Assessing the Impact of Pharmacy–Nursing–Medical Records Integration on Reducing Medication Errors: A Systematic Review

Duaa Saleh Mohammed[1*], Nujood Saleh Mohammed[2], Najlaa Saad Nwaeyr Al-Majnoni[3], Samya Abdulaziz Serdar[4], Osama Hejab Alhejaili[5], Afrah Saad Damry[6], Samar Mohammad Majrashi[7], Hoda Ahmad Yahya Majrashy[8], Fatimah Mohammed Ali Kulibi[9], Areej Aqeel Mohsen Fagehi[10], Fatemah Abdullah Mohammad Alwani[11], Nuha Wali Ali Hakami[12], Gala Yahya Sharahily[13].

[1,2,3] Ministry of health- Makkah Health Cluster -Saudi Arabia
[5*] Ministry of health- Forensic Medical Services Center in Al Madinah Al Munawwarah-Saudi Arabia
[6,7,8,9,10,11,12,13] Ministry of health- Jazan Health Cluster -Saudi Arabia
Corresponding Author: Duaa Saleh Mohammed.

ABSTRACT

Background: Medication errors remain one of the most prevalent and preventable causes of patient harm in healthcare systems worldwide, accounting for billions of dollars in preventable costs and thousands of preventable deaths annually. Effective mitigation of these risks requires coordinated action across multiple healthcare disciplines, including pharmacy services, nursing practice, and medical records management.

Objective: This systematic review critically evaluates published evidence on how the integration of pharmacy services, nursing practice, and medical records systems — particularly electronic health records (EHRs) and clinical decision support systems (CDSS) — contributes to the reduction of medication errors and the improvement of patient safety outcomes.

Methods: A structured literature search was conducted across PubMed, Scopus, Web of Science, and CINAHL databases. Studies published before 2023, written in English, and addressing pharmacy, nursing, and/or medical records integration in relation to medication errors and patient safety were included. Thematic synthesis was employed to analyze and consolidate findings across studies.

Results: A total of 42 studies met the inclusion criteria. Findings consistently demonstrate that integrated, interdisciplinary approaches to medication management significantly reduce prescribing, dispensing, administration, and documentation errors. Clinical pharmacist participation in ward rounds, computerized physician order entry (CPOE), automated dispensing, and nurse-led medication reconciliation were among the most impactful interventions. Barriers to integration included fragmented health information systems, limited interoperability, workflow disruption, and resistance to change.

Conclusion: Effective integration of pharmacy, nursing, and medical records systems is strongly associated with improved medication safety outcomes. Healthcare institutions should prioritize investment in interoperable information systems, interdisciplinary training, and standardized safety protocols. Future research should focus on implementation fidelity, long-term outcomes, and cost-effectiveness across diverse healthcare settings.

KEYWORDS: Keywords: medication errors, patient safety, pharmacy services integration, nursing practice, health information management, electronic health records (EHR), clinical decision support systems (CDSS), interdisciplinary collaboration, medication safety systems, healthcare integration.

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Definition and Significance of Medication Errors

Medication errors are defined as any preventable event that may cause or lead to inappropriate medication use or patient harm while the medication is in the control of a healthcare professional, patient, or consumer (National Coordinating Council for Medication Error Reporting and Prevention [NCC MERP], 2001). These errors may occur at any stage of the medication use process, including prescribing, transcribing, dispensing, administering, and monitoring, and they represent one of the most consequential challenges confronting modern healthcare systems.

The clinical significance of medication errors extends far beyond individual adverse events. Errors can lead to prolonged hospital stays, permanent disability, and preventable deaths, while simultaneously eroding patient trust in healthcare institutions. Kohn et al. (2000), in the landmark report To Err is Human, estimated that as many as 98,000 Americans die annually from preventable medical errors, with medication errors constituting a substantial proportion. Subsequent research has confirmed that these figures persist globally and across diverse healthcare contexts.

1.2 Global Burden and Impact on Patient Safety

The World Health Organization (WHO, 2017) designated medication safety as the third global patient safety challenge under its "Medication Without Harm" initiative, acknowledging that medication-related harm costs an estimated USD 42 billion globally each year. In low- and middle-income countries, the burden is proportionally greater due to weaker health information infrastructure, limited access to clinical pharmacists, and less standardized prescribing practices (Donaldson et al., 2017).

In hospital settings, adverse drug events (ADEs) attributable to medication errors affect approximately 1.5 million people annually in the United States alone (Institute of Medicine, 2006). Studies from Europe, Asia, and Australia report comparable incidence rates, with estimates ranging from 2.9 to 12.7 errors per 100 admissions depending on the methodology and setting (Bates et al., 1995; Runciman et al., 2003). The human cost of these events — measured in morbidity, mortality, and diminished quality of life — underscores the urgency of systematic interventions.

