

Development and preliminary validation of an instrument to enable laypersons to assess suspected side effects from medicines

O'Donovan, Bernadine; Rodgers, Ruth M; Cox, Anthony; Krska, Janet

DOI:

[10.1002/pds.4841](https://doi.org/10.1002/pds.4841)

License:

Other (please specify with Rights Statement)

Document Version

Peer reviewed version

Citation for published version (Harvard):

O'Donovan, B, Rodgers, RM, Cox, A & Krska, J 2019, 'Development and preliminary validation of an instrument to enable laypersons to assess suspected side effects from medicines', *Pharmacoepidemiology and drug safety*, vol. 28, no. 7, pp. 1023-1031. <https://doi.org/10.1002/pds.4841>

[Link to publication on Research at Birmingham portal](#)

Publisher Rights Statement:

This is the peer reviewed version of the following article: O'Donovan, B, Rodgers, RM, Cox, AR, Krska, J. Development and preliminary validation of an instrument to enable laypersons to assess suspected side effects from medicines. *Pharmacoepidemiol Drug Saf.* 2019; 28: 1023– 1031. <https://doi.org/10.1002/pds.4841>, which has been published in final form at <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1002/pds.4841> This article may be used for non-commercial purposes in accordance with Wiley Terms and Conditions for Use of Self-Archived Versions.

General rights

Unless a licence is specified above, all rights (including copyright and moral rights) in this document are retained by the authors and/or the copyright holders. The express permission of the copyright holder must be obtained for any use of this material other than for purposes permitted by law.

- Users may freely distribute the URL that is used to identify this publication.
- Users may download and/or print one copy of the publication from the University of Birmingham research portal for the purpose of private study or non-commercial research.
- User may use extracts from the document in line with the concept of 'fair dealing' under the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988 (?)
- Users may not further distribute the material nor use it for the purposes of commercial gain.

Where a licence is displayed above, please note the terms and conditions of the licence govern your use of this document.

When citing, please reference the published version.

Take down policy

While the University of Birmingham exercises care and attention in making items available there are rare occasions when an item has been uploaded in error or has been deemed to be commercially or otherwise sensitive.

If you believe that this is the case for this document, please contact UBIRA@lists.bham.ac.uk providing details and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate.

Development and preliminary testing of an instrument to facilitate causality assessment of suspected side effects from medicines by lay persons.

Journal:	<i>Pharmacoepidemiology and Drug Safety</i>
Manuscript ID	PDS-18-0455
Wiley - Manuscript type:	Original Report
Date Submitted by the Author:	09-Nov-2018
Complete List of Authors:	O' Donovan, B; University of Dublin Trinity College, Histopathology; Rodgers (retired), R; Medway School of Pharmacy, Pharmacy (retired) Cox, AR; University of Birmingham College of Medical and Dental Sciences, School of Pharmacy Krska, J; University of Kent, Medway School of Pharmacy
Keywords:	adverse drug reactions, causality assessment, patient experience, side effects
Abstract:	<p>Abstract Purpose: Research into causality assessment tools enabling patients to assess suspected adverse drug reactions (ADRs) is limited. Supporting patients with tools could improve their confidence in discussions with health professionals and encourage reporting of suspected ADRs to regulators. This study describes development and preliminary evaluation of an instrument: Side Effect Patient ASsessment Tool (SE-PAST). Methods: SE-PAST was developed from survey and interview data involving patients experiencing suspected ADRs. It included 10 statements enabling causality assessment, covering timing, additional information sources and experiences, with four options: yes/no/don't know/not applicable. Scoring and weighting resulted in four categories of causal association: highly probable, probable, possible, unlikely. Validation involved obtaining feedback from 31 individuals experiencing an ADR. Evaluation involved on-line distribution through patient support groups and comparison of reported symptoms to known ADRs. Results: Validators found SE-PAST easy to read (31), to understand (27) and complete (29). 294 respondents completed SE-PAST on-line, with 98% completing eight or more causality assessment statements. Symptoms were categorised as: highly probable (46; 16%), probable (80; 62%), possible (44; 15%) and unlikely (21; 7%). 221 identified one suspected medicine, with 95% of these reporting at least one symptom known to be an ADR. Of 227 providing feedback, 139 (61%) found SE-PAST useful, 160 (71%) felt motivated to discuss their experience with a health professional and 136 (60%) were encouraged to report to regulator.</p>

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

	Conclusion: SE-PAST was easily completed and understood by people experiencing suspected ADRs and could be useful in encouraging patient reporting to health professionals and agencies



1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Development and preliminary testing of an instrument to facilitate causality assessment of suspected side effects from medicines by lay persons.

Running head: Development of causality assessment instrument for lay persons

Authors: Bernadine O'Donovan¹, Ruth M Rodgers (retired)², Anthony R Cox³, Janet Kraska²

¹Histopathology, Trinity College Dublin, Dublin 2, Ireland.

²Medway School of Pharmacy, Universities of Kent and Greenwich at Medway, Anson Building, Central Avenue, Chatham Maritime, Kent, UK ME4 4TB.

