



ISSN: 2277- 7695
TPI 2016; 5(1): 99-105
© 2016 TPI
www.thepharmajournal.com
Received: 14-11-2015
Accepted: 15-12-2015

Maheshkumar VP
Department of Pharmacy,
Annamalai University,
Chidambaram- 608002, Tamil
Nadu, India.

Dhanapal CK
Department of Pharmacy,
Annamalai University,
Chidambaram- 608002, Tamil
Nadu, India.

Ramakrishna Rao M
Department of Medicine, Rajah
Muthiah Medical College
Hospital, Annamalai University,
Chidambaram- 608002, Tamil
Nadu, India.

Correspondence:
Maheshkumar VP
Department of Pharmacy,
Annamalai University,
Chidambaram- 608002, Tamil
Nadu, India.

Outcomes of clinical pharmacist's interventions in solving drug-related problems in geriatric patients of rural teaching hospital

Maheshkumar VP, Dhanapal CK, Ramakrishna Rao M

Abstract

This study was performed to assess outcomes of clinical pharmacist's interventions in solving drug-related problems in geriatric patients in the Medicine ward of Rajah Muthiah Medical College and Hospital, Annamalai University, during one year from January 2013 to January 2014. Demographic analyses of this prospective study revealed that out of 520 patients, 342 (65.76%) were males and 178 (34.23%) were females. The maximum patients were in the age group of 60-64 (38.84%) range lead to a significant increase in the number of medications. The most common diseases associated systems were cardiovascular system 147 (28.26%) patients. 93% of geriatric patients belong to rural area and only 6.34% geriatric patients belong to urban area (town). Most of the geriatric patients (95%) were illiterate. 93.84% of geriatric patients were married and 5.19% were widower. Only 0.38% of geriatric patients were never married. The study reveals that 56.53% of geriatric patients were prescribed 6-8 drugs for their treatment of diseases followed by 9-12 drugs (23.84%), ≤ 5 drugs (11.73%) and >12 drugs (7.88%). PCNE v 6.2 DRP system classification tool was used in this study to find out the Causes of DRP, pharmacist intervention in solving DRP and Outcomes of intervention. The drug selection is the most frequently identified cause for DRPs. Poly pharmacy and the hospital stay are significantly associated with various DRPs. More interventions were provided to the patient level, compare with prescriber level. Patient medication counseling is the most intervention in the study. Interventions proposed by a clinical pharmacist to tackle or avert medication related issues are to a huge degree acknowledged and endorsed by the prescribers. Most of the interventions are of high clinical importance. Outcomes of interventions indicate that almost 87.45% of problems are totally solved, by pharmacist's interventions in this study; it is expanding proof that support and intercession of clinical pharmacists in geriatric health care have a positive influence on clinical outcomes.

Keywords: Causes of DRP, Drug related Problem, Geriatric patients, Outcomes of intervention

1. Introduction

Drug-related problem (DRP) can be defined as: 'an event or circumstance involving drug therapy that actually or potentially interferes with desired health outcomes'. In this point of view, a potential problem means a circumstance that may consequence in drug-related morbidity or fatality if no exploit is carried out; an actual problem is marked with signs and symptoms^[1]. It should be differentiated now that the use of the appearance problem in the phrase ,drug-related problem is used to specify a drug related incident bendable to recognition, healing, or more aptly, avoidance, and should not be understood in the regular usage wherever it softly gives the thought that ,something (mystery, inconsistency, confusion) is incorrect here^[2]. The very important element of this explanation is the consequence of the problem on the health-end effect of the pharmacotherapy. There is no drug-related problem if there is no possible persuade^[3]. A DRP arises when patient occurrences or is likely to experience whichever a disease or symptom having an exact or unspecified association through drug therapy^[4].

Charles and Linda (1990) categorized DRPs into following eight categories; untreated indications, improper drug selection, sub-therapeutic dosage, failure to receive drugs, over dosage, adverse drug reactions, drug interactions, drug use without indication.

Many ways of classifications are available to code drug related problems, but all those classifications have not been tested for validity and reproducibility. Among classifications which are continuously tested is PCNE classification. Its basic classification has 4 primary domains for problems, 8 primary domains for causes, 5 primary domains for Interventions and 4 primary domains for the outcome of the intervention. Classification of DRPs can serve as a cynosure for establishing a systematic process for pharmacists to put in appreciably to positive patient outcomes^[5].

