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Informing the hospital of patients' drug regimens

CHARLES CLAURE, A R ELKINGTON

Abstract

Patients who are admitted to Lowestoft Eye Hospital are asked to bring from their general practitioners with drugs their drug regimens. The hospital staff was asked to compare these with their own records. Over a period of 2 weeks, 20 patients were admitted, and the information from the hospital and the general practitioner was compared. In 12 patients there was agreement, but in 8 patients there were discrepancies. Of these discrepancies, 2 were fatal. In 1 patient there was a discrepancy between the patient's own records and those of both the hospital and the general practitioner. This patient had been taking two different drugs, the records of which were not seen by the hospital.

Introduction

The general practitioners have authority to inflict legal penalties on patients who are detained. However, the hospital is not informed of these penalties. This study was undertaken to determine the frequency and nature of the discrepancies between the drug regimens of patients admitted to the hospital and those recorded by their respective general practitioners.

Methods

The drug regimens of 20 patients were compared. The hospital records were obtained from the hospital medical records department, and the general practitioners' records were obtained by the general practitioners.

Results

In 12 patients there was agreement between the hospital and general practitioners, and in 8 patients there were discrepancies. Of these discrepancies, 2 were fatal. In 1 patient there was a discrepancy between the patient's own records and those of both the hospital and the general practitioner. This patient had been taking two different drugs, the records of which were not seen by the hospital.

Discussions

A similar study was undertaken at the National Hospital for Nervous Diseases in London, and a similar discrepancy was found in 1 patient. In that study, the patient was also taking two different drugs, the records of which were not seen by the hospital.
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