Experiences with the implementation of pharmacist's medication reviews in ambulatory care settings: a systematic review using the consolidated framework for implementation research.

MICHEL, D., STEWART, D., WEIDMANN, A.

2019
Experiences with the implementation of pharmacist's medication reviews in ambulatory care settings: a systematic review using the consolidated framework for implementation research

Dorothee Michel, Derek Stewart, Anita Weidmann

Citation
Dorothee Michel, Derek Stewart, Anita Weidmann. Experiences with the implementation of pharmacist's medication reviews in ambulatory care settings: a systematic review using the consolidated framework for implementation research. PROSPERO 2019 CRD42019122836
Available from: https://www.crd.york.ac.uk/prospero/display_record.php?ID=CRD42019122836

Review question
The aim of this systematic review is to critically appraise, synthesise and present the available evidence on experiences with the implementation of Medication Reviews (MR) in ambulatory care settings including potential facilitators and barriers, regardless of implementation status.
The CFIR (Consolidated Framework for Implementation Research) will be used to guide the review and to identify facilitators and barriers at all stages of the implementation process.
The specific review questions are
1. What are the experiences, perceptions, attitudes, views and beliefs stakeholders (e.g. pharmacists, health professionals, general public, patients, policy makers etc.) have gained with implementation of medication reviews in ambulatory care settings?
2. Which barriers and facilitators have been identified in the implementation of pharmacist's medication reviews into ambulatory care settings?

Searches
The systematic review will be carried out according to the PRISMA guidelines in the following databases:
Cumulative Index to Nursing and Allied Health Literature (CINAHL), MEDLINE, The Cochrane Library, International Pharmaceutical Abstracts (IPA), Scopus. The search will include publications in the German, Spanish and English language.
We will apply a three-step search strategy: An orientating search will be conducted in MEDLINE and IPA using the key search terms: “implementation”, “pharmac*”, “[medication review” OR “medication management”], “facilitat*”, “barrier*”. The titles, abstracts and index terms of the retrieved papers will be screened for additional search terms. These will be used in the third step, the search in all databases named above. Furthermore, manual searches of related studies listed in the reference, footnote and citations will be carried out to include more relevant papers.
Only peer reviewed papers and primary research items will be included. We will exclude opinion articles, editorials and narrative reports.

Types of study to be included
This review will consider studies with quantitative, qualitative and mixed methods.

Condition or domain being studied
Implementation of Medication Reviews carried out by pharmacists in community pharmacy and other ambulatory health care settings. We will understand the term “Medication Review” according to the PCNE 2017 definition: “Medication review is a structured evaluation of a patient's medicines with the aim of optimising medicines use and improving health outcomes. This entails detecting drug related problems and recommending interventions.”

Participants/population
All stakeholders, including pharmacists, other health professionals, policy makers and patients, whose experiences, views, beliefs, attitudes are described in the studies included.
Intervention(s), exposure(s)
Implementation of Medication Reviews (Medication Reviews according to the PCNE definition).

Comparator(s)/control
Not applicable.

Context

Main outcome(s)
• experiences of stakeholders such as views, perceptions, opinions, attitudes, beliefs, thoughts, feelings, impressions, stances, viewpoints, standpoints and positions of the implementation process.
• facilitators and barriers to the implementation of pharmacist's medication reviews in community pharmacies and other ambulatory health care settings.

Additional outcome(s)
None.

Data extraction (selection and coding)
The identification, screening, eligibility and inclusion of papers will be performed and presented according to the Prisma -P 2015 Checklist and the Prisma 2009 flow diagram.
The extraction tools will be designed according to the objectives in this systematic review. The CFIR domains will be used to sort the experiences and to guide the identification of differing types of barriers and facilitators.

Risk of bias (quality) assessment
Quality assessment will be conducted on all included manuscripts by two independent reviewers using the Mixed Methods Appraisal Tools (MMAT, Pluye et.al. 2011). Disagreements will be resolved by consensus after discussion with the research team.

Strategy for data synthesis
Only papers with sufficient methodological quality (according to MMAT) will be included in this review. First all included papers will be tabulated, indicating also their quality and risk of bias. Where possible, quantitative data findings will be pooled for studies using similar outcome measures and population statistics and analysed using statistical meta-analysis. To judge the heterogeneity of the studies we will use the ?²-test, to assess the effect size of categorical data we will calculate the Odds Ratio and for continuous data weighted mean differences (IBM SPSS Statistic for Windows, Armonk, NY, USA). If heterogeneity of the studies does not allow statistical pooling, we will report the findings narratively supported by tables and figures, where appropriate.
Results from qualitative papers will be aggregated and assessed within their respective domain of the consolidated framework for implementation research (CFIR) (I: Intervention characteristics; II: Outer setting; III: Inner setting; IV: Characteristic of individuals; V: Process); this will be reported as narrative synthesis, also supported by tables and figures. The CFIR will provide the framework for grouping experiences with implementation as well as facilitators and barriers to implementation in the format of a “thematic analysis”. The data synthesis will be performed by two researchers independently, discrepancies will be discussed and where necessary solved within the entire team.

Analysis of subgroups or subsets
None planned.
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