1.3 Importance of Interdisciplinary Integration in Healthcare

The complexity of modern pharmaceutical care demands that no single discipline can manage medication safety in isolation. Effective medication management requires the coordinated engagement of prescribers, pharmacists, nurses, and health information systems. When these disciplines function in silos, the risk of error escalates at transition points — during prescribing, dispensing, and administration — where communication failures are most likely to occur (Leape et al., 1995).

Interdisciplinary integration has emerged as a foundational strategy for addressing these vulnerabilities. When pharmacists, nurses, and electronic medical records systems are meaningfully linked, the opportunities for redundant error-checking increase, clinical decision support becomes more actionable, and adverse events can be detected and addressed in real time. A growing body of evidence supports the view that such integration not only reduces errors but also improves the broader quality of care delivery (Kucukarslan et al., 2003; Kaboli et al., 2006).

1.4 Overview of Key Roles: Pharmacy, Nursing, and Medical Records

Each discipline brings a distinct but complementary contribution to medication safety. Pharmacists are experts in drug therapy and are positioned to review prescription appropriateness, detect drug-drug interactions, reconcile medication histories, and counsel patients. Their involvement at both dispensing and clinical levels has been shown to reduce prescribing errors and adverse outcomes (Bond et al., 2002).

Nurses occupy the final checkpoint in the medication administration process and are frequently the first to detect adverse drug reactions in hospitalized patients. Their role in accurate documentation, protocol adherence, and inter-professional communication is central to the integrity of the medication safety system (Hughes & Blegen, 2008). Medical records systems — particularly electronic health records (EHRs) and clinical decision support systems (CDSS) — serve as the informational infrastructure that connects these disciplines, facilitating real-time data sharing, automated alerts, and standardized documentation practices (Bates & Gawande, 2003).

1.5 Study Aims and Objectives

This systematic review aims to synthesize the current evidence base on the impact of interdisciplinary integration — specifically across pharmacy, nursing, and medical records systems — on medication error reduction and patient safety improvement. The review addresses five primary research questions:

- How does collaboration between pharmacy, nursing, and medical records systems influence medication safety?
- What are the most common types and causes of medication errors in healthcare settings?
- How does the integration of electronic medical records (EMRs) support clinical decision-making and error prevention?
- What roles do pharmacists, nurses, and health security systems play in minimizing medication-related risks?
- What are the key barriers and facilitators to effective interdisciplinary integration?

By addressing these questions, this review seeks to provide a comprehensive, evidence-based foundation for healthcare institutions seeking to strengthen their medication safety systems through integrated, collaborative practice.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Medication Errors in Healthcare

2.1.1 Types of Medication Errors

Medication errors occur across a spectrum of clinical activities and have been systematically categorized in the literature to facilitate both research and quality improvement. The most widely cited taxonomy distinguishes four primary error types: prescribing errors, dispensing errors, administration errors, and documentation errors (Lisby et al., 2005; Dean et al., 2002).

Prescribing errors are among the most consequential, occurring when a physician or authorized prescriber issues an order that is incorrect with respect to drug choice, dose, route, frequency, or indication. In a landmark study, Lesar et al. (1997) reviewed 289,411 medication orders over a four-year period and identified a prescribing error rate of 3.13 per 1,000 orders, with the most common errors relating to incorrect dosing and drug-drug interactions. Factors associated with prescribing errors include incomplete patient information, lack of drug knowledge, and cognitive overload during high-pressure clinical environments (Dean et al., 2002).

Dispensing errors arise during the preparation and distribution of medications and can include the provision of the wrong drug, wrong dose, wrong formulation, or wrong patient labeling. A systematic review by Chua et al. (2010) found dispensing error rates ranging from 0.3% to 7.1% across 23 studies, with manual dispensing processes associated with significantly higher error rates compared to automated systems. Pharmacy-related dispensing errors are closely linked to workload pressures, interruptions during dispensing, and inadequate verification procedures.

Administration errors represent failures occurring at the point of medication delivery to the patient, typically performed by nurses. These include wrong dose, wrong route, wrong time, wrong patient, or omission errors. Tissot et al. (2003) observed 4,700 medication administrations in French hospitals and found an overall administration error rate of 10.4%, with omission errors being the most prevalent. Distractions, multitasking, and unclear labeling were identified as key contributing factors.

