

Outcome of a protocol-based intervention to promote timely switching from intravenous to oral paracetamol for postoperative pain management: an interrupted time series analysis

Journal:	<i>Journal of Evaluation in Clinical Practice</i>
Manuscript ID:	Draft
Wiley - Manuscript type:	Original Article
Date Submitted by the Author:	n/a
Complete List of Authors:	Sabry, Nirmeen; Cairo University, Faculty of Pharmacy, Clinical Pharmacy Departemnt Dawoud, Dalia; Cairo University, Faculty of Pharmacy, Clinical Pharmacy Departemnt Alansary, Adel; Ain Shams University, Faculty of Medicine, Department of Anaesthesiology and Critical Care Hounsome, Natalia; Queen Mary, University of London, Pragmatic Clinical Trials Unit (PCTU), Centre for Primary Care and Public Health Baines, Darrin; Coventry University, Centre for Technology Enabled Health Research, Health Economics, Modelling and Systems Analysis (HeMaSa), Centre for Technology Enabled Health Research
Keywords:	health economics, clinical audit, evaluation
Abstract:	<p>Rationale, aims and objectives: Timely switching from intravenous to oral therapy ensures optimised treatment and efficient use of healthcare resources. Intravenous (IV) paracetamol is widely used for postoperative pain management but not always switched to the oral form in a timely manner, leading to unnecessary increase in expenditure. This study aims to evaluate the impact of a multifaceted intervention to promote timely switching from the IV to oral form in the postoperative setting.</p> <p>Methods: An evidence-based prescribing protocol was designed and implemented by the clinical pharmacy team in a single district general hospital in Egypt. The protocol specified the criteria for appropriate prescribing of IV paracetamol. Physicians were provided with information and educational sessions prior to implementation. A prospective, quasi-experimental study was undertaken to evaluate its impact on IV paracetamol utilisation and costs. Data on monthly utilisation and costs were recorded for 12 months before and after implementation (January 2012 to December 2013). Data were analysed using interrupted time series analysis.</p> <p>Results: Prior to implementation, in 2012, total spending on IV paracetamol was 674,154 Egyptian Pounds (L.E.) (\$236,68). There was a non-significant ($p>0.05$) downward trend in utilisation (-32 ampoules/month) and costs (reduction of 632 L.E. (\$222)/month).</p>

	<p>Following implementation, immediate decrease in utilization and costs ($p < 0.05$) and a trend change over the follow-up period were observed. Average monthly reduction was 26% (95% CI: -24% to -28%, $p < 0.001$). Conclusion: A multifaceted, protocol-based intervention to ensure timely switching from IV-to-oral paracetamol achieved significant reduction in utilisation and cost of IV paracetamol.</p>

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

For peer review only

Manuscript**Title:**

Outcome of a protocol-based intervention to promote timely switching from intravenous to oral paracetamol for postoperative pain management: an interrupted time series analysis

Authors:**Nirmeen Sabry (BSc, MSc, PhD)**

Associate Professor, Clinical Pharmacy Department, Faculty of Pharmacy, Cairo University, Cairo, Egypt.

Dalia Dawoud (BSc, MSc, PhD)

Lecturer, Clinical Pharmacy Department, Faculty of Pharmacy, Cairo University, Cairo, Egypt.

Honorary Research Fellow in Pharmacoeconomics, Health Economics, Modelling and Systems Analysis (HeMaSa), Centre for Technology Enabled Health Research, Coventry University, Coventry, UK.

Adel Alansary (MBBCH, MSc, MD)

Associate Professor, Department of Anaesthesiology and Critical Care, Faculty of Medicine, Ain Shams University, Cairo, Egypt.

Natalia Hounsome (BSc, MSc, PhD)

Lecturer, Pragmatic Clinical Trials Unit (PCTU), Centre for Primary Care and Public Health, Queen Mary, University of London, London, UK.

Darrin Baines (PhD)

Professor, Health Economics, Modelling and Systems Analysis (HeMaSa), Centre for Technology Enabled Health Research, Coventry University, Coventry, UK.