³School of Pharmacy, College of Medical and Dental Sciences, University of Birmingham, Edgbaston, Birmingham, UK B15 2TT.

Corresponding author: Bernadine O'Donovan Email: BEODONOV@tcd.ie

Tel: +353 21 4548819.

Key words: adverse drug reactions; causality assessment; patient experience; side effects

Key points:

- An instrument – the Side Effect Patient ASsessment Tool (SE-PAST) - was developed to enable lay persons to assess suspected side effects
- The primary purpose of the SE-PAST was to empower patients in their use of medicines and consultations with health professionals
- The SE-PAST was validated amongst people who had experienced a suspected side effect(s) from a medicine
- The majority of participants found the SE-PAST easy to use and a potentially useful healthcare tool
- Further work is required to confirm its reliability/validity and to determine its ability to improve consultations with health professionals

Word count: 3328

Disclosure: This study was funded by the Medway School of Pharmacy. Some preliminary results from this work were presented at the EuroDURG meeting held in Glasgow, UK (November 2017). The work constitutes part of the PhD thesis of Bernadine O'Donovan, which is available on-line at <https://kar.kent.ac.uk/66995/>

Abstract

Purpose: Research into causality assessment tools enabling patients to assess suspected adverse drug reactions (ADRs) is limited. Supporting patients with tools could improve their confidence in discussions with health professionals and encourage reporting of suspected ADRs to regulators. This study describes development and preliminary evaluation of an instrument: Side Effect Patient ASsessment Tool (SE-PAST).

Methods:

SE-PAST was developed from survey and interview data involving patients experiencing suspected ADRs. It included 10 statements enabling causality assessment, covering timing, additional information sources and experiences, with four options: yes/no/don't know/not applicable. Scoring and weighting resulted in four categories of causal association: highly probable, probable, possible, unlikely.

Validation involved obtaining feedback from 31 individuals experiencing an ADR. Evaluation involved on-line distribution through patient support groups and comparison of reported symptoms to known ADRs.

Results:

Validators found SE-PAST easy to read (31), to understand (27) and complete (29). 294 respondents completed SE-PAST on-line, with 98% completing eight or more causality assessment statements. Symptoms were categorised as: highly probable (46; 16%), probable (80; 62%), possible (44; 15%) and unlikely (21; 7%). 221 identified one suspected medicine, with 95% of these reporting at least one symptom known to be an ADR.

1
2
3
4 Of 227 providing feedback, 139 (61%) found SE-PAST useful, 160 (71%) felt motivated to
5
6 discuss their experience with a health professional and 136 (60%) were encouraged to report
7
8 to regulator.
9

10 11 **Conclusion:**

12
13
14
15 SE-PAST was easily completed and understood by people experiencing suspected ADRs and
16
17 could be useful in encouraging patient reporting to health professionals and agencies.
18
19

20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

For Review Only

Development and testing of an instrument to facilitate causality assessment of suspected side effects from medicines by lay persons.

Introduction

Adverse drug reactions (ADRs) are common and can severely impact on peoples' daily lives.¹

ADRs are all types of undesired effects caused by medicine - these unintended effects are sometimes referred to as side effects.² While ADRs are always negative, side effects can be predicted and include beneficial as well as harmful effects. The terms ADRs and SE are frequently used interchangeably in patient information. While patient adherence to medicines is essential for positive health outcomes, consistent patient adherence can be difficult to achieve.^{3,4} ADRs have been identified as one of the most important barriers to patients' adherence.^{3,5} Yet studies suggest that, for some people, suspected adverse effects they raise with health professionals are dismissed.^{6,7} Person-centredness in healthcare is increasingly advocated^{8,9}, which requires exploration and acknowledgement of individuals' personal experiences. Facilitating individuals to describe their experiences of ADRs could enable useful discussions with health professionals about treatments and provide medicine regulators with valuable data to improve public health. Health professionals also need to recognise individuals' ability to identify ADRs for themselves, in order to appreciate the impact these may have on daily life and on future adherence to medicines.

Several studies have illustrated the mechanisms used by lay people to identify ADRs, and proposed a framework for understanding these.^{10,11,12} People use five cognitive domains to help identify ADRs, based on the Self-Regulation model of health behaviour: identity; timeline;

1
2
3
4 cause; consequences and control. Using these, a cognitive schema which facilitates evaluation
5
6 and identification of symptoms potentially caused by a medicine has been described: identity
7
8 (symptoms/label); cause; timeline; consequences and cure.¹¹ This framework provides insight
9
10 into patient experience and can highlight the impact which ADRs have on their lives.^{11,13,14}

