

## Computer Physician Order Entry

### Key Facts about Medication Errors

More than one million serious medication errors occur every year in U.S. hospitals.<sup>1</sup> Such errors include administration of the wrong drug, drug overdoses, and overlooked drug interactions and allergies. They occur for many reasons, including illegible handwritten prescriptions and decimal point errors.

Medication errors often have tragic consequences for patients. Many serious medication errors result in preventable adverse drug events (ADEs), approximately 20% of which are life-threatening.<sup>2,3</sup> According to the 1999 Institute of Medicine report, *To Err is Human*, medication errors alone contribute to 7,000 deaths annually.<sup>4</sup>

Medication errors also result in tremendous financial costs. One ADE adds more than \$2,000 on average to the costs of hospitalization.<sup>5</sup> This translates to \$2 billion per year nationwide in hospital costs alone.<sup>6</sup> Furthermore, this figure excludes other important costs of medication errors, such as malpractice insurance premiums and losses in worker productivity.

### What is Computer Physician Order Entry?

Computer physician order entry (CPOE) systems are electronic prescribing systems that intercept errors when they most commonly occur — at the time medications are ordered. With CPOE, physicians enter orders into a computer rather than on paper. Orders are integrated with patient information, including laboratory and prescription data. The order is then automatically checked for potential errors or problems. Specific benefits of CPOE include...

- Prompts that warn against the possibility of drug interaction, allergy or overdose;
- Accurate, current information that helps physicians keep up with new drugs as they are introduced into the market;
- Drug-specific information that eliminates confusion among drug names that sound alike;
- Improved communication between physicians and pharmacists; and
- Reduced healthcare costs due to improved efficiencies.

### Effectiveness of CPOE in Reducing Errors

CPOE systems can be remarkably effective in reducing the rate of serious medication errors. A study led by David Bates MD, Chief of General Medicine at Boston's Brigham and Women's Hospital, demonstrated that CPOE reduced error rates by 55% — from 10.7 to 4.9 per 1000 patient-days.<sup>2</sup> Rates of serious medication errors fell by 88% in a subsequent study by the same group.<sup>3</sup> The prevention of errors was attributed to the CPOE system's structured orders and medication checks.<sup>2,3</sup> Another study conducted at LDS Hospital in Salt Lake City by David Classen MD demonstrated a 70% reduction in antibiotic-related ADEs after implementation of decision support for these drugs.<sup>7</sup>

CPOE has paid other dividends. Length of stay at Wishard Memorial Hospital in Indianapolis fell by 0.9 days, and hospital charges fell by 13% after implementation of CPOE.<sup>8</sup> A recent study at Ohio State University also identified substantial reductions in pharmacy, radiology and laboratory turn-around times, and there was a reduction in length of stay in one of the two hospitals studied.<sup>9</sup>

John Birkmeyer MD, the professor of surgery and a health services researcher at University of Michigan Medical School, estimates that implementation of CPOE systems at all non-rural U.S. hospitals could prevent between 570,000 and 907,000 serious medication errors each year.<sup>1</sup>

### The Leapfrog CPOE Standard

Given the potential benefits for both patients and payers, national experts in health care quality and patient safety advised The Leapfrog Group to select CPOE as one of its Safety Standards. Leapfrog's original CPOE Standard was based on extensive review of published research and consultation with leading experts in medication errors and CPOE. This standard has since been reviewed and revised, incorporating even more current data and input from the hospital and physician communities.

# Computer Physician Order Entry

---

In order to fully meet Leapfrog's CPOE Standard, hospitals must:

1. Assure that physicians enter at least 75% of medication orders via a computer system that includes prescribing-error prevention software;
2. Demonstrate that their inpatient CPOE system can alert physicians of at least 50% of common, serious prescribing errors, using a testing protocol now under development by First Consulting Group and the Institute for Safe Medication Practices (this criterion for the Leap will not count towards the hospital's publicly reported status on this Leap until the test is available); and,
3. Require that physicians electronically document a reason for overriding an interception prior to doing so.

The Leapfrog Group, working in partnership with The MEDSTAT Group, invites hospitals to respond to the Leapfrog Group voluntary online survey (<https://leapfrog.medstat.com>) and share their progress toward meeting Leapfrog's standard for this practice. Hospitals that have implemented CPOE in at least one of their units will earn partial credit for their progress. In addition, hospitals planning to implement CPOE systems can record their progress on the Leapfrog web site.