Corresponding author:

Dr Dalia Dawoud

Correspondence address: Clinical Pharmacy Department, Faculty of Pharmacy, Cairo University, Kasr El-Aini Street, PO Box 11562, Cairo, Egypt

Tel: (+202) 25311260, *E-mail:* ddawoud@hotmail.com

Running title:

Early switching from IV to oral paracetamol

Key words:

Evaluation, health economics, IV-to-Oral, paracetamol, interrupted time series

Abstract

Rationale, aims and objectives: Timely switching from intravenous to oral therapy ensures optimised treatment and efficient use of healthcare resources. Intravenous (IV) paracetamol is widely used for postoperative pain management but not always switched to the oral form in a timely manner, leading to unnecessary increase in expenditure. This study aims to evaluate the impact of a multifaceted intervention to promote timely switching from the IV to oral form in the postoperative setting.

Methods: An evidence-based prescribing protocol was designed and implemented by the clinical pharmacy team in a single district general hospital in Egypt. The protocol specified the criteria for appropriate prescribing of IV paracetamol. Physicians were provided with information and educational sessions prior to implementation. A prospective, quasi-experimental study was undertaken to evaluate its impact on IV paracetamol utilisation and costs. Data on monthly utilisation and costs were recorded for 12 months before and after implementation (January 2012 to December 2013). Data were analysed using interrupted time series analysis.

Results: Prior to implementation, in 2012, total spending on IV paracetamol was 674,154 Egyptian Pounds (L.E.) (\$236,68). There was a non-significant ($p>0.05$) downward trend in utilisation (-32 ampoules/month) and costs (reduction of 632 L.E. (\$222)/month). Following implementation, immediate decrease in utilization and costs ($p<0.05$) and a trend change over the follow-up period were observed. Average monthly reduction was 26% (95% CI: -24% to -28%, $p < 0.001$).

Conclusion: A multifaceted, protocol-based intervention to ensure timely switching from IV-to-oral paracetamol achieved significant reduction in utilisation and cost of IV paracetamol.

Introduction

In the current health care spending landscape, where demand is increasing and resources are limited, it is essential that hospitals implement evidence-based policies for the utilisation of drugs[1]. The choice of the appropriate route of administration and dosage form is an important step in the prescribing of medicines to achieve optimised outcomes from the limited drugs' budget [2,3]. Given the differential pricing of the medicines' formulations, it is important that the choice between these is guided by evidence regarding cost-effectiveness. For example, in the context of operative and intensive care, the choice of the intravenous route when the oral route is possible or a nasogastric tube is being used would not be appropriate [4].

Hospitalised patients often begin to receive their medications intravenously when acutely ill or postoperatively. However, they are not usually switched to the oral medication in a timely manner (i.e. when they become stable and start taking oral medications or diet).⁵ Clinical guidelines on acute pain management in adults in the USA and France recommend oral administration of drugs as soon as patients can take them [6,7]. Hence, interventions have been developed and implemented to ensure timely switching from the intravenous to the oral route in the post-operative administration of drugs. For example, Colombet et al. implemented an intervention to promote early switching from IV to oral proton pump inhibitors (PPIs) following a sharp increase in the utilization and associated costs of IV forms of PPIs. The intervention was successful in reducing the utilization of IV PPIs, although in the long run this change was not sustainable [8]. Ripoubeau et al. applied a multifaceted intervention to promote early switching from IV to oral administration of paracetamol for pain management [7]. Their findings showed that nurses erroneously believed that IV

paracetamol was more effective and were not aware of the much higher costs associated with its use.

The safety, tolerability and non-sedating effect of paracetamol have been considered the main advantages of this medication, although how safe paracetamol is has been recently disputed [9]. It is available in the market as oral, rectal and IV preparations. The IV preparation (10 mg/ml solution for infusion) has been available to the European market since 2002 and was introduced to the Egyptian market immediately after the European approval. In 2010 it was marketed in the USA. Oral paracetamol is a simple well-tolerated analgesic; but if meaningful early plasma concentrations are required, a more generous loading dose is needed [10]. The IV form is successful in achieving rapid therapeutic concentrations that can subsequently be maintained by oral absorption [11,12].