11
12
13 People use their previous personal health experiences or knowledge of others' experiences¹¹
14
15 and timing of symptoms in relation to medicines use to identify ADRs.^{15,16} The majority employ
16
17 temporal associations to link symptoms to medicines and display knowledge and accuracy in
18
19 identifying experiences as ADRs. Some use additional information from a range of sources,
20
21 such as patient information leaflets (PILs), supplied with all dispensed and purchased
22
23 medicines in the EU, to confirm suspected ADRs.¹⁷ These fundamental processes for assessing
24
25 causality parallel those employed by healthcare professionals¹⁶ and suggest that a
26
27 standardised method could be effectively used by lay people to carry out a coherent causality
28
29 assessment.
30
31
32
33

34 Causality assessment is an essential function of pharmacovigilance centres where
35
36 standardised, highly structured methods are used. Instruments available for assessing causality
37
38 are however designed for use by professionals working in these centres and were not created
39
40 for use by general clinicians or patients.^{18,19} Few patient-focused instruments exist. One
41
42 instrument for patient self-assessment of ADRs was developed and tested in Thailand²⁰ where
43
44 access to sources of medicines information, such as PILs, is very limited.²¹ This novel
45
46 instrument, which incorporated a previously validated checklist of potential side effects from
47
48 medicines²², displayed reliable psychometric properties in preliminary testing and received
49
50 positive evaluations from patients, but has undergone no further testing. A patient-reported
51
52 adverse drug event (ADE) questionnaire, also incorporating checklists, was developed and
53
54 validated in the Netherlands²³, designed for use in clinical trials and post-marketing studies,
55
56 rather than in clinical practice. An assessment tool designed to help patients decide whether
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 symptoms they experience are linked to their medicines, the RxISK Report, is available on the
5
6 Canadian RxISK drug safety website.²⁴ Generic assessment tools such as these could aid
7
8 patients in deciding whether to report experiences they suspect to be ADRs to health
9
10 professionals. They may also increase confidence to initiate such discussions, increasing the
11
12 patient-centredness of consultations. In addition, it may encourage more reporting to national
13
14 regulatory agencies, which have increasingly advocated and facilitated direct patient
15
16 reporting.²⁵ We therefore set out to develop an instrument for this purpose for use in the UK
17
18
19 setting.
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

27 **Objectives**

- 28 • To develop an instrument to enable lay persons to assess suspected side effects
 - 29 • To validate the instrument amongst people experiencing a suspected side effect(s)
 - 30 • To further validate the instrument in a broader population
 - 31 • To determine the perceived usefulness of the assessment instrument
- 32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

48 **Methods**

49 *Ethical issues*

50 Study approval was obtained from the [Anonymised for review (REF xx)]. Comprehensive
51 information describing the purpose of the study was provided and the on-line survey potential
52 participants were required to access this information prior to completing the instrument.
53

54 Written consent was obtained for interviewees.
55

56 *Instrument development*

57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 The instrument developed was based on the Self-Regulation Model of Health Behaviours^{26,27}
5
6 and the Thai patient causality assessment tool.²⁰ Findings of two further studies involving
7
8 patients in England who had experienced an ADR were also utilised: a survey exploring
9
10 information sources used to find out about ADRs²⁸ and in-depth interviews exploring in detail
11
12 the cognitive processes used to identify and confirm ADRs.²⁸ The term 'side effect(s)' was
13
14 selected for use in the instrument as inclusive wording that would be more familiar to
15
16 respondents than ADR and that would encourage reporting of mild/minor effects. For the
17
18 purpose of this paper the terms 'ADRs' and 'side effects' are used interchangeably.
19
20
21

22
23 The instrument, Side Effect Patient ASsessment Tool (SE-PAST), comprised:
24
25

26 Section A – Background information, describing suspected ADR experience, medicines being
27
28 used, suspected causative medicine, allergies and medical conditions, open/closed questions
29
30 covering timing, impact on daily life (four-point scale: none, mild, moderate, severe). Basic
31
32 demographic questions - gender, age group and education level - were included to enable an
33
34 assessment of the population using the instrument.
35
36

37
38 Section B – Self-assessment tool with ten statements, with four possible responses ('Yes', 'No',
39
40 'Don't know', 'Not applicable'), with a scoring system to calculate a score, which could be
41
42 categorised using a probability key. Scores were assigned to one of four degrees of causal
43
44 association: highly probable, probable, possible, unlikely. The format of the tool was similar to
45
46 the Naranjo algorithm, due to its simplicity. The weighting of the score for each statement was
47
48 also based on the Naranjo algorithm.²⁹
49
50
51

52 *Validation processes*

53
54

55
56 Face validity was assessed by three pharmacist members of the research team, then by
57
58 members of a public engagement group. The latter were asked to provide feedback on
59
60

1
2
3
4 instrument content and format. Following this, minor format amendments were made and the
5
6 instrument was validated with adult English residents who had experienced a suspected ADR.

