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Abstract

ABSTRACT

Background

Opioids are a high-risk medicine, and one of the most frequently reported drug classes causing patient harm. In specialist palliative care inpatient services opioids are widely used to manage cancer pain and other symptoms. Palliative care inpatients are vulnerable to both exposure to, and harm from, opioid errors due to a combination of their: advanced age, comorbidities which affect drug metabolism, polypharmacy, and the seriousness of their illness. Despite this potential for harm, and the frequency of opioid administration in this specialist setting, little is known about opioid errors in palliative care. Better understanding the prevalence, patient impact and error contributing factors in the specialist palliative care inpatient setting will help to strengthen and support safe opioid delivery and minimise opioid error harms for this vulnerable population.

Aim

The PERISCOPE project aims to identify the: i) burden and characteristics of opioid errors; and ii) actions required to support safe opioid delivery within specialist inpatient palliative care services.

Methods

Research design: The PERISCOPE research project is a two-phase, pragmatic, explanatory sequential mixed methods study. This doctoral research project is situated within a quality and safety agenda and guided by a multi-incident analysis framework, and the Yorkshire Contributory Factors Framework. The PERISCOPE Project employed five discreet but inter-related studies conducted over two-phases. During Phase one, a: systematic literature review of opioid errors in palliative care services (Study 1); two retrospective reviews of clinical incidents involving opioids in palliative care services, one at a jurisdictional level (Study 2) and the other within three local specialist palliative care inpatient services in New South Wales (NSW) (Study 3) was undertaken. A review of opioid error contributing factors documented in clinical incident reports in local specialist palliative care inpatient services was also completed (Study 4). Phase two involved a series of semi-structured interviews...
and focus groups which sought palliative care clinicians’ and service managers perceptions of opioid errors in their specialist palliative care inpatient services (Study 5). Data integration and meta-inference of these data were undertaken following the completion of the two study phases, and facilitated a series of individual and systems-level recommendations to strengthen safe opioid delivery in specialist palliative care inpatient services.

Results

Phase one: The systematic review revealed a paucity of empirical data, with the reported opioid errors limited to deviations from opioid prescribing, and no opioid administration errors in the palliative care clinical setting reported. These systematic review findings contrasted with the results of the NSW state-wide and local retrospective reviews, which found that opioid administration errors accounted for three-quarters of reported opioid related incidents. The majority of these opioid errors were due to omitted dose errors. While serious patient harm due to error was exceedingly rare in palliative care services, half of all palliative inpatients exposed to an opioid error experienced iatrogenic harms. Over half of these errors resulted in opioid under-dose for the patient, which adversely impacted on their pain management. Active failures (i.e., errors made by the palliative care clinician) were reported as contributing to two-thirds of these opioid errors, and one-fifth of errors were directly attributed to deficits in clinical communication.

Phase two: The qualitative study with palliative care clinicians confirmed these results and identified additional error contributory factors including: the complexity and frequency of opioid delivery in specialist palliative care inpatient services, sub-optimal skill mix, and the absence of a clinical pharmacist in the palliative care service. This study also highlighted that palliative care services’ had substantially invested in creating and sustaining a positive safety culture, which drove the services’ approach to error mitigation strategies.

Meta-inference of the integrated data across the five studies revealed four factors that are required to support safe opioid delivery in specialist palliative care inpatient services: i) embedding a positive opioid safety culture; ii) enabling optimal skill mix, staffing and resources; iii) privileging opioid education in the palliative care service; and iv) empowering clinicians to identify, challenge and report opioid errors.
Conclusion

Despite specialist palliative care inpatient services clinicians ordering and administering opioids in high frequency, the overall prevalence of opioid errors in this setting is low. However, the most prevalent opioid errors that were identified were omitted dose errors, which caused unnecessary pain and suffering for affected palliative care inpatients. These errors were largely due to human error as a result of high workload and sub-optimal skill mix, and the use of paper-based versus electronic medication management systems.

