SMASH!

The Salford Medication Safety Dashboard

1 Introduction

1.1 Background

A recent study of general practice identified errors in 5% of prescription items, with one in 550 items containing a severe (potentially life threatening) error¹. Other studies have found that prescribing errors in general practices contribute to one in 25 hospital admissions², and the costs to the NHS are about £500 million per year³. GP systems that try to block this via use of in-consultation pop-ups are frequently limited by "alert fatigue". An alternative paradigm is to use electronic audit and feedback (AF) systems or dashboards to present results to clinicians after the event to allow review, and hopefully change. Despite the widespread usage of such dashboards there exists little evidence as to what factors contribute to their success or failure.

1.2 SMASH

The Salford Medication Safety Dashboard (SMASH) analyses patient records and uses advanced algorithms to detect patients who may be at risk due to the medication that they are receiving. Data from GP systems is processed, validated and analysed to produce a daily report, allowing health care professionals to always view up to date information. The reports contain lists of NHS number which are available to GPs and pharmacists via an intuitive web interface; they can then decide whether to take further action. The indicators are based on the widely adopted PINCER standard which has been shown to reduce prescribing errors in a cost-effective manner⁴.

Several	screenshots	are d	isplayed	below in	Figures 1-5	
JUVUIUI	301001311013	arcu	ispiayeu		inguico I J.	

	nboard Users endale Medical Practice / Affected patients for Asthma and BE	Administrato
Asthma and BETA BL	Report type: Report date:	Comparison date: • 30 April 2015 •
Patients Trend	Information	
NHS number	Indicators breached	Since
96510	WARF no GP and ASP	20 February 2015
	Asthma and BETA BLOCKER	16 January 2015
110726	Asthma and BETA BLOCKER	1 May 2011
153980	Asthma and BETA BLOCKER	1 May 2013
51507	Asthma and BETA BLOCKER	20 November 2014
132469	Asthma and BETA BLOCKER	30 July 2013
43458	Asthma and BETA BLOCKER	9 July 2013

Figure 1 – A list of patients currently flagged by SMASH for the "Asthma and Beta Blocker" indicator



Figure 2 – Some users enjoy the ability to compare their performance with the CCG or local neighbourhood in order to prioritise their efforts



Figure 3 – Feedback showing a practice's improvement over time can enforce a positive feedback loop



Figure 4 - CCG pharmacists can see which practices are doing well and badly to best focus scarce resources