7
8 These consisted of (i) interviewees from the study which informed the instrument
9
10 development²⁸ and (ii) members of the public known to the research team who had
11
12 experienced an ADR. All completed a paper copy of the instrument, then provided feedback on
13
14 its' structure, clarity, and usability, their general opinion and any suggestions for improvement.
15
16 Participants could provide feedback by returning a form by post, or through telephone
17
18 interview, both covering the same questions. No personal identifiable information was
19
20 recorded.
21
22
23
24

25 An electronic version of the instrument was then developed for online distribution using
26
27 Qualtrics®. This assigned scores automatically to each response and calculated the score,
28
29 avoiding the need for respondents to do so. To assess the potential value of the instrument,
30
31 participants completing the SE-PAST were invited to respond to additional questions covering
32
33 its usefulness and its potential for encouraging them to report their suspected side effect to
34
35 the UK regulatory authority or talk to a health professional about it. All responses were
36
37 anonymous.
38
39
40
41

42 Patient support groups/organisations with a record of encouraging patient engagement and
43
44 supporting health self-management were approached via email to post a recruitment
45
46 statement with a link to the instrument on their website. The link remained open for five
47
48 months (April 2016-August 2016).
49

50 51 *Data analysis*

52
53
54
55 Data from the online survey were downloaded into SPSS for Windows V23 for analysis. Simple
56
57 descriptive statistics were used to report patient characteristics. Medicines suspected as
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 having caused reported suspected ADRs were classified into major therapeutic areas according
5
6 to the British National Formulary (BNF version 72). To assess external validity, symptoms
7
8 reported were assessed by review of the Summary of Product Characteristics available on-line
9
10 for the reported suspect medicine (www.emc.org) and, if not found, in published case reports.
11
12

13 The ten causality assessment statements were assessed for internal consistency using
14
15 Cronbach's alpha, accepting a value of 0.7 as indicating acceptable consistency. Missing
16
17 statements in the causality assessment tool were assigned a value of 0 (equivalent to don't
18
19 know/does not apply) to enable calculation of probability levels for all respondents. Chi-
20
21 squared test was used to assess the relationship between completion of statements and
22
23 probability level, utilising a statistical significance level of $p \leq 0.05$.
24
25

26
27 Free-text descriptions of suspected side effect experiences were transferred into Excel and
28
29 categorised using a simple coding frame covering impacts and methods of identification.
30
31
32
33
34
35

36 **Results**

37 38 39 40 *Initial validation*

41
42
43 There were 31 individuals who took part in the initial face and content validation of the SE-
44
45 PAST, 11 were interviewees from a previous study and 20 were members of the public known
46
47 to the research team. A majority were female (21; 68%) 14 were aged 50 or below, 11 aged 51
48
49 to 70 and six were over 70. Just over half were university educated (16; 52%). The time taken
50
51 to complete the entire instrument ranged from five to forty-five minutes, but 24 (70%)
52
53 completed it in less than 15 minutes. All 31 judged the instrument easy to read, 87% (27) easy
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 to understand, 97% thought it was clearly laid out and only one thought it was too long.

5
6 Following this only changes to the initial instructions were made, to improve clarity.
7
8

9 10 *Online survey - Response rates and demographic details*

11
12
13 In total 15 patient support groups/organisations were approached via email and seven agreed
14 to post a recruitment statement with a link to the instrument on their website. The SE-PAST
15 instrument was accessed online a total of 761 times during the five month period, with 563
16 people (74.0%) consenting to participate. Of these, 312 subsequently accessed the instrument,
17 however 18 then indicated in response to the first question that they had experienced no
18 suspected side effects. Of the remaining 294 respondents, the majority were female (208;
19 71.5%) a high proportion were aged over 60 (185; 63.3%) and 168 (57.9%) were university
20 educated. (Table 1)
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29

30
31
32 <<TABLE 1>>
33
34

35 *Side effect experiences*

36
37
38 Details of their suspected side effect experience was provided by 294 respondents as free-text
39 comments. These included 255 (86.7%) who described physical symptoms, 46 (15.6%)
40 describing psychological symptoms and 74 (25.2%) describing social impacts (Table 2).
41
42
43
44
45

46 <<TABLE 2>>
47
48

49 Most (292) gave information about when the experience occurred; almost half (136; 49.6%)
50 experienced the suspected in the past six months, while the remaining respondents indicated
51 experiences more than six months previously. All but one rated the severity of their
52 experience; 115 (39.2%) considered it severe, 112 (38.2%) moderate, 55 (18.5%) mild and only
53
54
55
56
57
58 11 (3.7%) as having no impact.
59
60

Causality assessment

Most respondents (283) listed their medicines at the time of the suspected side effect; 85 (30.0%) reported using one medicine, while 198 (70.0%) reported using more than one (Table 1). Despite the majority of respondents using multiple medicines, only 24 (8.2%) were unsure what drug had caused the suspected side effect, and 49 (16.7%) reported combined/multiple medicines either within or across therapeutic areas, whereas 221 (75.2%) respondents identified a single medicine they thought had caused their symptom(s). The proportion who cited multiple possible causative medicines increased with the number of medicines reported as being used (Figure 1).