The US Health and Human Services define Clinical Pharmacy as: ‘Functions performed by pharmacists on behalf of the patient to identify, resolve and prevent drug-related problems’ [6]. A Clinical pharmacist can play a very important role by addressing the whole range of drug therapy in hospitals and, in general, the clinical pharmacy services have been reported to improve patient care by reducing inappropriate prescribing [7, 8], improve disease management [9, 10] diminish adverse drug events, reduce length of stay, ADRs and mortality and give economic benefit [11]. The pharmacist’s responsibility to the optimizations of drug remedy may be evaluated by ascertaining the number of drug-related problems addressed or prevented, or by evaluating the clinical outcomes for the patients [12].

PCNE V 6.2 DRP system classification system has been significantly assessed mostly suitable classification that reveals results, and the effects are reproducible [13]. The aim of the study was to identify and describe the magnitude and types of DRPs in patients, to estimate the extent to which pharmacist plays his role in reducing the incidences of DRPs and solving drug-related issues.

Materials and Methods

This Prospective Observational and Interventional study was carried out in the Medicine ward of Rajah Muthiah Medical College and Hospital, Annamalai University during one year from January 2013 to January 2014. The research protocol was

approved by Institutional Human Ethical Committee. The study included 520 hospitalized patients of geriatric age group (≥ 60years) of both sex. Demographic data, medical and medication history were collected from the patient’s case sheet after getting consent from the patients. Then collected information was analyzed according to their age, gender and therapeutic category.

A PCNE v 6.2 DRP system classification is helpful to document DRPs amid the older as it can assist pharmacist build up the strategy to diminish DRPs. The classification tool has been authenticated and was used in a lot of previous published studies to measure DRP occurrence [14-16]. This same tool was used in this study to find out the Causes of DRP, pharmacist intervention in solving DRP and Outcomes of intervention. All collected data were scrutinized with the SPSS v 20 for data management and analyzes in the study. The socio-demographic data were calculated and expressed as percentages. The summarized results were arranged and put into a table form with the use of Microsoft word 2010.

Results and Discussion

A total of 520 geriatric cases were collected from the Rajah Muthiah Medical College and Hospital. In our total study population 342(65.76%) cases were males and 178(34.23%) were females. Tabulated data of study population is given in Table-1.

Table 1: Characteristics of hospitalized geriatric patients

| | Number of Patients | Percentage (%) |
|-----------------------------------|--------------------|----------------|
| Gender | | |
| Male | 342 | 65.76 |
| Female | 178 | 34.23 |
| Age Groups | | |
| 60 - 64 | 202 | 38.84 |
| 65 – 69 | 152 | 29.23 |
| 70 – 74 | 103 | 19.80 |
| ≥ 75 | 63 | 12.11 |
| Demographic Status | | |
| Urban | 33 | 6.34 |
| Rural | 487 | 93.65 |
| Literacy Status | | |
| Illiterate | 494 | 95 |
| literate | 26 | 5 |
| Marital Status | | |
| Never married | 2 | 0.38 |
| Separated | 3 | 0.57 |
| Widow | 27 | 5.19 |
| Married | 488 | 93.84 |
| Therapeutic Category | | |
| Cardiovascular System | 147 | 28.26 |
| Respiratory System | 103 | 19.80 |
| Hepatic System | 97 | 18.65 |
| Endocrine system | 73 | 14.03 |
| Nervous System | 41 | 7.85 |
| Gastrointestinal System | 36 | 6.92 |
| Others | 23 | 4.42 |
| Number of drugs Prescribed | | |
| ≤ 5 | 61 | 11.73 |
| 6 - 8 | 294 | 56.53 |
| 9 – 12 | 124 | 23.84 |
| > 12 | 41 | 7.88 |

Out of 520 geriatric patients, the majority of the elderly patients (38.84%) belongs to age group 60-64 years among that 123 were males and 79 were females followed by age

group 65-69 years (29.23%) among them 99 were males and 53 were female and above75 years (12.11%) patients among them 45 were males 18 were females. 93% of geriatric patients

belong to rural area and only 6.34% geriatric patients belong to urban area (Town). Most of the geriatric patients (95%) were illiterate, remaining 5% of geriatric patients were literate. A study done by Md Rafiq Islam [17] in rural area of Bangladesh (n=300) showed that 61% were illiterate. 93.84% of geriatric patients were married and 5.19% were widower. Only 0.38% of geriatric patients were never married. Geriatric patient's personal habits were observed that reveals 65.57% (n=341) of the patients used Tobacco products. 59.03 % (n=307) of patients used alcohol and habit of smoking. 4.2% of patients had habit of smoking only. 1.53% patients used only alcohol. This study indicates that most prevalent diseases were cardiovascular diseases (28.26%) followed by Respiratory diseases (19.80%), Hepatic diseases (18.65%), Endocrine diseases (14.03%), Nervous diseases (7.85%), Gastrointestinal diseases (6.92%) and other diseases (4.42%).