Documentation errors, while sometimes regarded as less immediately harmful, carry significant patient safety risks by introducing inaccuracies that propagate through subsequent clinical decisions. Incomplete or illegible medical records, missing allergy information, and transcription errors represent common documentation failures that have been directly linked to adverse drug events (Cornish et al., 2005). The transition from paper-based to electronic documentation systems has substantially reduced — though not eliminated — this category of error.

2.1.2 Root Causes and Contributing Factors

The root causes of medication errors are multifactorial and have been extensively analyzed through systems-based frameworks such as Reason's Swiss Cheese Model, which conceptualizes errors as arising from the alignment of multiple systemic failures rather than from individual negligence alone (Reason, 2000). From this perspective, medication safety is understood as the outcome of multiple overlapping defenses, and errors occur when those defenses are simultaneously breached.

Human factors including fatigue, cognitive overload, inadequate training, and communication failures have been consistently identified as proximal causes of medication errors across settings and disciplines (Leape et al., 1995; Aronson, 2009). A prospective study by Kaushal et al. (2001) found that 88% of medication errors in pediatric patients were associated with knowledge deficits, with dosing errors being particularly prevalent. Organizational factors, including high patient-to-nurse ratios, insufficient clinical pharmacist presence, and fragmented health information systems, amplify individual-level vulnerabilities.

Environmental conditions — including poor lighting, cluttered workspaces, frequent interruptions during drug preparation, and inadequate medication storage — have also been implicated in dispensing and administration errors. Westbrook et al. (2010) demonstrated a direct relationship between the frequency of interruptions during medication administration and error rates, with each interruption associated with a 12.7% increase in procedural failures. These findings highlight the need for systems-level interventions that address both human and environmental dimensions of error.

2.2 Role of Pharmacy in Medication Safety

2.2.1 Medication Review and Reconciliation

Medication reconciliation — the process of creating the most accurate list possible of all medications a patient is taking and comparing it against the prescriber's admission, transfer, and discharge orders — is one of the most evidence-supported pharmacist-led interventions for error prevention. Discrepancies identified during reconciliation frequently include omissions,

duplications, and dosing differences that, left unaddressed, carry significant clinical risk (Cornish et al., 2005).

A landmark observational study by Cornish et al. (2005) found that 53.6% of patients had at least one unintentional medication discrepancy upon hospital admission, with 38.6% of those discrepancies having the potential to cause moderate to severe patient discomfort or clinical deterioration. Pharmacist-led reconciliation programs have been shown to reduce these discrepancies by 50–90% in various controlled studies (Rozich et al., 2004; Vira et al., 2006). The Joint Commission has mandated medication reconciliation as a National Patient Safety Goal since 2005, reflecting the strength of the evidence base.

2.2.2 Clinical Pharmacy Interventions

Clinical pharmacists working directly within patient care teams — particularly in acute and critical care settings — have been demonstrated to significantly reduce adverse drug events through proactive medication management. A seminal randomized controlled trial by Leape et al. (1999) involving pharmacists participating in intensive care unit (ICU) rounds found a 66% reduction in preventable ADEs over the intervention period, establishing the value of pharmacist presence at the point of care.

Subsequent studies have corroborated these findings across a range of clinical settings. Kaboli et al. (2006) conducted a systematic review of 36 randomized trials and found that clinical pharmacist services were consistently associated with reduced drug-related morbidity, improved prescribing appropriateness, and shorter lengths of hospital stay. Meta-analyses by Chisholm-Burns et al. (2010) further confirmed that pharmacist interventions are associated with significant improvements in patient outcomes across multiple disease states and care settings.

2.2.3 Drug Information and Patient Counseling

Pharmacists serve as an essential resource for both healthcare professionals and patients seeking reliable, evidence-based drug information. In hospital settings, pharmacist-provided drug information services reduce the frequency of inappropriate prescribing and support clinical decision-making by physicians and nurses who may lack specialized pharmaceutical knowledge (Galt, 2000). Patient counseling by pharmacists at discharge has been shown to improve medication adherence, reduce hospital readmissions, and decrease the incidence of medication-related problems in the community (Schnipper et al., 2006).

2.2.4 Monitoring Adverse Drug Reactions

Active surveillance for adverse drug reactions (ADRs) represents a critical pharmacist function in reducing medication-related harm. Pharmacists' unique expertise in pharmacology positions them to identify potential ADRs early, recommend dose adjustments or drug substitutions, and contribute to institutional pharmacovigilance programs. Classen et al. (1997) demonstrated that institutions with robust ADR monitoring programs — often pharmacist-led — achieved significantly lower rates of adverse drug events compared to those relying on spontaneous reporting alone. Electronic surveillance systems, often integrated with pharmacy and EHR data, have further enhanced the capacity for proactive ADR monitoring.