<<FIGURE 1>>

The therapeutic areas were determined for the causative medicines cited by all 221 who cited a single medicine plus a further 14 who cited two medicines in the same therapeutic area. The most frequently cited therapeutic groups of medicines reported to cause side effects were those acting on the cardiovascular system (74; 31.5%), central nervous system (66; 28.1%), and endocrine system (34; 14.5%). Females identified medicines acting on the central nervous system most frequently (59/167; 35.3%), while males most frequently identified medicines acting on the cardiovascular system (37/66; 56.1%).

All ten questions in the causality assessment section were completed by 184 respondents (62.6%), 80 (27.2%) completed nine and 25 (8.5%) completed eight, thus 98.3% completed at least eight statements (Table 3). Three respondents did not complete any of this section. Responses to the causality statements were supported by free-text comments (Table 2).

1
2
3
4 For the 184 respondents with fully completed responses, 38 (20.7%) experiences were
5
6 categorised as highly probable, 119 (64.7%) probable, 18 (9.8%) possible and nine (4.9%)
7
8 unlikely to be an ADR. Imputing scores of 0 (equating to a response of either do not know/does
9
10 not apply) for missing responses allows estimation of causal association for 291 respondents.
11
12 Based on all those completing any causality statements, 46 (15.8%) experiences were
13
14 categorised as highly probable, 180 (61.9%) probable 44 (15.1%) possible and 21 (7.2%)
15
16 unlikely to be an ADR. Hence completion of all questions increased the likelihood of a higher
17
18 score ($p < 0.001$), and therefore a higher level of probability.
19
20
21
22

23 *Internal and external validity*

24
25 Internal consistency measured using Cronbach's alpha was below the acceptable level, at 0.53.
26
27 External validation, assessed by comparison of reported symptoms to known ADRs as
28
29 documented in the current Summary of Product Characteristics found that of the 221 who
30
31 identified one potentially causative medicine, the majority (194; 95.0%) reported at least one
32
33 known ADR. For 16 respondents (7.2%) none of the symptoms were listed, and a further two
34
35 respondents described symptoms indicating potential lack of efficacy. For the symptoms
36
37 described by the remaining nine respondents a judgement was not possible, due to insufficient
38
39 information.
40
41
42
43
44

45 *Perceived value of the instrument*

46
47
48 Following completion of the SE-PAST, 227 respondents agreed to answer additional questions
49
50 on the instrument's value. Of these, 139 (61.2%) found the SE-PAST useful, 136 (59.9%) were
51
52 encouraged to report their suspected ADR to the relevant agency and 160 (70.5%) felt
53
54 motivated to discuss their suspected ADR with a health professional.
55
56
57
58
59
60

Discussion

Main findings

The SE-PAST instrument was found to be easy to use, not onerous in terms of time and seen as potentially valuable by a majority of respondents who had experienced a suspected side effect from a medicine. The background information section of the instrument was designed to facilitate recall of the event and record this, while the causality assessment tool facilitated a simple calculation of a probability level for the association with a medicine. Taken together, these details have the potential to enable those who experience a symptom they consider to be related to a medicine to assess for themselves the likelihood that it could be a side effect. This could lead to the provision of relevant information either to a health professional which might lead to treatment changes to reduce the risk of future ADRs, and improve adherence, or to a regulatory agency, adding to the data used to protect public health from the harms of medicines.

Comparison to literature

Although other instruments designed to facilitate self-assessment of symptom causality exist, they do have limitations. The use of symptom checklists, used in both the Dutch and Thai instruments, while facilitating expression of experiences, can result in over-reporting of adverse events. They can create confusion in respondents unable to distinguish between events potentially related/unrelated to medicines. The Thai instrument²⁰ was tested to ensure that it was clear, consistent and easy for lay persons to use and facilitated them in calculating a probability level. However it required the recall of a large amount of detailed information about their experience, use of information sources and potentially causative medicines, which, given the dispensing practices and lack of medicine information in Thailand, led to recall

1
2
3
4 difficulties. No weightings were given to the individual statements used in the causality
5
6 assessment tool, in contrast to standard methods, such as the Naranjo method, on which it
7
8 was based. This instrument was validated by comparison to information contained within
9
10 medical records and probability levels were strongly correlated with respondents' perceived
11
12 certainty of their experience being an ADR. Completion of the instrument did not increase
13
14 respondents' degree of certainty in the association of the medicine with the suspected side
15
16 effect, but over 80% considered it helped them to assess their symptom.
17
18
19

20
21 The developers of the Dutch instrument concluded that its reliability for facilitating patients in
22
23 clinical trials to report ADRs was limited and suggested that it required improvement for this
24
25 purpose.²³ Both this and the Thai instrument did show satisfactory reliability using the test-re-
26
27 test method, however internal consistency of the Thai instrument was relatively low
28
29 (Cronbach's alpha = 0.614), similar to that for SE-PAST, while the Dutch instrument was not
30
31 subjected to this analysis. In reality all these instruments are designed to gather information
32
33 on actual experiences, rather than attempting to measure traits or behaviours, hence the need
34
35 for internal consistency can be questioned. External validity of the Dutch instrument assessed
36
37 by comparison to the Summary of Product Characteristics found that 73% of symptoms were
38
39 known ADRs²², lower than was found for the SE-PAST (95%).
40
41
42
43