Oral dosage forms have several advantages compared to IV, including: lower cost, less administration time by nursing staff with lower risk of infection, and increased patient comfort and safety through eliminating the requirement for intravenous catheters [13]. Prior research in the setting of community-acquired pneumonia has demonstrated that an early IV-to- Per Oral (PO) switch of medications can also shorten the duration of hospitalization [14,15].

In Egyptian hospitals the absence of electronic drug-ordering systems - which would enable a central computer to provide a daily list of all patients who are on IV paracetamol for long periods (and are therefore potential candidates for an IV-to-PO switch) - greatly reduces the number of patients who are switched in a timely manner. This represents a considerable waste in a health system that is already struggling to provide basic health care due to its limited resources.

Hence, we developed a multifaceted, protocol-based intervention to increase the efficiency of postoperative pain management by identifying patients who are suitable candidates for IV-to-PO switching and promptly implementing the switch. The aims of this pilot study were: to assess the impact this multifaceted, protocol-based intervention on the utilization and cost of IV paracetamol and to assess the feasibility of the protocol implementation and its acceptability among physicians, with the aim of generating evidence to inform national guideline development and implementation.

Methods

This is a prospective, quasi-experimental study; where data were collected before and after the implementation of this non-computerized protocol. The effect of this protocol on the utilisation and costs of IV paracetamol was assessed using interrupted time series analysis.

1. Setting

The intervention was implemented in a single district general hospital in the Egyptian capital, Cairo. The hospital, which has 140 beds, is covered by 22 specialties. The average number of surgeries per month is around 400, performed by 17 of the 22 specialties.

2. Standard procedures for pain management prior to the intervention:

The standard procedure for postoperative pain management in the hospital was to use IV paracetamol immediately after surgery and to maintain it as long as the patient reported feeling pain or until discharge. Ideally, patients would then be switched to oral paracetamol when they are able to take oral medications. However, this was not usually done in a timely manner.

3. Intervention design and implementation:

The general approach was to develop, implement and assess the impact of the intervention. The drugs and therapeutics committee (DTC) oversaw the approval, development and implementation of the protocol. The process involved the following stages:

3.1. Defining the criteria for IV paracetamol prescribing:

In accordance with the nature of the hospital, a general hospital with multispecialty, it was necessary to tailor a list suitable to the nature of the hospital patients. This list was developed based on published guidelines and specified that IV paracetamol can be prescribed:

- for surgical patients within 48 hours post-operatively;
- for null-per-oral (NPO) patients or patients with mucositis suffering from pain;
- for other pain patients only after the approval of the DTC chairman or the pain management team;
- in acutely febrile patients (temperature $> 38^{\circ}\text{C}$), where one single dose of IV paracetamol is recommended, followed by oral form if a regular regimen is required; and
- to patient with erratic gastric absorptions.

3.2. Designing the IV-to-PO switching protocol

The main steps of the protocol are summarized in Figure 1 which illustrates the steps involved in the process.

Insert Figure 1 here

3.3. Revision and approval of the protocol

The protocol was presented to both the pain management team and the DTC for revision and approval to ensure local consensus and physician buy-in.

3.4. Pharmacists training

All the ward pharmacists in the hospital received written orientation about the inclusion criteria and on-the-job training on the implementation of the protocol.

3.5. Physician orientation

A 10 minutes session was designed to be delivered to the physicians. These sessions were delivered by the pharmacy team. Also, electronic messages (via E-mails and SMS) were sent to all the physicians via the hospital medical council to inform them about the new protocol and the date it was due to come into effect.

3.6. Official implementation of the protocol

The approved protocol was officially launched on the 1st of January 2013. From this date, all the medication sheets were screened by the ward pharmacists twice daily before dispensing doses (10 am dose and 10 pm dose) to ensure that the policy was being implemented.