Single Practice / Glendale Me	dical Practice / Affected patier	nts for Asthma and BETA	A BLOCKER	
	Report type:	Report date:	Comparison date:	
Asthma and BETA BLOCKER	 Affected patients 	• 1 May 2015	• 30 April 2015 •	
Patients Trend Inform	ation			
Patients with a histo	ory of asthma who	have been pre	escribed a β blocker	
What is the risk to patients	•			
Atenolol, bisoprolol, metoprolol, ne	ebivolol, and (to a lesser extent	kers can be used with ex acebutolol, have less e	ients with a history of asthma or xtreme caution under specialist supervision. effect on the β_2 (bronchial) receptors and ar	e,
Atenolol, bisoprolol, metoprolol, net therefore, relatively cardioselective this side effect". The Committee o	ebivolol, and (to a lesser extent e, but they are not cardiospecif n Safety of Medicines ¹ issued ed in patients with asthma or a	kers can be used with ex c) acebutolol, have less e ic. They have a lesser e the following advice: "f history of obstructive air	xtreme caution under specialist supervision. effect on the $β_2$ (bronchial) receptors and an ffect on airways resistance but are not free β blockers, even those with apparent rways disease, unless no alternative treatme	e, of
Atenolol, bisoprolol, metoprolol, metoprolol, metoprolol, metoproloc, relatively cardioselective this side effect". The Committee o cardioselectivity, should not be us	ebivolol, and (to a lesser extent e, but they are not cardiospecif n Safety of Medicines ¹ issued ed in patients with asthma or a of inducing bronchospasm sho	kers can be used with ex c) acebutolol, have less e ic. They have a lesser e the following advice: "f history of obstructive air ould be appreciated and	xtreme caution under specialist supervision. effect on the $β_2$ (bronchial) receptors and an ffect on airways resistance but are not free β blockers, even those with apparent rways disease, unless no alternative treatme	e, of
Atenolol, bisoprolol, metoprolol, metoprolol, metoprolol, metoprolol, metoprolol, metoprolol, metoprolol, metoprolol, metoproloc, relatively cardioselectivity, should not be us is available. In such cases the risk What evidence is there that β blockers vary in their affinity for cardioselective (affinity for β_2). Th affinity for β_1 -adrenoceptors) and	ebivolol, and (to a lesser extent e, but they are not cardiospecif n Safety of Medicines ¹ issued ed in patients with asthma or a t of inducing bronchospasm sho at this pattern of prescrib β_1 - and β_2 -adrenoceptors, and e majority show little selectivity	kers can be used with ex- constant of the server of the following advice: "f history of obstructive air ould be appreciated and bing is harmful? are divided into two grou for one receptor over the	xtreme caution under specialist supervision. effect on the $β_2$ (bronchial) receptors and an ffect on airways resistance but are not free β blockers, even those with apparent rways disease, unless no alternative treatme	e, of ent
Atenolol, bisoprolol, metoprolol, metoprolol, metoprolol, metoprolol, metoprolol, metoprolol, metoprolol, metoprolol, metoprolocation side effect". The Committee of cardioselectivity, should not be us is available. In such cases the risk What evidence is there that β blockers vary in their affinity for cardioselective (affinity for β ₂). The	ebivolol, and (to a lesser extent e, but they are not cardiospecif in Safety of Medicines ¹ issued to ed in patients with asthma or a cof inducing bronchospasm should be at this pattern of prescrib β_1 - and β_2 -adrenoceptors, and e majority show little selectivity timolol, sotalol and propranolol	kers can be used with es is acebutolol, have less e ic. They have a lesser ef the following advice: "f history of obstructive ail ould be appreciated and hing is harmful? are divided into two grou for one receptor over th (26-fold, 12-fold, and 8-	xtreme caution under specialist supervision. effect on the $β_2$ (bronchial) receptors and an ffect on airways resistance but are not free β blockers, even those with apparent rways disease, unless no alternative treatment l appropriate precautions taken." ups, cardioselective (affinity for $β_1$), and nor the other, except for bisoprolol (14-fold greate	e, of ent
Atenolol, bisoprolol, metoprolol, metoprolol, metoprolol, metoprolol, metoprolol, metoprolol, metoprolol, metoprolol, metoprolocardioselectivity, should not be us is available. In such cases the risk What evidence is there that β blockers vary in their affinity for cardioselective (affinity for β_2). Th affinity for β_1 -adrenoceptors) and respectively).	ebivolol, and (to a lesser extent e, but they are not cardiospecif in Safety of Medicines ¹ issued is ed in patients with asthma or a of inducing bronchospasm should be at this pattern of prescrib β_1 - and β_2 -adrenoceptors, and e majority show little selectivity timolol, sotalol and propranolol n-cardioselective betablockee	kers can be used with es i) acebutolol, have less e ic. They have a lesser ef the following advice: "f history of obstructive ail ould be appreciated and ing is harmful? are divided into two grou for one receptor over th (26-fold, 12-fold, and 8-	xtreme caution under specialist supervision. effect on the $β_2$ (bronchial) receptors and an ffect on airways resistance but are not free β blockers, even those with apparent rways disease, unless no alternative treatment l appropriate precautions taken." ups, cardioselective (affinity for $β_1$), and nor the other, except for bisoprolol (14-fold greate	e, of ent n-

Figure 5 - Information is available to show the importance of each indicator, the risks, and the possible solutions

2 Method

The effectiveness and utility of SMASH is currently being evaluated in a trial. Each recruited practice is approached by a pharmacist who introduces the dashboard and explains the importance of the indicators. The pharmacist assists the practice for a few weeks, before leaving to work with another practice. Each practice is followed for 12 months from first pharmacist involvement, during which time we track all interaction with the dashboard down to individual mouse clicks and hovers. This invaluable source of data, combined with qualitative data obtained from interviews, will enable us to provide a list of best practice recommendations for the future development of such systems.