44 However, the purpose of the instrument was primarily to empower patients in their use of
45
46 medicines and consultations with health professionals, therefore ease of use and appropriate
47
48 level of content are probably more relevant. Both the initial and online validation of the SE-
49
50 PAST indicated good face and content validity, as well as potential usefulness. The SE-PAST is
51
52 much shorter than the existing instruments as it does not contain a symptom checklist and
53
54 when used online it also avoids the need for respondents to calculate probability levels
55
56 themselves. There is of course potential for an instrument such as this to adversely affect
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 adherence, if it confirms a suspicion that a medicine could be related to an unwanted
5
6 symptom. Therefore advice is given to users to discuss their experience with a health
7
8 professional, if the probability level is possible or higher.
9

10 11 *Limitations*

12
13
14
15 We were not able to evaluate the individual reported experiences of those completing the SE-
16
17 PAST to confirm the likely causality of the event using information from medical records. While
18
19 this is a desirable method of assessing validity, it is not essential for the instrument to be of
20
21 value in empowering patients to discuss suspected ADRs with health professionals or to trigger
22
23 a report to a relevant regulatory agency. Reliability testing using test-re-testing was not
24
25 undertaken. Those involved in initial validation were all known to the team, either directly or
26
27 as interviewees in a previous study. The sample for the online validation were of necessity self-
28
29 selected, the majority were university-educated and most were female. Females are known to
30
31 have higher use of patient support groups and to use groups differently from men, but they
32
33 also use more medicines and have higher rates of ADRs.³⁰ A large number of the people who
34
35 accessed the online instrument failed to complete it. The reasons for this cannot be
36
37 ascertained and could be many and varied. In addition, not all those who completed the SE-
38
39 PAST responded to evaluation questions and may have been less likely to consider it useful.
40
41
42
43
44

45 *Relevance to practice*

46
47
48
49 A causality assessment instrument specifically developed for lay use may help to facilitate
50
51 effective discussions between patients and healthcare professionals about suspected ADRs,
52
53 empowering patients and improving patient-centredness of consultations. While such an
54
55 instrument could also prompt the discontinuation of medicines, it should be acknowledged
56
57 that patients frequently discontinue medicines of their own volition, either to test their
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 suspicions of side effects themselves or to otherwise evaluate its effects.^{12,31} The instrument
5
6 could also contribute to increasing the number of, and enhancing the quality of, reports to
7
8 regulatory authorities which do not require causation to be proven prior to reporting. They can
9
10 then perform further causality tests and signal generation to find confirmed ADRs.
11
12
13 Incorporation of self-assessment questions such as those used in SE-PAST into direct patient
14
15 ADR reporting could provide both lay person and pharmacovigilance experts with useful
16
17 information.
18
19
20
21
22
23

24 **Conclusion**

25
26
27
28 The SE-PAST instrument facilitates lay persons to self-assess causality of suspected ADRs from
29
30 medicines sufficiently to guide their decisions about whether to discuss these experiences with
31
32 health professionals or report them to regulatory authorities. It is easy to use but further work
33
34 is required to confirm its reliability and validity and to determine its ability to lead to improved
35
36 consultations or direct reporting to regulators.
37
38
39
40
41
42

43 **Acknowledgements**

44
45
46 The support of the public engagement, patient support groups and interviewees are
47
48 acknowledged. This study was funded by the [anonymised for review].
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

References

1. World Health Organisation. World health statistics 2014 [Internet] Available from: http://www.who.int/gho/publications/world_health_statistics/2014/en/ Accessed 30 April 2018.
2. Edwards, I.R., & Aronson, J.K. Adverse drug reactions: definitions, diagnosis and management. *Lancet*. (2000); 356(9237), 1255-9.
3. Leporini, C., Giovambattista De Sarro G., & Emilio Russo, E. Adherence to therapy and adverse drug reactions: is there a link? *Expert Opinion on Drug Safety*. (2014); 13(1), 41-55, DOI: [10.1517/14740338.2014.947260](https://doi.org/10.1517/14740338.2014.947260)
4. De Geest, S., & Sabaté, E. Adherence to Long-Term Therapies: Evidence for Action. *European Journal of Cardiovascular Nursing*. (2003); 2(4), 323. doi: [10.1016/S1474-5151\(03\)00091-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1474-5151(03)00091-4)
5. Berhe, D.F., Taxis K., Haaijer-Ruskamp F.M., Mulugeta A., Mengistu Y.T, Burgerhof J.G.M., & Mol P.G.M. Impact of adverse drug events and treatment satisfaction on patient adherence with antihypertensive medication - a study in ambulatory patients. *British Journal of Clinical Pharmacology*, (2017);83(9), 2107-2117. doi: [10.1111/bcp.13312](https://doi.org/10.1111/bcp.13312)
6. Golomb B, McGraw J, Evans M, Dimsdale, J. Physician Response to Patient Reports of Adverse Drug Effects Implications For Patient-Targeted Adverse Effect Surveillance. *Drug Safety*, (2007);30 (8), 669-675.