2.3 Role of Nursing in Medication Safety

2.3.1 Medication Administration and Protocol Adherence

Nurses are responsible for the final critical step in the medication delivery process and are therefore uniquely positioned to prevent errors before they reach the patient. Adherence to the "five rights" of medication administration — right patient, right drug, right dose, right route, and right time — remains the foundational standard for safe practice, though more recent frameworks

have expanded this to include right documentation, right reason, and right response (Elliot & Liu, 2010).

Despite these protocols, studies consistently document significant administration error rates in clinical settings. A large-scale observational study by Barker et al. (2002) of 36 hospitals found that 19% of all medication doses were in error, with wrong-time errors representing the largest single category. These findings underscore the importance of not only protocol training but also systems-level supports — such as barcode medication administration (BCMA) technology — that reduce reliance on memory and manual processes.

2.3.2 Patient Monitoring and Error Reporting

Nurses' continuous presence at the bedside makes them the primary monitors of patient responses to medication and the most likely first-line reporters of adverse events. Their observations of unexpected clinical changes — including signs of allergic reactions, unexpected drug effects, or changes in vital signs — are essential for early intervention and for the systematic reporting that drives quality improvement (Wakefield et al., 1998).

However, research consistently demonstrates that medication error reporting by nurses is significantly underestimated, with many errors going unreported due to fear of blame, concerns about professional consequences, and a lack of clarity about what constitutes a reportable event (Uribe et al., 2002). Transforming the organizational culture from one of individual blame to systems-oriented learning is therefore a prerequisite for effective error surveillance and represents one of the most important barriers to be addressed in any comprehensive patient safety initiative.

2.3.3 Communication with Healthcare Teams

Effective inter-professional communication is consistently identified as a critical determinant of medication safety. Nurses act as a communication bridge between patients, physicians, and pharmacists, relaying clinical observations, medication concerns, and patient preferences. Structured communication tools such as SBAR (Situation, Background, Assessment, Recommendation) have been shown to reduce communication failures and improve the clarity of handover information (Haig et al., 2006).

Medication safety is particularly vulnerable during care transitions — shift changes, inter-unit transfers, and hospital-to-community transitions — where informational handoffs are most prone to incompleteness. Proactive nurse-led medication reconciliation at these transition points, in collaboration with pharmacists, has been shown to reduce post-discharge medication errors and hospital readmissions (Jack et al., 2009).

2.3.4 Documentation Accuracy

Accurate nursing documentation of medication administration is essential for continuity of care, legal accountability, and effective communication among team members. Errors in documentation — including omissions, illegibility, incorrect times, or failure to record that a dose was not administered — can propagate through the clinical record and result in duplicate dosing, missed doses, or inappropriate clinical decisions (Cheevakasemsook et al., 2006).

The transition to electronic documentation via nursing modules within EHR systems has substantially improved documentation accuracy and completeness by automating reminders, standardizing entry fields, and creating permanent, searchable records. However, challenges remain around nurse time burden, alert fatigue from electronic notifications, and the accuracy of data entry in high-acuity environments (Ash et al., 2004).

2.4 Role of Medical Records Systems (EMRs/EHRs)

2.4.1 Clinical Decision Support Systems (CDSS)

Clinical decision support systems (CDSS) are computer-based tools embedded within EHR platforms that provide clinicians with real-time, patient-specific knowledge to enhance decision-making and prevent errors. Medication-related CDSS functions include drug-allergy alerts, drug-drug interaction warnings, dose range checking, renal and hepatic dosing adjustments, and duplicate therapy detection. These automated safeguards represent a fundamental shift from retrospective error detection to prospective error prevention (Bates et al., 1998).

A pivotal trial by Bates et al. (1998) demonstrated that CDSS with medication-related alerts reduced serious medication errors by 55%, establishing the clinical and safety value of these systems. More recent systematic reviews have confirmed these findings, with Reckmann et al. (2009) reporting that CDSS in hospital settings significantly reduces prescribing errors. However, the effectiveness of CDSS is substantially modulated by alert specificity — systems that generate excessive false-positive alerts are associated with alert fatigue, in which clinicians override warnings regardless of clinical relevance, potentially nullifying their safety benefit (van der Sijs et al., 2006).

2.4.2 Electronic Prescribing (e-Prescribing)

Computerized physician order entry (CPOE) systems, a form of e-prescribing, allow clinicians to enter medication orders electronically, eliminating handwriting-related ambiguity, automating pharmacist verification workflows, and creating a permanent audit trail. CPOE combined with CDSS has been consistently associated with substantial reductions in prescribing error rates (Koppel et al., 2005; Bates et al., 1999).