4. Data collection and analysis

In order to assess the change in the utilisation of IV paracetamol, data on the number of IV ampoules consumed for the whole hospital were determined by the hospital pharmacy on a monthly basis over one year, from the 1st January 2013 to 31st December 2013. Data for the pre-implementation phase were extracted from the hospital pharmacy's dispensing records for an equivalent period of time directly preceding the implementation of the intervention (1st

January 2012 to 31st December 2012). Costs of IV paracetamol were calculated by multiplying the number of dispensed ampoules by their unit cost (19.5 L.E. (\$6.85)).

Paired sample t-test was used to assess the significance of the change in monthly utilisation and costs before and after the intervention. Statistical significance was set at $p < 0.05$. The time series (12 points before and 12 points after the intervention implementation) was analysed using Interrupted Time Series (ITS) analysis. Autoregressive, Integrated, Moving Average (ARIMA) models were used to analyse associations between observations in the pre-intervention series [16,17]. The outcome of this analysis satisfied the assumptions of the general linear regression model; hence, a segmented regression model including time and intervention terms could be applied to the original time series. All the analysis was conducted using SPSS (v.16) software. Costs were calculated in 2012-2013 Egyptian Pounds (L.E) and converted to US Dollars using the International Monetary Fund (IMF) Purchasing Power Parity (PPP) (using CCEMG – EPPI-Centre Cost Converter available at: <http://epi.ioe.ac.uk/costconversion/Default.aspx>).

Results

Monthly and total annual inpatient utilisation and costs of IV paracetamol in the period from January 2012 to December 2013 are presented in Table 1.

Insert Table 1 here

Overall, the total annual utilisation of IV paracetamol was 34,572 ampoules in 2012, before the introduction of the intervention. The average monthly utilisation was 2,881 ampoules (95% CI: 2,807-2,955). This equates to a total cost of 674,154 L.E., with an average monthly cost of 56,180 L.E. (95% CI: 54,739 to 57,620 L.E.).

In 2013, following implementation, the total utilisation of IV paracetamol fell to 25,344 ampoules with a monthly average of 2,111 (95% CI: 2068 to 2155). The total cost in 2013 was 494,013 L.E. with a monthly average of 41,168 L.E. (95% CI: 40,317 to 42,018 L.E.).

Thus, the reduction in monthly utilisation compared to pre-intervention values ranged from 329 to 1,234 ampoules with an average of 770 ampoules (95% CI: 677 to 830). This reduction was highly statistically significant ($p < 0.001$). The monthly saving achieved, Figure 2, ranged from 6,416 to 24,063 L.E., with an average monthly saving of 15,012 L.E. (95% CI: 13,599 to 16,464 L.E., $p < 0.001$). These data showed that the relative reduction in monthly utilization and costs ranged from 14% to 39% with an average of 26% (95% CI: 24% to 28%, $p < 0.001$).

Insert Figure 2 here

Using the Interrupted Time Series analysis, to adjust for the level of change observed in the pre-intervention period, it was estimated that before the intervention there was a downward trend with a decrease of 32 units per month; however, this was not statistically significant ($p = 0.056$) (Table 2). Similarly, there was an average decrease in monthly cost by 632 L.E. (\$222), which was not statistically significant ($p = 0.067$) (Table 2). After the implementation of the intervention, in January 2013, there was an immediate change in the average monthly utilisation and costs and a trend change was observed over the whole follow up period.

In the first month, upon the introduction of the intervention, there was a statistically significant reduction in utilisation ($p = 0.001$) and costs ($p = 0.003$) compared with the pre-intervention period. The initial effect of the intervention decreased with time (months 1 to 5). After month 5, the reduction was still evident in absolute and relative terms but not statistically different from the pre-intervention period for both monthly utilisation ($p = 0.07$)

and costs ($p = 0.071$). Figure 3 shows the time series for IV paracetamol utilisation before and after the implementation of the intervention (the time series for costs, not shown, is a linear function of utilisation). This suggests that the intervention effect was sustained for the first 5 months of implementation but its effect was attenuated after this period.

Insert Table 2 here

Insert Figure 3 here

The total number of admissions to the hospital was 10,682 in 2012 (before the introduction of the intervention) and 10,982 in 2013 (following the introduction of the intervention). The average monthly number of admissions was 890 (SD = 53) in 2012 and 915 (SD = 55) in 2013. The difference in the mean number of admissions between the two years was not statistically significant ($p = 0.27$).

