Author's response to reviews

Title: Medication Reconciliation at Admission and Discharge: a Time and Motion

Authors:

Ari N. Meguerditchian (ari.meguerditchian@mcgill.ca)
Stanimira P. Krotneva (stanimira.krotneva@mail.mcgill.ca)
Kristen Reidel (reidelkristen@hotmail.com)
Allen Huang (allenhuang@toh.on.ca)
Robyn Tamblyn (robyn.tamblyn@mcgill.ca)

Version: 3
Date: 14 November 2013

Author's response to reviews: see over
November 14, 2013

Mr. Paolo Mabuyo and Prof. Dominique Somme, Editors

_BMC Health Services Research_
Floor 6, 236 Gray's Inn Road
London WC1X 8HB
United Kingdom

Dear Mr. Mabuyo and Prof. Dominique Somme,

We would like to thank the Reviewer for reviewing our manuscript for a second time and providing us with suggestions on how to improve the discussion. We have revised the manuscript in light of them. Revisions are highlighted in yellow and details of our responses to each comment are shown below. Please do not hesitate to contact us for any additional information.

Sincerely,

Ari Meguerditchian, MD, MSc, FRCS
Assistant Professor of Surgery, McGill University
Surgical Oncologist, McGill University Health Centre
Member, Clinical and Health Informatics Research Group
687 Pine Avenue West, Room S7.30
Clinical: Phone: (514) 934-1934 ext: 34081 Fax: (514) 843-1633
Research: Phone (514) 934-1934 ext: 32950 Fax: (514) 843-1551
Reviewer's report:

Title: Medication Reconciliation at Admission and Discharge: a Time and Motion
Version: 2 Date: 11 October 2013
Reviewer: Stephanie K Mueller

Reviewer's report:
Overall I think the authors did an excellent job of responding to my original comments. I currently have only the following Major compulsory revision (although it is more organization rather than content related):

1.) In doing revisions, I believe the discussion section of the article has now become a bit long and disorganized and difficult to follow - what are the authors trying to say? What are the ultimate conclusions? Based on what I think your findings suggest and what I think you're trying to say, I would reorganize the discussion section as follows:

In 1 paragraph, repeat the main findings/results of your study: first, that anywhere from 1-3 health professionals are involved in the medication reconciliation process; second, that there is a large variation in time spent on medication reconciliation between units (anywhere from 9.9 to 92.2 minutes); third, there is large variation in subtasks performed both between and within units, and additionally, the time spent on non-direct patient interaction subtasks is more than twice time spent on tasks involving direct patient contact.

Then you should interpret these findings, as you have done, but organize your interpretations. I would suggest the following: Spend 1-2 paragraphs discussing how your findings suggest that there are inefficiencies in the medication reconciliation process. This is supported by your findings of multiple different health professionals are doing the same job which could indicate unclear role responsibilities. This is also supported by all the time spent on non-direct patient interaction subtasks which could indicate waste. Then discuss ways in which these issues could be ameliorated in order to improve efficiency (clearer role responsibilities, IT modalities to help eliminate waste, etc.).

The next couple of paragraphs could be spent on your next conclusion, how your findings in addition to suggesting evidence of inefficiencies, also suggest variability in quality of the medication reconciliation process. This is suggested by the variability in time spent on medication reconciliation between the different units (is 90+ minutes spent on geriatrics too long?, is 10 minutes spent on surgery too short?, etc.). Then make suggestions as to how this variability can be improved (standardization, inclusion of known best practices of med rec, etc.) End with your conclusion, reiterating the above, but in 1 succinct paragraph.

Authors’ comment: We thank the Reviewer for these suggestions. We agree that the discussion has become too long and disorganized. We have, therefore, reorganized it, following, to the best of our abilities, the Reviewer’s instructions. As the Reviewer suggested, we summarized our most important findings in the first paragraph. The
second paragraph concerns interpretations of the possible reasons for the observed results. The third paragraph offers motivation for optimizing medication reconciliation, as well as potential ways to ameliorate work-flow inefficiencies and excessive time consumption, arising from unclear roles and responsibilities and lack of standardized task lists. The fourth paragraph focuses e-health technology and what it can offer for medication reconciliation. The fifth paragraph discusses MOXXI, an e-health tool currently in place in Quebec, which can be used for medication reconciliation. The sixth paragraph outlines the study limitation. In the conclusion, we reiterate the findings, interpretations and solutions.
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