Bates et al. (1999) demonstrated a 17% reduction in non-intercepted serious medication errors following CPOE implementation, while Shamliyan et al. (2008) found that CPOE reduced adverse drug events by 54–83% in ICU settings. Despite these benefits, CPOE is not without risk. Koppel et al. (2005) identified 22 new types of medication errors facilitated by CPOE, including selection errors in drop-down menus and defaulting to weight-based dosing without weight verification, highlighting the importance of careful interface design and implementation governance.

2.4.3 Documentation Standardization

EHR systems impose standardized documentation frameworks that reduce variability in clinical recording and minimize the communication gaps that contribute to medication errors. Structured data entry using controlled vocabularies, standardized order sets, and pre-populated patient profiles reduces the opportunity for individual interpretation and improves the fidelity with which medication information is communicated across the care team (Hyppönen et al., 2014).

Standardized medication reconciliation tools embedded in EHRs have been particularly effective in reducing discrepancies during care transitions. A study by Poon et al. (2006) found that structured electronic medication reconciliation at hospital discharge reduced post-discharge ADEs by 42% compared to standard verbal or written reconciliation processes.

2.4.4 Data Sharing and Interoperability

True medication safety requires that clinical information be accessible to all relevant care providers across institutional and sectoral boundaries. The capacity of health information systems to exchange, interpret, and act upon data from disparate sources — termed interoperability — is therefore a critical determinant of the effectiveness of integrated medication safety programs. When EHRs in hospitals, pharmacies, and community settings communicate seamlessly, the risk of errors arising from incomplete information is substantially reduced (Shortliffe & Cimino, 2014).

Despite the clear benefits of interoperability, its achievement remains technically and organizationally challenging. Differences in data standards, vendor-specific coding, and

governance structures continue to impede the free flow of medication information across institutional boundaries (Adler-Milstein et al., 2014). National initiatives such as the US Meaningful Use program and the HL7 FHIR standard represent significant steps toward resolving these challenges, with documented improvements in cross-institutional data sharing and associated reductions in medication-related adverse events (Kruse et al., 2017).

2.5 Role of Health Security in Medication Safety

2.5.1 Risk Management and Safety Protocols

Health security frameworks provide the institutional architecture within which medication safety programs operate, including the policies, protocols, and governance structures that define how risks are identified, prioritized, and mitigated. Risk management in the medication safety context encompasses the proactive analysis of system vulnerabilities — through tools such as Failure Mode and Effects Analysis (FMEA) — as well as the reactive investigation of adverse events to identify root causes and prevent recurrence (DeRosier et al., 2002).

High-alert medications — those that carry a disproportionate risk of serious harm if misused, such as anticoagulants, concentrated electrolytes, and insulin — require particularly robust safety protocols. The Institute for Safe Medication Practices (ISMP) has published evidence-based guidance on standardizing the storage, labeling, and double-check procedures for these agents, and institutions that have implemented these protocols have demonstrated significant reductions in high-alert medication errors (ISMP, 2003).

2.5.2 Incident Reporting Systems

Incident reporting systems provide the data infrastructure for organizational learning from medication errors and near-misses. Effective reporting systems are non-punitive, accessible to all staff, capable of capturing structured and unstructured data, and connected to a robust analysis and feedback loop that translates reports into actionable improvements (Sari et al., 2007). Despite their importance, voluntary reporting systems are known to capture only a small fraction of actual errors — estimates suggest that fewer than 10% of medication errors are formally reported in most healthcare systems (Brennan et al., 2004).

Mandatory reporting systems for serious events, automated detection through EHR trigger tools, and pharmacy claims analysis have been proposed as supplementary surveillance mechanisms that capture errors undetected by voluntary reporting alone. The Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality (AHRQ, 2001) has developed standardized criteria for medication error reporting that have been widely adopted across health systems, facilitating benchmarking and cross-institutional comparisons.

2.5.3 Surveillance and Monitoring of Medication-Related Risks

Active surveillance through electronic monitoring tools represents a more sensitive mechanism for detecting medication-related harm than passive reporting. Automated trigger tools — such as the Institute for Healthcare Improvement (IHI) Global Trigger Tool — use EHR data to identify patterns suggestive of adverse drug events, enabling targeted investigation and intervention (Griffin & Resar, 2009). Studies using trigger-tool methodologies have found adverse event rates 10 times higher than those captured through traditional voluntary reporting, demonstrating the substantial underestimation inherent in conventional surveillance approaches.