The majority of patients in our study had co morbid conditions. The prevalent co morbidities in our study are very similar to the ones reported in another Indian study [18]. Loss of functional reserve with aging makes geriatric patients vulnerable to the development of multiple diseases affecting different body systems. The presence of co morbidities means that multiple and complex drug therapy is required and thus the chances of ADRs and drug interactions are greater. The study reveals that 56.53% of geriatric patients were prescribed 6-8 drugs for their treatment of diseases followed by 9-12 drugs (23.84%), ≤ 5 drugs (11.73%) and >12 drugs (7.88%). Poly pharmacy unfortunately is very common in India [19] and some other countries [20-22]. It results in increased cost of treatment, which may lead to non-adherence by patients as they have more medicines than they can cope with. It also increases the risk of significant adverse drug interaction.

Table 2: Definition of DRP classification

| Code | DRP | Definition |
|------|---------------------|---|
| P1 | Adverse reactions | Patient undergoes from an adverse drug event |
| P2 | Drug choice problem | Patient gets or is going to get a mistaken (or no drug) drug for disease or condition |
| P3 | Dosing problem | Patient gets more or less than the quantity of drug he or she needs |
| P4 | Drug use problem | 1) wrong drug is taken by patient |
| P5 | Interactions | 2) No drug was taken/administered for at least one dose of entire daily dose There is a manifest or potential drug-drug or drug-food or drug-disease interaction |

Table 3: The drug-related problems on PCNE Classification

| Drug Related Problems | Number of problems | Percentage (%) |
|-----------------------|--------------------|----------------|
| Adverse drug reaction | 97 | 12.40 |
| Drug choice problem | 264 | 33.75 |
| Dosing problem | 20 | 2.55 |
| Drug use problem | 69 | 8.82 |
| Drug interaction | 332 | 42.45 |
| Total | 782 | 100 |

Out of 520 patients, total numbers of 782 DRP were identified among 481 geriatric patients. The DRP were identified that according with their definition which is revealed in the table-2. There was an average of 1.62 problems per patients. The results demonstrated that in 93.27% (n=319) of males and 91.01% (n=162) of females DRPs were recognized. While the

occurrence of DRP in male patients was moderately high, this could be due to the fact that a high number of males stayed the hospital in that exacting time. This demo-graphic report is linked study [23] in their statement in which the occurrence of DRPs was elevated in males (58.06%) as compared to females (41.93%). Though age factor was not considered with DRP in this study.

782 DRPs were examined in this study and the common of the issues were associated to drug interaction of drugs (42.45%; n=332), followed by 33.75 % (n=264) drug choice problem, 12.40 %; (n=97) adverse drug reaction, 8.82%; n=69 drug use problem and 2.55%; n=20 dosing problem is shown Table-3. More number of drugs was prescribed for geriatric patients for their multiple diseases, this leads to drug interaction.

Table 4: Factors association with DRP (n=481)

| Characters | Number of patients | DRP | | Chi- square | P* -value |
|----------------------|--------------------|------------|-----------|-------------|-----------|
| | | Yes | No | | |
| Gender | | | | | |
| Male | 342 | 319(93.27) | 23(6.72) | 0.8647 | 0.3524 |
| Female | 178 | 162(91.01) | 16(8.98) | | |
| Polypharmacy | | | | | |
| Yes | 459 | 451(98.25) | 8(1.74) | 186.9338 | 0 |
| No | 61 | 30(49.18) | 31(50.81) | | |
| Hospital stay | | | | | |
| ≤1 week | 178 | 174(97.75) | 4(2.24) | 10.7641 | 0.001035 |
| >1 Week | 342 | 307(89.76) | 35(10.23) | | |

*P< 0.05 significant

In this study, statistical dissimilarity was identified between sex and the incidence of DRP. The male patients possess a high possibility (93.27%) of having DRPs match up to female patients (91.01%). They require of confirmation to propose that biological factors related with gender may influence the drug remedy. Gender is not significant at p<0.05 (p=0.3524) to DRP. The problem of Polypharmacy is usually description as a

risk factor that adds to the incidence of DRPs in different study subjects [24, 25]. 98.25% of Polypharmacy patients were exaggerated DRP. Polypharmacy is statistically significant (p=0) with DRP. 89.76% DRP patients were stayed more than one week in the hospital. Hospital stay is significant at p< 0.05 with DRP (p=0.001).