The PERISCOPE Project confirmed that the opioid error contributory and mitigating factors in specialist palliative care inpatient services are multifactorial, encompassing individual and systems factors. Accordingly, any strategies to reduce opioid errors must apply an integrated systems approach in order to be of impact. Pro-actively embedding and sustaining a culture of opioid safety is a core component of supporting safe opioid delivery and reducing opioid errors in specialist palliative care inpatient services. While the PERISCOPE Project identified an overarching positive safety culture which encouraged and supported error reporting and facilitated organisational learnings to minimise and prevent opioid errors, there are still opportunities to reduce the prevalence of opioid errors, particularly missed doses in this setting. These strategies include ensuring optimal skill mix and medical/nursing ratios each shift, prioritising the transition from paper-based to electronic medication management systems, and mandating a minimum ratio of palliative care pharmacist hours for all specialist palliative care inpatient services.
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## Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CNC</td>
<td>Clinical Nurse Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNE</td>
<td>Clinical Nurse Educator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNS</td>
<td>Clinical Nurse Specialist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EEN</td>
<td>Endorsed Enrolled Nurse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GM</td>
<td>Governance Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HREC</td>
<td>Human Research Ethics Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INT</td>
<td>Intern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NHMRC</td>
<td>National Health and Medical Research Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>New South Wales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NUM</td>
<td>Nurse Unit Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRN</td>
<td>Pro re nata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REG</td>
<td>Registrar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMO</td>
<td>Resident Medical Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RN</td>
<td>Registered Nurse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSA</td>
<td>Site Specific Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Glossary of Terms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Clinical incident</strong></th>
<th>Any unplanned event which causes, or has the potential to cause, harm to a patient, including when an incident is intercepted before causing harm (‘near miss’) (NSW Health, 2014).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Clinician</strong></td>
<td>A healthcare professional that is directly involved in patient care, e.g., physician, nurse, pharmacist.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Contributing factors</strong></td>
<td>Circumstances or actions that may have played a part in the origin or development of the incident (World Health Organisation, 2005).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Drug room</strong></td>
<td>A dedicated room for the preparation of drugs prior to administration. Controlled drug registers and secure drug storage units are located in the drug room (Ministry of Health NSW, 2013).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Drug storage/wastage/security</strong></td>
<td>The incident involved a problem related to medication storage, wastage, or involved a security issue, e.g., incorrect storage, loss through leakage, unintentionally discarded, tampering, stolen (Clinical Excellence Commission, 2019).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Error type</strong></td>
<td>Descriptive classification of error following categorisation by ‘problem type’. e.g., wrong dose, wrong drug (National Coordinating Council for Medication Error Reporting and Prevention, 1998).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Independent double check</strong></td>
<td>Clinicians separately check (alone and apart from each other, then comparing results) each component of prescribing, dispensing, and verifying the medicine before administering it to the patient (Ministry of Health NSW, 2013).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Local palliative care services</strong></td>
<td>The three specialist palliative care inpatient services that participated in the PERISCOPE project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Medication error</strong></td>
<td>Any preventable event that may cause or lead to inappropriate medication use or patient harm while the medication is in the control of the health care professional, patient, or consumer (National Coordinating Council for Medication Error Reporting and Prevention, 2014).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Multi-incident analysis</strong></td>
<td>A structures process that enables the simultaneous reviewing of multiple clinical incidents with a common theme, to identify previously unrecognised patterns and/or trends in incident characteristics and contributing factors, which may not be apparent when incidents are investigated in isolation (Incident Analysis Collaborating Parties, 2012).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Narcotic discrepancy</strong></td>
<td>The incident involved a discrepancy with a narcotic or a controlled drug count, e.g., discrepancy in stock count,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Near miss**
A clinical incident that is intercepted before reaching the patient and/or causing patient harm (Ministry of Health, 2014).

**Opioid delivery**
The process encompassing opioid prescribing, dispensing, preparation for administration, and administering the opioid to the patient (Leape et al., 1995).

**Opioid handling policy**
Mandated medication handling policy which encompasses opioid procurement, storage, supplying, dispensing and administration (Ministry of Health NSW, 2013).

**Pro re nata (PRN)**
Medication administered ‘as required’.

**Problem type (medication error)**
Initial categorisation of opioid errors according to where in the opioid delivery process the error occurred, e.g., prescribing, administration (Clinical Excellence Commission, 2019).

**Problem type: Administration problem**
The incident occurred during the administration process, e.g., omission or suspected omission, problem with checking procedure, "signing off" or technique, wrong medication, dose, timing, route, patient etc. (Clinical Excellence Commission, 2019).

**Problem type: Dispensing problem**
There was a problem during the dispensing process (pharmacy), e.g., problem with labelling, no or delayed dispensing, wrong medication, wrong dose/volume (Clinical Excellence Commission, 2019).

**Problem type: Prescribing problem**
The incident involved a problem with the prescribing of a medication, e.g., not prescribed or transcribed when indicated, unclear prescription or transcription, wrong medication, dose, rate, patient etc. (Clinical Excellence Commission, 2019).

**Problem type: Presentation problem**
The incident involved a problem with the appearance of a medication, e.g., similar colour, size, shape or similarity between names (Clinical Excellence Commission, 2019).

**Problem type: Supply/ordering problem**
The incident occurred during the supply or ordering process, e.g., stock not ordered or not supplied, incorrect stock ordered, insufficient stock ordered or supplied (Clinical Excellence Commission, 2019).

**Schedule 8 drug register**
A dedicated register where all Schedule 8 medication transactions must be recorded, including disposal/destruction of expired, unusable or unwanted medications (Ministry of Health NSW, 2013).
Schedule 8 medication storage unit
A separate medication storage unit for Schedule 8 drugs that is kept locked when not in immediate use (Ministry of Health NSW, 2013).

Schedule 8 (S8) opioid(s)
Buprenorphine, fentanyl, hydromorphone, methadone, morphine, and oxycodone (Ministry of Health NSW, 2013).

Severity Assessment Code (SAC)
A Severity Assessment Code (SAC) is assigned to all reported clinical incidents to direct the level of incident investigation and action required, and is informed by the consequence of the incident. SAC ratings range from SAC 1 to SAC 4:

- SAC 1: serious clinical consequence, e.g., death of a patient; extreme risk, must be reported to Ministry of Health within 24 hours, triggers root cause analysis investigation;
- SAC 2: moderate to major clinical consequences, e.g., patient suffering permanent loss of function unrelated to the natural course of their illness; high risk, senior management notified, detailed investigation required;
- SAC 3: minor clinical consequences, e.g., patient required increased level of care; medium risk, management responsibility specified, practice improvement project undertaken; and
- SAC 4: minimum clinical consequences, e.g., no patient injury or increased level of care required as a result of incident; low risk, manage by routine procedure, practice improvement project undertaken (NSW Health, 2014).
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