## Challenges to CPOE Implementation

Despite the considerable benefits, fewer than 2% of U.S. hospitals have CPOE completely or partially available and require its use by physicians.<sup>10</sup> Why?

The upfront cost of implementing CPOE is one major obstacle for hospitals. At Brigham and Women's Hospital, the cost of developing and implementing CPOE was approximately \$1.9 million, with \$500,000 maintenance costs per year since. Installation of even "off the shelf" CPOE packages requires a significant amount of customization for each hospital and can be very expensive.<sup>2</sup>

Finally, there may be cultural obstacles to CPOE implementation. For example, many physicians resist the idea of ordering prescriptions via computer instead of by hand.

## Why Purchasers Need to Get Involved

Given these obstacles, hospitals may need encouragement from purchasers to implement CPOE. Leapfrog purchasers can help make the business case for CPOE and make hospitals aware of the potential savings from improved efficiencies. At Brigham and Women's Hospital, for example, the return on its initial investment has been between \$5 and \$10 million in annual savings.<sup>2</sup>

By recognizing and rewarding hospitals, Leapfrog purchasers can create the appropriate incentives for hospitals to invest in CPOE. They can accelerate the process by helping to make consumers more aware of the importance of seeking care at hospitals with CPOE systems in place. Finally, Leapfrog purchaser attention to this safety issue may stimulate CPOE vendors to hasten product improvements and reduce the burden and cost of CPOE implementation.

By getting hospitals to implement CPOE, Leapfrog purchasers can leverage major improvements in hospital safety for their employees and other patients.

## References

1. Kuperman GJ, Bobb, A, Payne TH et al. Medication-related Clinical Decision Support in Computerized Provider Order Entry Systems: A Review. *J Am Med Inform Assoc.* 2007; 14(1):29-40. Epub 2006 Oct 26
2. Kelly WN, Rucker TD. Compelling features of a safe medication-use system. *Am J Health Syst Pharm.* 2006 Aug 1;63(15):1461-8
3. Van der Sijs H, Aarts J, Vulto A, Berg M. Overriding of drug safety alerts in computerized physician order entry. *J Am Med Inform Assoc.* 2006 Mar-Apr;13(2):138-47. Epub 2005 Dec 15
4. Shah NR, Seger AC, Seger DL et al. Improving acceptance of computerized prescribing alerts in ambulatory care. *J Am Med Inform Assoc.* 2006 Jan-Feb;13(1):5-11. Epub 2005 Oct 12.
5. Galanter WL, Polikaitis A, DiDomenico RJ. A trial of automated safety alerts for inpatient digoxin use with computerized physician order entry. *J Am Med Inform Assoc.* 2004 Jul-Aug;11(4):270-7. Epub 2004 Apr 2.
6. Birkmeyer JD, Dimick JB. Leapfrog safety standards: potential benefits of universal adoption. The Leapfrog group. Washington, DC: 2004.
7. King WJ, Paice N, Rangrej J et al. The effect of computerized physician order entry on