Table 5: Causes of drug related problems

| Primary Domain | Code V6.2 | Causes of Drug Related Problems | Number of Causes | Total | Percentage (%) |
|---------------------|-----------|---|------------------|-------|----------------|
| 1. Drug Selection | C1.1 | Inappropriate drug (Beer’s criteria) | 242 | 264 | 45.36 |
| | C1.2 | No indication for drug | 5 | | |
| | C1.3 | Inappropriate combination of drug | 4 | | |
| | C1.4 | Drug duplication | 4 | | |
| | C1.5 | Multiple drugs for indication | 3 | | |
| | C1.6 | More cost effective drugs | 4 | | |
| | C1.7 | Preventive drugs not given | 2 | | |
| 2. Drug Form | C2.1 | Inappropriate drug form | 3 | 3 | 0.51 |
| 3. Dose Selection | C3.1 | Drug dose too low | 4 | 20 | 3.43 |
| | C3.2 | Drug dose too high | 6 | | |
| | C3.3 | Dosage regimen not frequent enough | 3 | | |
| | C3.4 | Dosage regimen too frequent | 4 | | |
| | C3.5 | No therapeutic monitoring | 2 | | |
| | C3.6 | Pharmacokinetic problem requiring dose adjustment | 1 | | |
| 4. Drug Use Process | C5.1 | Inappropriate dosing interval | 37 | 69 | 11.85 |
| | C5.2 | Drug underused | 5 | | |
| | C5.3 | Drug overused | 4 | | |
| | C5.4 | Drug not taken/administrated at all | 14 | | |
| | C5.5 | Wrong drug taken/administrated | 3 | | |
| | C5.6 | Drug abused | 2 | | |
| | C5.7 | Patient unable to take prescribed dosage form | 4 | | |
| 5. Logistics | C6.1 | Prescribed drug not available | 3 | 11 | 1.89 |
| | C6.2 | Prescribing error(necessary information Missing) | 6 | | |
| | C6.3 | Dispensing error(wrong drug or dose dispensed) | 2 | | |
| 6. Patient | C7.1 | Missed dose(patients forget to use/take drug) | 213 | 215 | 36.94 |
| | C7.2 | Unnecessary use of drug | 3 | | |

Moreover various causes were recognized (table-5) that be the origin of DRPs. A total of 582 causes were recognized during the study which is relatively more than those found [26] in their study. The widely held of the causes were created by drug selection (45.36%), followed by patients (36.94%), Drug use process (11.85%), Dose selection (3.43), Logistics (1.89%) and Drug form (0.51%). The outcomes from this study exposed that amongst all the causes, “drug selection” was the majority often recognized the cause for DRPs such as drug

choice problems, drug interactions. The DRPs, of causes is directly associated to the dosage selection.

Comparison between factors and classification of DRPs

In this study, some factors like Polypharmacy, hospital stay was compared with various classifications of DRP that was an adverse drug reaction, Drug choice problem, dosing problem, Drug use problem and Drug interaction.

Table 6: Comparison between factors and ADR

| Factors | Adverse drug reaction (n=97) (12.40%) | | | Chi- square | p-value |
|----------------------|---------------------------------------|------------|--|-------------|----------|
| | Yes | No | | | |
| Polypharmacy | | | | 17.688 | 2.5E-0.5 |
| Yes | 82(84.53) | 369(81.8) | | | |
| No | 15(15.46) | 15(50) | | | |
| Hospital stay | | | | 8.3839 | 0.00378 |
| ≤1 week | 21(33.2) | 157(88.20) | | | |
| >1 Week | 76(63.8) | 266(77.77) | | | |

The Polypharmacy is statistically significant at p<0.05(p=2.5E-0.5) with ADR. Hospital stay is statistically significant at p<0.05(0.00378) with ADR (table-6). More number of drugs prescribed for multiple diseases, it leads to

adverse drug reaction in the geriatric patients. All the potential ADR should be engaged into concern, particularly in the older that may experience significant harmful results.