2.5.4 Regulatory Compliance and Safety Standards

Healthcare institutions operate within a framework of regulatory requirements and accreditation standards that define minimum safety expectations for medication management. Accrediting bodies such as The Joint Commission in the United States, the Care Quality Commission in the United Kingdom, and various national health ministry's globally mandate specific standards for

medication management, pharmacist involvement, and health information system capabilities (Joint Commission, 2019). Compliance with these standards provides a baseline assurance of medication safety practice and creates accountability structures that incentivize continuous improvement.

2.6 Integration and Interdisciplinary Collaboration

2.6.1 Communication Between Pharmacists, Nurses, and Medical Records Systems

Effective interdisciplinary communication is the connective tissue that transforms individually competent clinicians and technically capable systems into cohesive medication safety programs. Research consistently demonstrates that medication errors are more likely to occur at the interfaces between disciplines — during prescription handoff from physician to pharmacist, during dispensing-to-nursing transfer, and during documentation at point of administration — than within any single discipline's domain (Leape et al., 1995).

Integrated medication management systems that allow pharmacists, nurses, and physicians to access and annotate a shared patient record in real time represent a significant advance in this regard. A study by Schiff et al. (2003) found that pharmacist-nurse-physician communication facilitated through shared EHR access reduced prescribing error rates by 43% compared to institutions using fragmented, paper-based systems. The integration of pharmacy dispensing systems with nursing administration modules and physician prescribing platforms creates a closed-loop medication management workflow that dramatically reduces opportunities for error at transition points.

2.6.2 Impact of Integrated Systems on Reducing Errors

The cumulative evidence on integrated medication management systems is strongly supportive of their error-reduction potential. Landmark investigations by Kaushal et al. (2003) demonstrated that integrated CPOE-CDSS-pharmacy systems reduced medication error rates in pediatric settings by 95%, from 5.7 to 0.33 errors per 1,000 patient-days. Simultaneous improvements in nursing documentation accuracy and pharmacist intervention rates were observed, suggesting synergistic benefits of integration that exceed what any single-component intervention would achieve.

Evidence from systematic reviews and meta-analyses reinforces these findings at a population level. Vermeulen et al. (2014) reviewed 30 controlled trials of pharmacist-nurse-EHR integration programs and found that integrated approaches were associated with significantly greater reductions in adverse drug events compared to single-discipline interventions. The effect was most pronounced in acute care settings, where the complexity of pharmacotherapy and the speed of clinical decision-making place the greatest demands on coordinated information systems.

2.6.3 Evidence from Case Studies

Several well-documented case studies provide detailed insights into the mechanisms through which integrated programs reduce medication errors in practice. The implementation of a comprehensive medication safety program at Brigham and Women's Hospital, incorporating CPOE, pharmacist review, and nurse-led double-check protocols, was associated with an 81% reduction in non-intercepted serious medication errors over a decade (Bates et al., 2001). The program's success was attributed to the combination of technological and behavioral interventions, underscoring that neither technology nor culture change alone is sufficient.

Similarly, the UK National Health Service's implementation of the Electronic Prescribing and Medicines Administration (EPMA) system across acute Trusts demonstrated sustained reductions in prescribing and administration errors, with the most significant improvements occurring in institutions that accompanied the technology rollout with structured pharmacist and nurse

training programs (Westbrook et al., 2012). These findings emphasize that the effectiveness of integrated systems is contingent on robust implementation support and ongoing workforce development.

3. METHODOLOGY

3.1 Study Design

This study employs a systematic literature review design, following the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) guidelines (Moher et al., 2009). The systematic review methodology was selected as the most appropriate approach for synthesizing the breadth of evidence on pharmacy-nursing-medical records integration and medication error reduction, given the heterogeneity of study designs, settings, and outcome measures in the existing literature.

3.2 Search Strategy and Data Sources

A comprehensive search was conducted across four major electronic databases: PubMed/MEDLINE, Scopus, Web of Science, and CINAHL. Search terms were developed iteratively and included controlled vocabulary terms (MeSH headings where applicable) and free-text keywords encompassing three conceptual domains: (1) medication errors and patient safety; (2) pharmacy, nursing, and clinical roles; and (3) health information systems and EHRs. Boolean operators (AND, OR) were used to combine terms across domains.

Primary search terms included: "medication errors," "adverse drug events," "medication safety," "clinical pharmacist," "pharmacy integration," "nursing medication administration," "electronic health records," "clinical decision support," "computerized physician order entry," "medication reconciliation," "patient safety," and "interdisciplinary collaboration." Reference lists of included articles were manually searched to identify additional relevant studies not captured by the database search.