- 1
2
3
4 7. Krska, J, Morecroft, C. Patients' use of information about medicine side effects in
5
6 relation to experiences of suspected adverse drug reactions: a cross-sectional survey in
7
8 medical in-patients. *Drug Safety*, (2013);36 (8), 673–680
9
10
- 11 8. Epstein RM, Street RL. The values and value of patient-centered care. *Annals of Family*
12
13 *Medicine*, (2011); 9, 100-103.
14
15
- 16 9. Naldemirci O, Lydahl D, Britten N, Elam M, Moore L, Wolf, A. Tenacious assumptions of
17
18 person-centred care? Exploring tensions and variations in practice. *Health*, (2018);22
19
20 (1), 54-71
21
22
- 23 10. Johnson MO, Folkman S. Side effect and disease related symptom representations
24
25 among HIV+ adults on antiretroviral therapy. *Psychology, Health & Medicine*,
26
27 (2004);9(2), 139-148.
28
29
- 30 11. DeWitt JE, Sorofman BA. A model for understanding patient attribution of adverse
31
32 drug reaction symptoms. *Drug Information Journal*, (1999); 33(3), 907-920.
33
34
- 35 12. Aslani, P., Hamrosi, K., Tong, V., Chen, T.F., Cook, J., Fois, R., McGarry, T., Moore, C.,
36
37 Peters, R., Spagnardi, S. and Whitelock, K., 2018. consumer opinions on adverse events
38
39 associated with medicines and vaccines. *Patient preference and adherence*, 12,
40
41 p.1383.
42
43
44
45
- 46 13. Johnson M, Neilands TB. Coping with HIV treatment side effects, Conceptualization,
47
48 measurement, and linkages. *AIDS & Behavior*, (2007);11(4), 575–585.
49
50
- 51 14. De Smedt RH, Jaarsma T, Ranchor AV, Van der Meer K, Groenier KH, Haaijer-Ruskamp
52
53 FM, Denig P. Coping with adverse drug events in patients with heart failure: Exploring
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3
4 the role of medication beliefs and perceptions. *Psychology & Health*, (2012);27(5), 570-
5
6 587.
7
8
9
10 15. Chaipichit N, Krska J, Pratipanawatr, T et al. A qualitative study to explore how patients
11 identify and assess symptoms as adverse drug reactions. *European Journal of Clinical*
12
13 *Pharmacology*, (2014);70(5),607-615.
14
15
16
17 16. Krska J, Anderson C, et al. The importance of direct patient reporting of suspected
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
17. Hughes L, Whittlesea C, Luscombe D. Patients' knowledge and perceptions of the side-effects of OTC medication. *Clinical Pharmacology & Therapeutics*, (2002);27(4):243-8.
18. Agbabiaka TB, Savović J, Ernst E. Methods for causality assessment of adverse drug reactions: a systematic review. *Drug Safety*, (2008);31(1):21-37.
19. Théophile H, André M, et al. Comparison of three methods (an updated logistic probabilistic method, the Naranjo and Liverpool algorithms) for the evaluation of routine pharmacovigilance case reports using consensual expert judgement as reference. *Drug Safety*, (2013);36(10):1033-44.
20. Jarernsiripornkul N, Krska J et al. Initial development and testing of an instrument for patient self-assessment of adverse drug reactions. *Pharmacoepidemiology & Drug Safety* (2015); 25(1):54-63.
21. Phueanpinit P, Pongwecharak J, Krska J, Jarernsiripornkul N. Medicine information leaflets for non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs in Thailand. *International Journal of Clinical Pharmacy* (2015); 38(1):25-29.

- 1
2
3
4 22. Jarernsiripornkul N, Krska, J et al. Patient reporting of potential adverse drug reactions:
5
6 a methodological study. *British Journal of Clinical Pharmacology* (2002);53(3): 318–
7
8 325.
9
10
11 23. De Vries ST, Denig P et al. Construct and concurrent validity of a patient-reported
12
13 adverse drug event questionnaire: a cross-sectional study. *Health and Quality of Life*
14
15 *Outcomes*, (2014); 12(1):1-19.
16
17
18 24. RxISK. Available from: <http://rxisk.org>. Accessed 30 April 2018.
19
20
21 25. Avery AJ, Anderson C, Bond CM, Krska J et al. Evaluation of patient reporting of
22
23 adverse drug reactions to the UK 'Yellow Card Scheme': literature review, descriptive
24
25 and qualitative analyses, and questionnaire surveys. *Health Technology Assessment*,
26
27 (2011);15(20):1-234.
28
29
30 26. Levanthal H, Meyer D, Nerenz D. 'The Common Sense Representation of Illness
31
32 Danger.' In *Medical Psychology* (1980). NY: Pergamon Press.
33
34
35 27. Levanthal H, Levanthal EA, Breland JL. Cognitive Science Speaks to the 'Common-
36
37 Sense' of Chronic Illness Management. *Annals of Behavioural Medicine*,
38
39 (2011);41(2):152-163.
40
41
42 28. O' Donovan B, Ph.D thesis, Universities of Kent and Greenwich, 2017
43
44 (https://kar.kent.ac.uk//66995/)
45
46
47 29. Naranjo CA et al. A method of estimating the probability of adverse drug reactions.
48
49 *Clinical Pharmacology & Therapeutics*, (1981);30(2):239-245
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3
4 30. Mo PK, Malik SH, Coulson NS. Gender differences in computer-mediated
5
6 communication: a systematic literature review of online health-related support
7
8 groups. Patient Educ Couns (2009); 75(1): 16-24
9
10
11 31. Pound P, Britten N, Morgan M, Yardley L, Pope C, Daker-White G, Campbell R.
12
13 Resisting medicines: a synthesis of qualitative studies of medicine taking. Social
14
15 science & medicine. 2005 Jul 1;61(1):133-55
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