Table 7: Comparison between factors and Drug choice problem

| Factors | Drug choice problem (n=264) (33.75%) | | | Chi- square | p-value |
|----------------------|--------------------------------------|-------------|--|-------------|---------|
| | Yes | No | | | |
| Polypharmacy | | | | 15.9326 | 6.6E-05 |
| Yes | 237(89.7) | 214(47.453) | | | |
| No | 27(10.22) | 3(10%) | | | |
| Hospital stay | | | | 48.3956 | 0 |
| ≤1 week | 128(48.4) | 50(28.08) | | | |
| >1 Week | 136(51.5) | 206 (60.23) | | | |

Polypharmacy is statistically significant at p<0.05 (p=6.6E-05) with Drug choice problem.

The hospital stay is statistically significant at p<0.05(p=0) with Drug choice problem (table-7) The second most problem

was drug choice problem same with DRP in this study and this outcome was related to olden studies [27, 28].

Table 8: Comparison between factors and dosing problem

| Factors | Dosing problem (n=20) (2.55%) | | | |
|---------------|-------------------------------|------------|------------|---------|
| | Yes | No | Chi-square | p-value |
| Polypharmacy | | | | |
| Yes | 17(85) | 434(96.23) | 2.7401 | 0.0978 |
| No | 3(15) | 27(90) | | |
| Hospital stay | | | | |
| ≤1 week | 15(75) | 163(91.57) | 15.3564 | 8.9E-05 |
| >1 Week | 5(25) | 337(98.53) | | |

Polypharmacy is statistically not significant at p<0.05 (p=0.0978) with the dosing problem.

The hospital stay is statistically significant at p<0.05 (p=8.9E-05) with dosing problem (table-8). There is no association of Polypharmacy with dosing problem, but hospital stay is associated with dosing of medicine in geriatric patients.

Table 9: Comparison between factors and Drug use problem

| Factors | Drug use problem (n=69) (8.82%) | | | |
|---------------|---------------------------------|------------|------------|---------|
| | Yes | No | Chi-square | p-value |
| Polypharmacy | | | | |
| Yes | 52(75.36) | 399(88.47) | 46.6398 | 0 |
| No | 17(24.63) | 13(43.33) | | |
| Hospital stay | | | | |
| ≤1 week | 49(71.10) | 129(72.47) | 47.8132 | 0 |
| >1 Week | 20(28.98) | 322(97.07) | | |

Polypharmacy is statistically significant at p< 0.05 (p=0) with Drug use problem.

The hospital stay is statistically significant at p<0.05 (p=0) with Drug use problem (table-9). The forgetfulness may exist one of the reasons for non-adherence in this study. A systematic review verified the poor compliance in elderly patients who were prescribed more medicines; Non-adherence has confirmed to be related with harmful results such as high levels in the clinical parameter.

Table 10: Comparison between factors and Drug interaction

| Factors | Drug interaction (n=332) (42.45%) | | | |
|---------------|-----------------------------------|------------|------------|---------|
| | Yes | No | Chi-square | p-value |
| Polypharmacy | | | | |
| Yes | 321(96.68) | 130(28.82) | 15.6665 | 7.6E-05 |
| No | 11(3.31) | 19(63.33) | | |
| Hospital stay | | | | |
| ≤1 week | 31(9.33) | 147(82.58) | 252.7629 | 0 |
| >1 Week | 301(90.66) | 41(11.98) | | |

Polypharmacy is statistically significant at p < 0.05 (p=0.) with Drug interaction. The hospital stay is statistically significant at p<0.05 (p=0) with Drug interaction (table-10).

It is an identified the reality that Polypharmacy is powerfully related with DRPs and this has been exposed by several studies [29-32]. The outcomes of our study revealed a significant statistical link between Polypharmacy and drug interactions [33].