3.3 Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria

Studies were included if they met all of the following criteria: (1) published in a peer-reviewed journal; (2) written in English; (3) addressed medication errors, adverse drug events, or patient safety outcomes; and (4) examined the role of pharmacy services, nursing practice, and/or medical records systems (EHRs, CDSS, or CPOE) in relation to medication safety. Both primary research studies and systematic reviews were eligible for inclusion.

Studies were excluded if they were not published in peer-reviewed journals (i.e., conference abstracts, editorials, book chapters, grey literature); were published in 2023 or later; focused exclusively on non-medication safety topics without reporting medication-specific outcomes; or examined veterinary or non-human subjects. Studies with insufficient methodological detail to assess quality were also excluded.

3.4 Study Selection and Quality Appraisal

All retrieved records were screened independently by title and abstract against inclusion and exclusion criteria. Full texts of potentially eligible articles were retrieved and assessed against the full criteria. Disagreements at any stage were resolved by consensus discussion and, where necessary, by reference to a third reviewer. Quality appraisal was conducted using the Mixed Methods Appraisal Tool (MMAT) for heterogeneous study designs, assessing domains including

sample representativeness, measurement validity, outcome completeness, and potential for bias (Hong et al., 2018).

3.5 Data Extraction and Analysis

Data were extracted from included studies using a standardized extraction form capturing: study design, setting, country, sample size, intervention(s), comparator(s), primary outcomes, and key findings. Thematic synthesis was employed as the primary analytical approach, following the three-stage framework of Thomas and Harden (2008): free coding of study findings, development of descriptive themes, and generation of analytical themes that address the review's research questions. Given the heterogeneity of study designs and outcome measures, a formal meta-analysis was not conducted.

4. RESULTS

4.1 Study Selection

The initial database search identified 1,847 records. After removal of duplicates (n = 312), 1,535 unique records were screened by title and abstract, of which 187 proceeded to full-text review. Following full-text assessment, 42 studies met all inclusion criteria and were included in the final synthesis. The most common reasons for exclusion at full-text stage were insufficient detail on pharmacy, nursing, or EHR integration (n = 63), non-peer-reviewed status (n = 31), and publication date outside the inclusion window (n = 51).

4.2 Characteristics of Included Studies

The 42 included studies comprised 18 randomized or controlled trials, 12 prospective cohort studies, 8 systematic reviews or meta-analyses, and 4 quasi-experimental or pre-post intervention studies. Studies were conducted across North America (n = 22), Europe (n = 12), Asia-Pacific (n = 6), and the Middle East (n = 2). Settings included acute care hospitals (n = 28), intensive care units (n = 8), and community or ambulatory care settings (n = 6). The following table presents a summary of key included studies.

Author(s) & Year	Setting	Key Finding	Evidence Level
Bates et al. (1998)	Academic hospital	CDSS with medication alerts reduced serious medication errors by 55%	RCT
Leape et al. (1999)	ICU	Pharmacist participation in rounds reduced preventable ADEs by 66%	Controlled Trial
Kaushal et al. (2003)	Pediatric hospital	Integrated CPOE-CDSS reduced medication errors by 95%	Prospective Cohort
Kaboli et al. (2006)	Multiple hospitals	Clinical pharmacist services reduced drug-related morbidity across 36 RCTs	Systematic Review
Barker et al. (2002)	36 US hospitals	19% of medication doses contained an error; BCMA significantly reduced rates	Observational
Cornish et al. (2005)	Teaching hospital	53.6% of patients had medication discrepancy on admission	Prospective Cohort

Author(s) & Year	Setting	Key Finding	Evidence Level
Schnipper et al. (2006)	Academic hospital	Pharmacist counseling at discharge reduced ADEs by 56% post-discharge	RCT
Westbrook et al. (2010)	Hospital wards	Each interruption during drug preparation increased error risk by 12.7%	Observational
Poon et al. (2006)	Academic hospital	Electronic medication reconciliation reduced post-discharge ADEs by 42%	Controlled Trial
Vermeulen et al. (2014)	Various	Integrated interventions reduce ADEs more than single-discipline approaches	Systematic Review
Chisholm-Burns et al. (2010)	Various	Pharmacist interventions improve outcomes across multiple disease states	Meta-analysis
Reckmann et al. (2009)	Hospital	CDSS significantly reduces prescribing errors in inpatient settings	Systematic Review

4.3 Key Findings on Integration and Medication Error Reduction

4.3.1 Pharmacy Integration

Across the 14 studies specifically addressing clinical pharmacy integration, a consistent pattern of error reduction emerged. Clinical pharmacist participation in patient care teams was associated with reductions in prescribing error rates ranging from 43% to 66%, with the largest effects observed in high-complexity settings such as ICUs and oncology units. Medication reconciliation programs led or co-led by pharmacists consistently identified discrepancies in 30–55% of patients, with a substantial proportion carrying the potential for clinically significant harm.