3 Results

We have recruited 45 (out of 46) of the general practices within Salford. The first practice recruited completed the 12 month follow up in March 2017, and the last practice recruited will complete in April 2018. The full and final analysis will be performed next year when all practices have completed the trial, but preliminary results are extremely promising.

Practices recruited prior to January 2017 (n=31) have seen the number of at risk patients fall by almost half from 1433 to 771. This is a mean reduction of 21.4 patients per practice and is significant (p=0.0006) when compared with the mean reduction of 3.7 patients per practice recruited after January 2017 (n=14). Early data shows that while pharmacist usage decreases over time, the usage of other practice staff is constant, suggesting that the dashboard continues to be used after the pharmacist departs and that the number of at risk patients will remain low, rather than return to prestudy levels – a limitation of other pharmacist-led interventions¹.

Interviews have shown that users of the system are extremely satisfied with the system and find it "quick and easy", "very user friendly", "straightforward" and "miles more efficient". One pharmacist remarked that "within an hour... you could have made quite an impact."

4 Future

The NIHR patient safety centre at Manchester has recently been awarded a further 5 years of funding. During this time, we will: improve the existing dashboard based on feedback from the trial; deploy more indicators; roll out the system across Greater Manchester; and, working with industry partners, explore ways of allowing patients to interact with the system. The ability for patients to discover when they are 'flagged up' by safety systems such as this will start to change the interactions between patient and provider, and opens up several interesting avenues for future research.

5 About me

Richard Williams is a senior software engineer and informatician working at the University of Manchester within the Greater Manchester Primary Care Patient Safety Translational Research Centre. Richard was the lead developer on the SMASH project and ensured that the system was built ahead of schedule, virtually bug free, and has attained an availability in excess of 99.9%. He is responsible for its future development and direction.

In addition to SMASH, he has designed, built and implemented several other web applications and their associated infrastructure: the award-winning COCPIT for analysing patient adherence to care pathways⁵⁻⁷; an application for simulating disease progression at a population level; and e-Labs for combining cohort data for increased statistical power. Richard is currently working towards a PhD on the gap between "routinely collected" and "research ready" datasets.

6 References

- Avery AJ, Ghaleb M, Barber N, et al. The prevalence and nature of prescribing and monitoring errors in English general practice: a retrospective case note review. Br J Gen Pract. 2013 Aug;63(613):e543-53.
- 2. Howard RL, Avery AJ, Slavenburg S, et al. Which drugs cause preventable admissions to hospital? A systematic review. Br J Clin Pharmacol 2007;63(2):136-47.
- 3. Pirmohamed M, James S, Meakin S, et al. Adverse drug reactions as cause of admission to hospital: prospective analysis of 18 820 patients. BMJ 2004;329(7456):15-9.
- 4. Avery AJ, Rodgers S, Cantrill JA, et al. Protocol for the PINCER trial: a cluster randomised trial comparing the effectiveness of a pharmacist-led IT-based intervention with simple feedback in reducing rates of clinically important errors in medicines management in general practices. Trials 2009;10:28
- 5. Brown B, Williams R, Ainsworth J, Buchan I. Missed Opportunities Mapping: Computable Healthcare Quality Improvement. Stud Health Technol Inform. IOS Press; 2013;192:387–91.
- Balatsoukas P, Williams R, Davies C, Ainsworth J, Buchan I. User Interface Requirements for Web-Based Integrated Care Pathways: Evidence from the Evaluation of an Online Care Pathway Investigation Tool. J Med Syst. 2015 Oct 7;39(11):183.
- 7. Ainsworth J, Buchan I. COCPIT: A Tool for Integrated Care Pathway Variance Analysis. Stud Health Technol Inform. 2012;180:995–9.