Table 11: Pharmacist’s interventions for drug-related problems

| Primary domain | Code V6.2 | intervention | Number of intervention | Total | Percentage (%) |
|---------------------------|-----------|--|------------------------|-------|----------------|
| No intervention | I0.0 | No intervention | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1. At prescriber level | I1.1 | Prescriber informed only | 41 | 149 | 25.60 |
| | I1.2 | Prescriber asked for information | 4 | | |
| | I1.3 | Intervention proposed, approved by prescriber | 89 | | |
| | I1.4 | Intervention proposed not approved by prescriber | 13 | | |
| | I1.5 | Intervention proposed, outcome known | 2 | | |
| 2. At patient/Carer level | I2.1 | Patient (medication) counseling | 301 | 386 | 66.32 |
| | I2.2 | Written information provided only | 6 | | |
| | I2.3 | Referred to prescriber | 3 | | |
| | I2.4 | Spoken to family member/Carer | 76 | | |
| 3. At drug level | I3.1 | Drug change to | 11 | 41 | 7.04 |
| | I3.2 | Dosage change to | 6 | | |
| | I3.3 | Formulation change to | 4 | | |
| | I3.4 | Instruction of use changed to | 7 | | |
| | I3.5 | Drug stopped | 12 | | |
| | I3.6 | New drug started | 1 | | |
| 4. Others | I4.1 | Other intervention | 2 | 6 | 1.03 |
| | I4.2 | Side effects reported to authorities | 4 | | |

All the causes of DRP were intervened in various levels, which are shown in table-11. All the intervention were classified according to PCNE, they are prescriber level in the PCNE classification the items I1.1 to I1.5, patients level in the PCNE classification the items I2.1 to I2.4, drug level in the PCNE classification the items I3.1 to I3.6 and other interventions in the PCNE classification the items I4.1 to I4.2. 66.32% (n=386) of intervention were provided in patients level. The medication counseling was the major intervention which needed for Patient to taking their medication properly. 25.60% (n=149) of intervention for Prescriber level. More Interventions were

proposed, and approved by prescriber regarding medication. 7.04% (n=41) of interventions were provided for drug level. Some drugs were stopped and changed, because of their adverse reaction in geriatric patients. The interventions made by the pharmacist were mostly at patient’s level, followed by prescriber level and drug level. These results were not related with the Indian study [34]. Where the recommendations were often given at drug level. Contrastingly no interventions were provided by the clinical pharmacist at patient level. The need of patient-pharmacist communication very important for effective utilisation of medicine.

Table 12: Outcomes of interventions

| Primary Domain | Code V6.2 | Outcomes | No of problems solved | Total | Percentage (%) |
|---------------------|-----------|---|-----------------------|-------|----------------|
| 0. Not known | O0.0 | Outcome intervention not known | 16 | 16 | 2.79 |
| 1. Solved | O1.0 | Problem totally solved | 509 | 509 | 87.45 |
| 2. Partially solved | O2.0 | Problem Partially solved | 3 | 3 | 0.51 |
| 3. Not solved | O3.1 | Not Solved lack of cooperation of Patient | 32 | 54 | 9.27 |
| | O3.2 | Lack of Cooperation of Prescriber | 9 | | |
| | O3.3 | Intervention not effective | 11 | | |
| | O3.4 | No need or possibility to solve problem | 2 | | |

Outcomes of interventions were measured and classified according their category is shown table-12. It reveals that 87.45% (n=509) of problems totally solved, 9.27% (n=54) problems not solved in the PCNE classification the items O3.1 to O3.4, 2.79% (n=16) Outcome of intervention not known and 0.51% (3) partially solved. A similar study has been conducted in Pakistan, that result showing, 86.33% of drug related problems were solved by pharmacist's intervention [35]. This study indicates that pharmacist's intervention is important for solving DRP in the geriatric patients. The overall observation through from this study was that pharmacists have bigger responsibility in elderly healthcare team in minimizing and preventing DRPs and by this means can potentially reduce the unnecessary hospital stay, readmission, laboratory monitoring and drug expenditure.

Conclusion

The most prevalent diseases are cardiovascular diseases, followed by respiratory and hepatic diseases. It is important to realize that the number of medications and treatment with Drugs acting on the gastrointestinal system were the most frequently prescribed drugs, followed by cardiovascular drugs and Antimicrobial drugs, Which are significantly associated with DRPs. Potential drug interactions, Drug choice problem, adverse drug reaction, drug use problem, reduced medication adherence and the lack of health awareness were the most common DRP found in geriatric patients in this study.

