymond K, et al. Pharmacists' attitudes toward ADRs reporting in Hong Kong. *Ann Pharmacother* 1994;**28**:1400–3.
21. Sweis D, Wong IC. A survey on factors that could affect ADR reporting according to hospital pharmacists in Great Britain. *Drug Saf* 2000;**23**:165–72.
22. Generali JA, Danish MA, Rosenbaum SE. Knowledge of and attitudes about ADR reporting among Rhode Island pharmacists. *Ann Pharmacother* 1995;**29**:365–9.
23. Figueiras A, Tato F, Fontainas J, et al. Physicians' attitudes towards voluntary reporting of adverse drug events. *J Eval Clin Pract* 2001;**7**:347–54.
24. Zerrin Toklu H, Uysal MK. The knowledge and attitude of the Turkish community pharmacists toward pharmacovigilance in the Kadikoy district of Istanbul. *Pharm World Sci* 2008;**30**:556– 62.
25. Belton KJ, Lewis SC, Payne S, et al. Attitudinal survey of ADR reporting by medical practitioners in the United Kingdom. *Br J Clin Pharmacol* 1995;**39**:223–6.
26. Cosentino M, Leoni O, Banfi F, et al. Attitudes to ADR reporting by medical practitioners in a northern Italian district. *Pharmacol Res* 1997;**35**:85–8.

Table 1 – Reasons that cause ADR not be reported

Reason	Before intervention	After intervention	P value
Uncertain association between reaction and drug	18(22)	17(20.7)	1
Unimportant to report	13(15.9)	11(9)	0.30
Well known that don't need to be reported	21(25.6)	16(19.5)	0.23
Unaware of the existence of a national ADR reporting system	17(20.7)	15(18.3)	0.62
Did not know importance of reporting	12(14.6)	10(12.2)	0.69
Did not know how to report	20(24.4)	12(14.6)	0.02
Lack of time	11(13.4)	16 (19.50)	0.18
Lack of financial reimbursement	2(2.4)	2(2.4)	1
Fear of legal liability	2(2.4)	2(2.4)	1
Yellow card not available	16(19.5)	9(11)	0.04
Reporting system is too technical	18(9.8)	14(4.9)	0.12
Not enough information from the patient	82(100)	3(3.7)	0.0001

Table 2 - Reactions characteristics that might encourage health care professionals to report

Factor	Before intervention	After intervention	P value
A serious reaction	53(64.6)	74(90.2)	<0.001
Unusual reaction	38(46.3)	66(80.5)	<0.001
Reaction of a new product	36(43.9)	46(56.1)	0.02
Reaction not reported before for a particular drug	36(43.9)	66(80.5)	<0.001
Reaction is well recognized for a particular drug	8(9.8)	31(37.8)	<0.001
Any reaction (serious or non-serious, well-known or new) to an old or new product	7(20.7)	26(31.7)	0.004

Table 3 - Health care workers' perception about ADR and spontaneous reporting systems' goals, before and after intervention.

Goal	Before intervention	After intervention	P value
To enable safe drugs to be identified	36(43.9)	46(56.1)	0.02
To measure the incidence of ADR	39(47.6)	57(69.5)	<0.001
To identify factors which might predispose to ADR	35(42.7)	58(70.7)	<0.001
To identify previously unrecognized ADRs	56(68.3)	70(85.4)	<0.001
To compare ADRs for drugs in similar therapeutic classes	36(43.9)	52(63.4)	<0.001
To compare ADRs of same drug from different drug companies	44(53.7)	44(53.7)	1

Table 4- Beliefs about spontaneous reporting, before and after intervention

Believes about spontaneous reporting	Before intervention	After intervention	P value
Professional responsibility	55(67.1)	60(73.2)	0.12
Felt that one report can not modify the health-care system	6(7.3)	6(7.3)	1
All serious ADRs were recognized before drug marketing	3(3.7)	1(1.2)	0.5
Completely aware of what should be reported	4(4.9)	8(9.8)	0.06
Yellow-cards are too complicated	19(23.2)	18(22)	1

Table 5 – Health care workers' attitude for reporting; some instances of ADR

Event	Category of reaction	Report before the intervention	Report after the intervention	P value
Carbamazepine induced agranulocytosis	serious	30(36.6)	74(90.2)	<0.001
Hypoglycemic's coma of a new diabetes medication	Serious for a new drug	48(58.5)	45(54.9)	0.72
Myalgia with a new statin	New drug	19(23.2)	20(14.2)	1
Weight loss after 8 week of fluoxetine	well recognized for a particular drug	69(7.3)	13(15.9)	0.14
Rash with amoxicillin after 6 days treatment	well recognized for a particular drug	18(22)	12(14.6)	0.33
Foot edema after 4 month amlodipine treatment	well recognized for a particular drug	19(23.2)	18(22)	1
Pain and tingling of tongue after two weeks of a new anti- seizure therapy	Reaction not reported before for a particular drug	33(40.2)	40(48.8)	0.34
Bronchospasm in an asthmatic patient after the first administration of a beta-blocker	Serious well recognized for a particular drug	33(40.2)	29(35.4)	0.63

Table 6- Health care workers' preferred method for reporting of ADR

Preferred method	Before intervention	After intervention	P value
Yellow Card	29(32)	34(45.1)	0.09
Telephone	18(24.3)	16(21.6)	0.21
Fax	1(1.4)	0	0.33
Online	21(28.4)	23(31.1)	0.45
None	5(6.8)	1(1.4)	0.02

For peer review only