# Computer Physician Order Entry

---

- medication errors and adverse drug events in pediatric inpatients. *Pediatrics*. 2003 Sep;112(3 Pt 1):506-9.
8. Kaushal R, Shojania KG, Bates DW. Effects of computerized physician order entry and clinical decision support systems on medication safety: a systematic review. *Archives of Internal Medicine*. 2003;163:1409-1416.
  9. Birkmeyer CM, Lee J, Bates DW, Birkmeyer JD. Will electronic order entry reduce health care costs? *Effective Clinical Practice*. 2002;5: 67-74.
  10. Mekhjian HS, Kumar RR, Kuehr L et al. Immediate benefits realized following implementation of physician order entry at an academic medical center. *J Am Med Inform Assoc*, 2002; Sept-Oct; 9(5) 529-39.
  11. Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality. HCUPnet, Healthcare Cost and Utilization Project. Rockville, MD; 2001.
  12. Chertow GM, Lee J, Kuperman GJ, Burdick E, Horsky J, Seger DL, Lee R, Mekala A, Song J, Komaroff AL, Bates DW. Guided medication dosing for inpatients with renal insufficiency. *Journal of the American Medical Association*. 2001; 286:2839-2944.
  13. Pedersen CA, Schnieder PJ, Santell JP. ASHP national survey of pharmacy practice in hospital settings: prescribing and transcribing – 2001. *American Journal of Health Systems Pharmacy*. 2001; 58:2251-2266.
  14. Bates DW, Teich JM, Merchia PR, Schimiz BS, Kuperman GJ, Spurr CD. Effects of Computerized Physician Order Entry on Prescribing Practices. *Archives of Internal Medicine*. 2000; 160: 2741-2747.
  15. Teich JM, Merchia PR, Schimiz JL, Kuperman GJ, Spurr CD, Bates DW. Effects of computerized physician order entry on prescribing practices. *Archives of Internal Medicine*. 2000;160:2741-2747.
  16. Bates DW, Teich JM, Lee J, Seger D, Kuperman GJ, Ma'Luf N, Boyle D, Leape L. The impact of computerized physician order entry on medication error prevention. *Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association*. 1999; 6:313-21.
  17. Kohn, LT, Corrigan JM, Donaldson MS (eds): *To Err is Human: Building a Safer Health System: a report from the Committee on Quality of Healthcare in America*, Institute of Medicine, National Academy of Sciences. National Academy Press, Washington, DC, 1999.
  18. Ash JS, Gorman PN, Hersh WR. Physicians order entry in U.S. hospitals. *Proceedings/AMIA Annual Symposium*. 1998; 235-9.
  19. Bates DW, Leape L, Cullen DJ, et al. Effect of computerized physician order entry and a team intervention on prevention of serious medication errors. *JAMA*. 1998; 280:1311-16.
  20. Bates DW. Drugs and adverse drug reactions: how worried should we be? (Editorial). *JAMA*. 1998; 279:1216-1222.
  21. Evans RS, Pestotnik SL, Classen DC, et al. A computer-assisted management program for anti-biotics and other anti-infective agents. *N Engl J Med*. 1998; 338:232-238.
  22. Bates DW, Spell N, Cullen DJ, et al. The costs of adverse drug events in hospitalized patients. *JAMA*. 1997; 277:307-311.
  23. Classen DC, Pestotnik SL, Evans RS, Lloyd JF, Burke JP. Adverse drug events in hospitalized patients: excess length of stay, extra costs, and attributable mortality. *JAMA*. 1997; 277:301-306.
  24. Overhage JM, Tierney WM, Zhou XH, McDonald CJ. A randomized trial of “corollary orders” to prevent errors of omission. *Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association*. 1997;4:346-375.

# Computer Physician Order Entry

---

25. Glaser J, Teich JM, Kuperman G. Impact of information events on medical care. In: Proceedings and abstracts of the 1996 Healthcare Information and Management Systems Society Annual Conference. February 6, 1996; Atlanta, GA, Ill. Pages 1-9.
26. Paterno M, Teich JM, Seger DL, Bates DW. A practical method for presenting drug interactions to clinicians. Proc AMIA Annu Fall Symp. 1996; 20:872.
27. Bates DW, Cullen D, Laird N, et al. Incidence of adverse drug events and potential adverse drug events. JAMA. 1995; 274:29-34.
28. Johnson JA, Bootman HL. Drug-related morbidity and mortality: a cost-of-illness model. Arch Intern Med. 1995; 155:1949-1956.
29. Leape LL, Bates DW, Cullen DJ, et al. Systems analysis of adverse drug events. JAMA. 1995; 274: 35-43.
30. Bates DW, O'Neil AC, Boyle D, et al. Potential identifiability and preventability of adverse events using information systems. J Am Med Assoc. 1994; 1:404-411.
31. Evans RS, Pestotnik SL, Classen DC, Horn SD, Bass SB, Burke JPP. Preventing adverse drug events in hospitalized patients. Ann Pharmacother. 1994; 28:523-527.
32. Sittig DF, Stead WW. Computer-based physician order entry: the state of the art. J Am Med Inform Assoc. 1994; 1:108-123.
33. Bates DW, Leape LL, Petrycki S. Incidence and preventability of adverse drug events in hospitalized adults. J Gen Intern Med. 1993; 8:289-294.
34. Massaro TA. Introducing physician order entry at a major academic medical center. Acad Med. 1993; 68:20-25.
35. Tiech JM, Spurr CD, Flammini SH, et al. Response to a trial of physician based inpatient order entry. Proc Annu Symp Comput Appl Med Care. 1993; 17:316-320.
36. Tierney WM, Miller ME, Overhage JM, McDonald CH. Physician inpatient order writing on microcomputer workstations. JAMA. 1993; 269:379-383.
37. Teich JM, Hurley JF, Beckley RF, Aranow M. Design of an easy-to-use physician order entry system with support for nursing and ancillary departments. Proc Annu Symp Comput Appl Med Care. 1992; 16:99-103.
38. Brown GC. Medication errors: a case study. Hospitals. 1979; 53:61-2, 65.