The geriatric patients from the hospital using five or more drugs for the treatment of chronic disease are associated with DRP. The results of the present study, the number of DRP increases with the number of drugs prescribed. Particularly in the geriatric patient group, the occurrence of DRP may result in increased risk of hospital readmission, morbidity, mortality, and health care costs. The clinical pharmacists should identify, resolves, and prevents the occurrence of DRP that is the important task for in this group of patients.

The drug selection is the most frequently identified cause for DRPs. Poly pharmacy and the hospital stay are significantly associated with various DRPs. More interventions were provided to the patient level, compare with prescriber level. Patient medication counseling is the most intervention in the study. Interventions proposed by a clinical pharmacist to tackle or avert medication related issues are to a huge degree acknowledged and endorsed by the prescribers. Most of the interventions are of high clinical importance. Outcomes of interventions indicate that almost 87.45% of problems are totally solved, by pharmacist's interventions in this study; it is expanding proof that support and intercession of clinical pharmacists in geriatric health care have a positive influence on clinical outcomes.

Reference

1. Hege SB, Kirsten KV, Sabine R. Classification of drug-related problems. Journal of the Norwegian Medical

- Association. 2007; 127:3073-76.
2. Linda MS, Peter CM, Robert JC, Ruthanne R. Drug Related Problems: Their Structure and Function. DCIP Annals of Pharmacotherapy, 1990; 24(11):1093- 97.
3. Foppe VM. Drug-related problem: A cornerstone for pharmaceutical care. J Malta College of Pharmacy Practice. 2005; 10:5-8.
4. Antoine CGE, Marie L, Ronald HBM. An ABC of Drug-Related Problems, Drug Safety, 2000; 22(6):415-23.
5. Ulrika G. Effects of Clinical Pharmacists Interventions on Drug-related Hospitalization and appropriateness of Prescribing in Elderly patients. Digitala Vetenskapliga Arkivet, 2012; 154:58.
6. Richard PK. The clinical role of the community pharmacist, Office of the Inspector General, Washington DC: US Department of Health and Human Services, 1990.
7. Bird JA, Lipton HL. The impact of clinical pharmacist's consultations on geriatric patient's compliance and medical care use: a randomized controlled trial. Gerontologist, 1994; 34(3):307-15.
8. Hanlon JT, Weinberger M, Samsa GP, Schmader KE. A randomized, controlled trial of a clinical pharmacist intervention to improve inappropriate prescribing in elderly outpatients with Polypharmacy. Am. J Med. 1996; 100(4):428-37.
9. Abbott RD, Bogden PE, Koontz LM, Onopa JK, Williamson P. Comparing standard care with a physician and pharmacist team approach for uncontrolled hypertension. J Gen Intern Med. 1998; 13(11):740-45.
10. Donovan JL, Drake JA, Tran MT, Whittaker P. Pharmacy-managed anticoagulation: assessment of in-hospital efficacy and evaluation of financial impact and community Acceptance. J Thromb Thrombolysis. 2006; 22(1):23-30.
11. Allen KM, Bright J, Carey DL, Doecke CJ, Dooley MJ, Galbraith KJ *et al.* Prospective multicentre study of pharmacist initiated changes to drug therapy and patient management in acute care government funded hospitals. Br J Clin Pharmacol. 2004; 57(4): 513-21.
12. Hege SB, Kirsten KV. The Impact of Clinical Pharmacists on Drug-Related Problems and Clinical Outcomes, Nordic Pharmacological Society. Basic & Clinical Pharmacology & Toxicology, 2008; 102(3):275-280.
13. Strand LM, Morley PC, Cipolle RJ, Ramsey R, Lamsam GD. Drug-related problems: Their structure and function. Ann Pharmacother, 1990; 24(11):1093-1097.
14. Chan DC, Chen JH, Kuo HK, We CJ, Lu IS, Chiu LS, Wu SC. Drug-related problems (DRP) identified from geriatric medication safety review clinics. Arch Gerontol Geriatrics, 2011; 54(1):168-174.
15. Eichenberger PM, Lampert ML, Kahmann IV, van Mil JWF, Hersberger KE. Classification of drug-related problems with new prescriptions using a modified PCNE classification system. Pharmaceut Weekblad Sci Ed, 2010;