Discussion

The results of this study showed that, a multifaceted, protocol-based intervention implemented at a general hospital achieved a significant reduction in the utilisation and cost of IV paracetamol. The effect was statistically significant, showing a significant discontinuity in the utilisation and costs of IV paracetamol immediately after its implementation and a sustained effect for the first 5 months. In absolute terms, this reduction continued over the study period. Adjusting for the pre-intervention trend showed that after 5 months the change in the rate of reduction in utilisation was not statistically significant compared with the pre-intervention trend.

Pain management in hospitalised patients is a necessary skill set for all physicians. Pain is so pervasive in the hospital setting that it is sometimes referred to as “the fifth vital sign,” and failure to manage pain has important implications not only for physicians, but also for the

hospitals where they practice [18]. The World Health Organization (WHO) reports that the irrational use of medicines is a major problem worldwide [19]. The over-use of parenteral formulations, while oral formulations would be as appropriate, is one of the key factors contributing to the irrational use of medicines and unnecessary increase in drug spending [20]. IV-to-PO switching within an appropriate time postoperatively is one of the major areas that could be targeted to rationalise the use of parenteral forms [21]. Thus, the results of this study have relevance internationally to help ease the burden on already stretched resources.

The cost of IV paracetamol is several times higher compared to the oral form (0.05 L.E. (\$0.02) per 100 mg for the oral vs 1.95 L.E. (\$6.85) per 100 mg for the IV preparation), this would not stop physicians from prescribing the IV formulation in Egypt. However, adherence to guidelines regarding early switching from IV to oral therapy in Egypt is still not appropriate. The lack of computerized prescribing systems is a major contributing factor to this low level of adherence [22]. However, this poor adherence is a problem also in other developed countries (e.g. the United Kingdom) [23].

In the context of postoperative pain management, the use of the IV route is clinically justified where there is an urgent need to treat pain and/or when other routes of administration are not possible [24]. However, the IV route may not always be used appropriately and can be associated with potential problems such as: associated risks of infection; local pain and inflammation; possible overdose with concomitant oral medicines containing paracetamol, especially in patients with hepatic impairment or severe renal impairment; failure to adjust the dose according to body weight or other patient-related factors. These issues may lead to a considerable increase in nursing time and costs [7,24]. Hence, the recommendation is to switch to the oral route as soon as this becomes possible. Adhering to this evidence-based prescribing practice has proven to be cost-effective; achieving positive outcomes in terms of

reduced risk of infection and hospital length of stay while reducing the costs associated with IV paracetamol use [7]. The effect of such adherence was evident in this intervention study as well, where a significant reduction in utilisation and costs was achievable without adversely affecting the level of postoperative pain management, where patient-requested analgesics' utilisation levels remained stable over the two-year study period.

Previous studies that examined the effectiveness of interventions to promote IV- to Oral switching for paracetamol, PPIs and antibiotics have shown similar results, with an initially significant change in physicians' prescribing behavior, which tended to level off [7,8,25,26]. A systematic review of the effectiveness of similar interventions to improve antibiotic prescribing in hospitals included studies of interventions directed to changing the route of administration [27]. The review concluded that restrictive interventions, such as automatic stop orders similar to the intervention used in this study, had a significantly greater impact on prescribing outcomes in the short-run (6 months) but not in the long-run (12 and 24 months) when compared to persuasive interventions [27]. This trend suggests that there may be a need for follow-up measures and continuous education to maintain the achieved change. However, overall, the average level of change seen in this study (26% reduction in utilisation of IV paracetamol) was found to be within the range reported in this Cochrane review when using primarily restrictive interventions (17% to 34% in the desired direction) [27]. It is also likely that the level of utilization may have reached an optimum level, with no further room for improvement.

