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Library and Information Services

# Journal club checklist

This checklist provides an outline that you can use to guide your discussion of any article in your journal club. Further advise and tools to use when critically appraising papers can be found in the [EBVM Resources page.](https://knowledge.rcvs.org.uk/evidence-based-veterinary-medicine/ebvm-resources/tools-guidelines-and-checklists/)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Title** | **UK veterinary professionals’ perceptions and experiences of adverse drug reaction reporting Veterinary Record. p. e1796.** |
| **What are the aims or objectives of the study?** | The stated aims of this study are to evaluate the barriers to reporting adverse drug reactions (ADR) faced by veterinary professionals in the UK and identify opportunities to facilitate spontaneous reporting by exploring the perceptions, attitudes, and experiences of veterinary professionals towards ADR reporting. |
| **Who carried out the research?** | The authors work at the University of Liverpool and the Pharmacovigilance Unit of the Veterinary Medicines Directorate (VMD) |
| **How might the issues discussed in this paper be relevant to your own practice?** | Although it is not a legal requirement in the UK to report ADRs, the supporting guidance to the RCVS Code of Professional conduct for veterinary surgeons and veterinary nurses (4.56) states that  *If, following administration of an authorised medicine in the UK, you become aware of any adverse events including adverse reactions involving an animal, you should record what happened in as much detail as possible and make a report to the VMD or the company who market the product, who are legally obliged to forward such reports to the VMD.*  It is also a requirement for the RCVS Practice Standards Scheme to have a protocol in place for reporting adverse events or lack of efficacy to the VMD or manufacturer.  It should also be noted that post approval pharmacovigilance is essential for monitoring the safety and efficacy of veterinary medicines. |
| **What methods did the researchers use?** |  |
| **Is this methodology appropriate to the objectives of the study?**  **What other methods could have been used?** | A questionnaire is an appropriate method of collecting people’s perceptions and opinions, but their responses may be biased.  Other methods for exploring people’s perceptions and opinions include interviews and focus groups.  Data on adverse reaction reports could also have been used to compare the results with the questionnaire results. |
| **How were participants recruited?** |  |
| **How do think the method of recruitment will have affected the response?** |  |
| **How was the study funded?** | This study forms part of a wider project into adverse drug reactions in veterinary medicine, funded by the Veterinary Medicines Directorate. This research was also funded in part by the Wellcome Trust. |
| **And are there any potential sources of bias?** | It should always be remembered that self-selecting samples may be biased toward those with most interest in or strongest opinions about the subject. |
| **How many people responded to the survey.**  **Do you think these are likely to provide a representative sample?** |  |
| **Are the results presented clearly?**  **Are there any improvements that could have been made in the presentation of results?** |  |
| **What types of adverse reaction are discussed in the paper?** | In this paper adverse reactions are described as serious, non-serious and lack of efficacy  Full definitions of these terms can be found on the following website.  Veterinary pharmacovigilance responsibilities for authorisation holders – definitions [Veterinary Medicines Directorate] [online] Available at: [https://www.gov.uk/guidance/veterinary-pharmacovigilance-your-responsibilities#definitions](https://www.gov.uk/guidance/veterinary-pharmacovigilance-your-responsibilities" \l "definitions) [Accessed 14 September 2022] Reporting suspected lack of efficacy can be particularly important for antimicrobials, where it may indicate the development of antimicrobial resistance. |
| **In terms of understanding reporting requirements what differences were there in terms of the different types of adverse drug reactions?**  **How do these responses compare to your own practice?** |  |
| **According to the data presented in Figure 2 what actions were taken following an adverse drug reaction?**  **How does this data, and the explanations given, compare to your own practice?** |  |
| **In terms of barriers to reporting adverse drug reactions what were the main reasons given for the different types of reactions?**  **(Serious, non-serious and lack of efficacy)?**  **How do these responses compare to your own practice?** |  |
| **In terms of facilitators to reporting which do you think would make the biggest difference in your own practice?** |  |
| **What are the limitations of this study?** |  |
| **Do you currently have a protocol or guidelines for reporting suspected adverse drug reactions in your practice?** | Remember that the VMD also collect reports on suspected human adverse reactions to animal medicines and adverse reaction to microchips. |
| **Do you currently have a system for monitoring and disseminating medicines updates and changes to product information?** | For practices working towards the RCVS Practice Standards Scheme award in Team and Professional Responsibility it should be noted that points are awarded where the practice has a system in place for updating all members of the practice team on new products or changes in the SPCs for current products. |
| **Having read this article would you change anything about the way that you carry out pharmacovigilance in your practice?** |  |
| **Is there any further information you need to change the way you record and report adverse drug reactions in your practice?** |  |