- 32(3):362-372.
16. Eichenberger PM, Haschke M, Lampert ML, Hersberger KE. Drug-related problems in diabetes and transplant patients: an observational study with home visits. *Int J Clin Pharm*. 2011; 33(5):815-823.
 17. Md Rafiq Islam. Mahfuzar Rahman Socio economic condition of the rural aged in Bangladesh; A logistic regression analysis. *Indian J Gerontology*. 2010; 24(2):225-36.
 18. Rana A. An epidemiological study of persons more than 60 years of age living in old age homes of Anand and Ahmedabad district [dissertation]. Karamsad, Gujarat (India): Sardar Patel University, 2006.
 19. Hazra A, Tripathi SK, Alam MS. Prescribing and dispensing activities at the health facilities of a non-governmental organization, *Natl Med J India*. 2000; 13(4):177-82.
 20. Ohaju-Obodo JO, Isah AO, Mabadeje AFB. Prescribing patterns of clinicians in private health institutions in Edo and Delta States of Nigeria, *Nigerian Quart J Hosp Med*. 1998, 891-94.
 21. Pavin M, Talgat N, Hafner G. Prescribing practices of rural primary health-care physicians in Uzbekistan, *Trop Med Int Health*. 2003; 8:182-190.
 22. Cheraghali AM, Nikfar S, Behmanesh Y. Evaluation of availability, accessibility and prescribing pattern of medicines in the Islamic Republic of Iran, World Health Organisation (Eastern Mediterranean Regional Office). *Bull WHO* 2004; 10:406-415.
 23. Ganachari MS, Mahendra Kumar BJ, Wali SC, Fabin M. Assessment of Drug Therapy Interventions by Clinical Pharmacist in a Tertiary Care Hospital. *Ind J PharmPract*. 2010; 3(3):22-28.
 24. Koh Y, Kutty FB, Li SC. Drug-related problems in hospitalized patients on Polypharmacy: The influence of age and gender. *J Therapeut Clin Risk Manag*. 2005; 1(1):39-48.
 25. Kirsten KV, Hege SB, Tron AM, Aasmund R. Polypharmacy as commonly defined is an indicator of limited value in the assessment of drug-related problems. *Brit J Clin Pharmacol*. 2006; 63(2):2187-2195.
 26. Lampert M, Kraehenbuehl S, Hug B. Drug-related problems: evaluation of a classification system in the daily practice of a Swiss University Hospital. *Pharm World Sci*. 2008; 30(6):768-76.
 27. Haugbolle LS, Sorensen EW. Drug-related problems in patients with angina pectoris, type 2 diabetes and asthma—interviewing patients at home. *Pharm World Sci*, 2006; 28(4):239-247.
 28. Van Roozendaal BW, Krass I. Development of an evidence-based checklist for the detection of drug related problems in type 2 diabetes. *Pharm World Sci*, 2009; 31(5):580-595.
 29. Cramer JA, Benedict A, Muszbek N, Keskinaslan A, Khan Z. The significance of compliance and persistence in the treatment of diabetes, hypertension and dyslipidaemia: a review. *Int. J Clin Pract*. 2008; 62(1):76-87.
 30. Leendertse AJ, Egberts ACG, Stoker LJ, van den Bemt PMLA. Frequency of and risk factors for preventable medication-related hospital admissions in the Netherlands. *Arch Intern Med*, 2008; 168(17):1890-1896.
 31. Blix HS, Viktil KK, Reikvam A, Moger TA, Hjemaas BJ, Pretsch P. The majority of hospitalised patients have drug-related problems: results from a prospective study in general hospitals. *Eur J Clin Pharmacol*. 2004; 60(9):651-658.
 32. Viktil KK, Blix HS, Moger TA, Reikvam A. Polypharmacy as commonly defined is an indicator of limited value in the assessment of drug related problems. *Br J Clin Pharmacol*. 2007; 63(2):187-195.
 33. Moura CS, Acurcio FA, Belo NO. Drug-drug interactions associated with length of stay and cost of hospitalization. *J Pharm Pharm Sci*. 2009; 12(3):266-272.
 34. Alagiriswami B, Ramesh M, Parthasarathi G, Basavanagowdappa H. A Study of Clinical Pharmacist Initiated Changes in Drug Therapy in a Teaching Hospital. *Ind Journ Pharm Pract* 2009; 1(2):36-45.
 35. Muhammad Umair Khan, Akram Ahmad. The Impact of Clinical Pharmacists' Interventions on Drug Related Problems in a Teaching Based Hospital. *International Journal of Pharmaceutical and Clinical Research*. 2014; 6(3):276-280.