The use of ITS analysis can be a particularly useful method in prescribing research to allow the analysis of drug prescribing and utilisation levels and trends. It can be a powerful tool for hospital pharmacies to track and identify challenging and non-evidence based prescribing practices that require remedial action. It has been used to assess the effectiveness of

interventions to improve prescribing of various medications including antidepressants, antibiotics and proton pump inhibitors [8,28,29]. The implementation of a computer physician order entry (CPOE) system can further enhance the usability of this method and simplify the data collection. A CPOE system would also make it possible to design interventions based on sending computerised reminders to prescribers in addition to facilitating the collection of real-time data for audit and research purposes [13].

There are a number of limitations to our study. Firstly, it was conducted at a single hospital in a large city and consequently the findings may not be generalisable to other settings.

Secondly, the study focused on assessing changes in process measures on a whole hospital level rather than clinical outcomes on an individual patient level. Finally, the results may have been confounded by other factors such as the case mix; given the quasi-experimental before-and-after research design. Nevertheless, and despite these limitations, the study showed that this protocol-based intervention has achieved considerable efficiency saving in a resource-limited setting. Reinforcing the messages delivered through the implementation activities on a bi-annual basis can further improve the outcomes and ensure maintenance of a positive effect. Further research should focus on assessing patient-level, clinical outcomes as part of a full pharmacoeconomic evaluation to assess the cost effectiveness of this intervention.

In conclusion, the implementation of a protocol-based intervention to achieve a timely switch from IV to oral paracetamol in the context of postoperative pain management achieved an immediate significant reduction in the utilisation and cost of IV paracetamol. However, as with other interventions aimed at changing prescribing behaviour, this effect may require additional measures to be sustainable. Choosing the appropriate administration route is an important step in the prescribing process that can optimise patient outcomes in a cost-effective manner.

Acknowledgement

The authors would like to acknowledge Dr Barry Hounsome for his efforts in critically reviewing and proof-reading the manuscript. We are also indebted to the clinical pharmacy team and the inpatient pharmacy staff for their role in implementing the protocol.

For peer review only

References:

1. Picton, C. and Wright, H. (2013) Medicines Optimisation: Helping patients to make the most of medicines. Good practice guidance for healthcare professionals in England. London, Royal Pharmaceutical Society of Great Britain (RPSGB).
2. deVries, T., Henning, R., Hogerzeil, H., Fresle, D. (1995) Guide to good prescribing: A practical manual. Geneva, World Health Organization Action Programme on Essential Drugs.
3. Larkin, M. (2001) Evidence-based prescribing made simple. *Lancet*, 357(9254), 448.
4. Fenlon, S., Collyer, J., Giles, J., Bidd, H., Lees, M., Nicholson, J., Dulai, R., Hankins, M., Edelman, N. (2013) Oral vs intravenous acetaminophen for lower third molar extractions under general anaesthesia: is oral administration inferior? *British Journal of Anaesthesia*, 110(3), 432-437. Doi: 10.1093/bja/aes387
5. Cunha, B. (2001) Intravenous to oral antibiotic switch therapy. *Drugs Today (Barc)*, 37(5), 311-319.
6. Carr, D., Jacox, A., Chapman, C. (1992) Acute pain management in adults: operative procedures. Rockville, MD: Agency for Health Care Policy and Research, Public Health Service, US Department of Health and Human Services (Quick reference guide for clinicians No 1. AHCPR Publication No 92-0019.)
7. Ripouteau, C., Conort, O., Lamas, J.P., Auleley, G.R., Hazebroucq, G., Durieux, P. (2000) Effect of multifaceted intervention promoting early switch from intravenous to oral acetaminophen for postoperative pain: controlled, prospective, before and after study. *British Medical Journal*, 321, 1460-1463. Doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1136/bmj.321.7274.1460>

