GSASA codification tool of clinical pharmacists’ interventions: inter-user agreement
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INTRODUCTION
☆ The Swiss Society of Public Health Administration and Hospital Pharmacists (GSASA) published in 2011 a codification tool to standardize the documentation of clinical pharmacists’ interventions during clinical rounds (www.gsasa.ch/pages/activites/activites-cliniques).
☆ It includes the 5 items: problem, type of problem (potential or actual), reason for intervention, intervention, and outcome.
☆ The clinical pharmacists at the ICHV document their interventions by a short description which is stored in a locally developed database. A random sample of those described interventions (DI) is codified with the GSASA tool once a year.

RESULTS
☆ Twenty of the 100 DI could not be codified because of an incomplete or vague description by the clinical pharmacist or because the DI was not covered by the items of the tool.

AIMS OF THE STUDY
☆ To compare the retrospective codification of the same described interventions (DI) by two pharmacists
☆ To evaluate the inter-user agreement
☆ To estimate the time needed for the codification

METHOD
100 randomly chosen DI done in 2012
Separated codification by two pharmacists
Elimination of DI which cannot be codified
Comparison of the codification of the two pharmacists

Concordance definition:
- Global agreement = 5 items in concordance
- Non-concordance = discrepancy of at least one item

DISCUSSION & CONCLUSION
☆ We welcome the GSASA codification tool which can be used to codify the described intervention retrospectively; however a high inter-user variability was identified.
☆ The item “type of problem” was the major cause of disagreement (64%). The choice between “actual” or “potential” is unclear. Does this item refer to a drug related problem or its effect on the patient?
☆ The “reason for intervention” showed 21% of disagreement because of one major reason: if two medications have an additive side effect (e.g additive effect of QT prolonging drugs), should it be classified as “interaction” (pharmacodynamic interaction) or as “adverse reaction”?
☆ GSASA is planning to develop an user’s manual which should help clarifying each category and improve inter-user agreement. This hypothesis should be further tested.