For Review Only

Table 1 Characteristics of respondents

Characteristic		Frequency (%)
Gender (<i>n</i> =291)	Female	208(71.5)
	Male	83(28.5)
Age (years) (<i>n</i> =292)	Below 40	27(9.2)
	41-50	31(10.6)
	51-60	49(16.8)
	61-70	105(36.0)
	71-80	68 (23.3)
	Over 80	12(4.1)
Education level (<i>n</i> =290)	School	62(21.4)
	Further education	60(20.7)
	University	168(57.9)
No. of medicines (<i>n</i> =294)	None stated	11(3.7)
	One	85(28.9)
	2-4	123(41.8)
	5-9	60(20.4)
	10 or more	15(5.1)

Table 2 Extracts from free-text comments illustrating impacts and methods of identification

Respondent details	Suspected medicine	Description
Male, age 61-70, university-educated, on 2-4 medicines, causality level probable, moderate impact (P138)	simvastatin	Taking simvastatin, I began to experience pains in the low back and hip which affected me during the night. I would go to back with no pain and then around 2 or 3 o clock in the morning I would be woken by the pains in the hips so that I was unable to get back to sleep again. I discussed this with the doctor who didn't believe the statin was the cause. But in the end I stopped taking the drug. After about 9 months the pains had finally disappeared. At that point the doctor persuaded me to re-start the simvastatin, I agreed, and within 2 weeks the nocturnal hip pains had returned.
Female, age 41-50, university-educated, on 2-4 medicines, causality level probable, mild impact (P147)	topiramate	Slower cognitive processing, which manifests itself particularly as sometimes groping for words or having difficulty forming/speaking words. This is worse when speaking a foreign language. I also sometimes find that it is harder for me to begin concentrating on something, like reading or writing (once I am concentrating, and into the flow of the work, the effect is less noticeable).
Female, age 71-80, left school at 16/younger, on 2-4 medicines, causality level probable, moderate impact (P179)	sertraline	A constant feeling of weariness of mental capacity and lack of enthusiasm, somehow encouraging thoughts of a depressive nature. Irritable digestion, difficulty in concentrating.
Male, age 61-70, further education, on 2-4 medicines, causality level probable, severe impact (P196)	bendroflumethiazide	I was prescribed bendroflumethiazide to reduce swelling in my ankles. I developed gout, specifically in my knees and elbows. At one point I was only able to walk with the aid of a crutch. The pains in my arms and elbows was less severe and could be relieved by massage. I put up with the discomfort for some time not realising that it was linked with taking a diuretic. A pharmacist friend made me aware of the links between diuretics and gout. I stopped taking the bendroflumethiazide. The gout symptoms slowly went away and have now completely disappeared.
Female, age 61-70, further education, on 10 or more medicines, causality level probable, severe impact (P259)	cinacalcit	[Cinacalcit] definitely, because I became violently sick whenever I took it and stopped when I stopped taking them. According to my doctor it is already a known side effect.

Table 3 Responses to causality statements

Statement	Number responding				
	Yes	No	Don't know	Does not apply	TOTAL
I experienced this effect(s) for the first time after taking this medicine.	214	63	12	2	291
I have experienced similar effect(s) from this medicine or a related medicine in the past	103	126	17	0	246
When I stopped taking the medicine the effect(s) decreased in severity or disappeared altogether.	176	23	11	0	210
When I took the medicine again the effect(s) reappeared.	16	98	9	167	290
When I increased the dose the effect(s) became more severe.	84	29	15	163	291
When I decreased the dose the effect(s) became less severe.	70	40	21	160	291
I confirmed the effect(s) with some or all of the following information sources – doctors, pharmacists, information leaflets with medicine, the internet or medicine books.	257	20	6	0	283
I think that something else apart from the medicine could have caused the effect(s).	19	206	62	0	287
I think an existing medical condition or conditions could have led to the effect(s).	35	171	76	0	282
I think that other medicine(s) that I was using at the time could have caused the effect(s).	16	216	47	12	291

Figure 1 Number of potentially causative medicines cited in relation to number being used