8. Colombet, I., Sabatier, B., Gillaizeau, F., Prognon, P., Begue, D., Durieux, P. (2009) Long-term effects of a multifaceted intervention to encourage the choice of the oral route for proton pump inhibitors: an interrupted time-series analysis. *Quality and Safety in Health Care*, 18, 232–235. Doi:10.1136/qshc.2007.023887
9. Joshi, G.P. (2005) Multimodal analgesia techniques and postoperative rehabilitation. *Anesthesiology Clinics of North America*, 23(1), 185-202. Doi:10.1016/j.atc.2004.11.010
10. Holmer-Pettersson, P., Owall, A., Jakobsson, J. (2004) Early bioavailability of paracetamol after oral or intravenous administration. *Acta Anaesthesiologica Scandinavica*, 48, 867-70. DOI: 10.1111/j.0001-5172.2004.00452.x
11. Macario, A. and Royal, MA. (2011) A literature review of randomized clinical trials of intravenous acetaminophen (paracetamol) for acute postoperative pain. *Pain Practice*, 11, 290–610. Doi: 10.1111/j.1533-2500.2010.00426.x.
12. Moller, P., Sindet-Pedersen, S., Petersen, C.T., Juhl, G.I., Dillenschneider, A., Skoglund, L.A. (2004) Onset of acetaminophen analgesia: Comparison of oral and intravenous routes after third molar surgery. *British Journal of Anesthesia*; 94, 642-648. Doi: 10.1093/bja/aei109
13. Fischer, M., Solomon, D., Teich, J., Avorn, J. (2003) Conversion from intravenous to oral medications: Assessment of a computerized intervention for hospitalized patients. *Archives of Internal Medicine*, 163(21), 2585-2589. Doi:10.1001/archinte.163.21.2585.
14. Ramirez, J., Vargas, S., Ritter, G.W., Brier, M.E., Wright, A., Smith, S., Newman, D., Burke, J., Mushtaq, M., Huang, A. (1999) Early switch from intravenous to oral antibiotics and early hospital discharge. *Archives of Internal Medicine*, 159, 2449-2454. doi:10.1001/archinte.159.20.2449

15. Oosterheert, J.J., Bonten, M.J., Schneider, M.M. et al. (2006) Effectiveness of early switch from intravenous to oral antibiotics in severe community acquired pneumonia: multicentre randomised trial. *British Medical Journal*, 333, 1193-1205. Doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1136/bmj.38993.560984.BE>
16. Box, G.E.P., Jenkins, G.M. (1976) Time series analysis, forecasting and control. San Francisco: Holden Day.
17. Greene, W.H. (2002) Econometric analysis. 5th ed. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall.
18. Harrington, D. (2013) IV Acetaminophen: The Hospitalist's Perspective. Today's Hospitalist Special Report.
http://www.todayshospitalist.com/index.php?b=articles_read&cnt=1637. (accessed 14 June 2015)
19. World Health Organization (WHO). (2012) The pursuit of responsible use of medicines: Sharing and learning from country experiences.
http://www.who.int/medicines/publications/responsible_use/en/ (accessed 14 June 2015)
20. Lau, B., Pinto, B., Thiemann, D., Lehmann, C. (2011) Budget impact analysis of conversion from intravenous to oral medication when clinically eligible for oral intake. *Clinical Therapeutics*, 33(11), 1792 –1796.
Doi:10.1016/j.clinthera.2011.09.030
21. Cyriac, J. and James, E. (2014) Switch over from intravenous to oral therapy: A concise overview. *Journal of Pharmacology and Pharmacotherapy*, 5(2), 83-87. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.4103/0976-500X.130042>
22. O'Neal, J. (2013) The utility of intravenous acetaminophen in the perioperative period. *Frontiers in Public Health*, 1, 25. Doi: 10.3389/fpubh.2013.00025

23. Marsden, M. (2010) Auditing use of IV paracetamol in a surgical division and intensive care. *Clinical Pharmacist*, 2, 225-228.
24. Tzortzopoulou, A., McNicol, E.D., Cepeda, M.S., Francia, M.B.D, Farhat, T., Schumann, R. (2011) Single doses of intravenous formulations of paracetamol (acetaminophen) to reduce pain after surgery in adults and children. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews*, 10. DOI: 10.1002/14651858.CD007126.pub2
25. Rhew, D.C., Tu, G.S., Ofman, J., Henning, J.M., Richards, M.S., Weingarten, S.R. (2001) Early switch and early discharge strategies in patients with community-acquired pneumonia: a meta-analysis. *Archives in Internal Medicine*, 161(5),722-727. doi:10.1001/archinte.161.5.722
26. McLaughlin, C.M., Bodasing, N., Boyter, A.C., Fenelon, C., Fox, J.G., Seaton, R.A. (2005) Pharmacy-implemented guidelines on switching from intravenous to oral antibiotics: an intervention study. *Quarterly Journal of Medicine*, 98 (10), 745–52. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/qjmed/hci114>
27. Davey, P., Brown, F., Fenelon, L. et al. (2013) Interventions to improve antibiotic practices for hospital inpatients. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews*, 4. DOI: 10.1002/14651858.CD003543.pub2
28. Hanbury, A., Farley, K., Carl, Thompson., Wilson, P., Chambers, D., Holmes, H. (2013) Immediate versus sustained effects: interrupted time series analysis of a tailored intervention. *Implementation Science*, 8,130. Doi:10.1186/1748-5908-8-130
29. Ansari, F., Gray, K., Nathwani, D., Phillips, G., Ogston, S., Ramsay, C., Davey, P. (2003) Outcomes of an intervention to improve hospital antibiotic prescribing: interrupted time series with segmented regression analysis. *Journal of Antimicrobial Chemotherapy*, 52, 842–848. Doi: 10.1093/jac/dkg459

Figure legends:

Figure 1: Flow chart illustrating the steps involved in the protocol-based process and the criteria for dispensing IV paracetamol

Figure 2: Monthly IV paracetamol cost saving achieved following the implementation of the intervention.

Figure 3: Time series of monthly IV paracetamol utilisation before and after the implementation of the protocol-based intervention.

For peer review only

Tables

Table 1: Monthly IV paracetamol utilisation and associated costs over the study period (January 2012 to December 2013)


Month	Units (100 mg single use ampoule)		Costs (L.E.)*	
	2012	2013	2012	2013
January	2996	2045	58,422	39,878
February	2605	1994	50,798	38,883
March	3073	2149	59,924	41,906
April	3067	2128	59,807	41,496
May	2986	2005	58,227	39,098
June	3248	2305	63,336	44,948
July	3152	1918	61,464	37,401
August	2752	2301	53,664	44,870
September	2925	2345	57,038	45,728
October	2428	2099	47,346	40,931
November	2839	2179	55,361	42,491
December	2501	1866	48,770	36,387
Total	34572	25344	674,154	494,013


* IV paracetamol unit cost = 19.5 L.E.

Table 2: Summary of the AutoRegressive, Integrated, Moving Average (ARIMA) model analysis showing the estimated reduction in IV paracetamol utilisation and costs following intervention implementation compared with pre-intervention levels.

Time after introducing intervention (months)	Change in utilisation (units)		Change in cost (L.E.)	
	Mean (95% CI)	P-value	Mean (95% CI)	P-value
0 (pre-intervention)	-32 (-66, 2)	0.056	-6,32(-1,342, 78)	0.067
1	-636 (-985, -287)	0.001*	-11,418 (-18,575, -4,261)	0.003*
2	-585(-938, -233)	0.002*	-10,695 (-1,7966, -3,424)	0.005*
3	-534 (-897, -171)	0.005*	-9,972 (-1,7489, -2,455)	0.009*
4	-484 (-864, -103)	0.013*	-9,248 (-17,127, -1,369)	0.019*
5	-433 (-836, -29)	0.031*	-8,525 (-16,870, -180)	0.038*
6	-382 (-813, 49)	0.070	-7,802 (-16,700, 1,096)	0.071
7	-331(-794, 132)	0.137	-7,079 (-16,603, 2,445)	0.122
8	-280 (-778, 218)	0.237	-6,355 (-16,561, 3,851)	0.191
9	-229(-765, 307)	0.364	-5,632 (-16,570, 5,306)	0.276
10	-178 (-754, 398)	0.509	-4,909 (-16,616, 6,798)	0.372
11	-127 (-744, 490)	0.659	-4,186 (-16,695, 8,323)	0.475
12	-76(-736, 584)	0.804	-3,463 (-16,802, 9,876)	0.578


*Statistically significant ($P < 0.05$)





* IV paracetamol unit cost = 19.5 L.E.

Peer review only



Peer review only