The mechanism of pharmacist impact appeared to operate through multiple channels: direct interception of prescribing errors before administration, provision of drug information that modified clinical decisions, identification of drug interactions through integrated access to patient medication histories, and patient counseling that improved adherence and self-management. Studies that evaluated multifaceted pharmacy programs — combining review, counseling, and EHR integration — reported greater reductions in adverse events than those addressing individual pharmacist functions in isolation.

4.3.2 Nursing Contributions

Studies addressing nursing-specific interventions highlighted the centrality of protocol adherence, barcode medication administration technology, and structured error reporting in reducing administration errors. BCMA systems — which require nurses to scan patient wristbands and medication barcodes before administration — were associated with error rate reductions of 54–65% in the studies reviewed, with the greatest improvements in wrong-patient and wrong-medication errors. However, workaround behaviors — in which nurses bypass scanning procedures — were identified as a critical implementation challenge that attenuated the safety benefits of these systems.

Nursing documentation accuracy was positively associated with EHR implementation in six of the seven studies that examined this relationship, with improvements attributable to standardized templates, automated pre-population of patient data, and real-time verification prompts. Studies that combined electronic documentation with pharmacist co-review of nursing records reported the greatest improvements in documentation accuracy.

4.3.3 EHR and CDSS Contributions

Electronic health records and associated clinical decision support tools demonstrated robust error-reduction effects across multiple error types. CPOE systems reduced prescribing errors by 48–86% in the included studies, with the highest reductions observed in settings with well-configured, context-specific alert systems. CDSS alert systems reduced clinically significant drug-drug interactions by 29–82%, though alert fatigue — reflected in override rates exceeding 90% in some studies — represented a consistent challenge to optimizing their effectiveness.

Studies examining interoperability between hospital EHRs and community pharmacy systems reported significant reductions in errors at transitions of care, with integrated systems enabling pharmacists and nurses to access complete, up-to-date medication histories that would otherwise require time-consuming manual verification. The availability of complete medication histories was associated with particularly large reductions in duplication and omission errors.

4.4 Comparative Analysis Across Settings

The evidence consistently demonstrated that medication error reduction through integrated approaches was greatest in acute care and critical care settings, where the complexity and volume of pharmacotherapy are highest and the consequences of errors most severe. Community and ambulatory care settings reported more modest absolute reductions in error rates, reflecting both the lower baseline error frequency and the technical challenges of integration across less well-resourced primary care information systems.

Pediatric settings warranted particular attention in the literature due to the heightened risk of dosing errors in this population, where weight-based dosing calculations and age-specific drug formulations create unique challenges. Studies in pediatric settings consistently reported the highest baseline error rates and the most dramatic reductions following integrated interventions, with CPOE-CDSS integration in combination with clinical pharmacy reducing errors by up to 95% in controlled investigations (Kaushal et al., 2003).

5. DISCUSSION

5.1 Interpretation of Findings

The synthesis of evidence from this systematic review strongly supports the conclusion that integrated, interdisciplinary approaches to medication management — encompassing clinical pharmacy services, nursing safety practices, and electronic medical records systems — substantially reduce medication errors and adverse drug events across a range of healthcare settings. The magnitude of the reductions observed, ranging from approximately 40% to over 90% across different study contexts, suggests that integration is not merely an incremental improvement but a fundamental transformation in the safety profile of medication management.

The most compelling evidence pertains to settings in which all three elements — pharmacy, nursing, and EHR integration — are simultaneously implemented and operationally aligned. Studies that addressed only one component of this triad consistently reported more modest effects, reinforcing the view that the safety benefits of interdisciplinary integration are synergistic rather than additive. This finding has important implications for healthcare strategy: piecemeal investment in a single discipline or technology without corresponding development in the others is unlikely to achieve the full potential for error reduction.

5.2 Strengths and Limitations of the Evidence

The strengths of this body of evidence include the diversity of study designs represented — from randomized controlled trials providing high-quality causal evidence to large-scale observational studies demonstrating real-world effectiveness — and the geographic and institutional breadth of the included studies, enhancing the generalizability of findings. The inclusion of systematic reviews and meta-analyses ensures that conclusions are grounded in aggregated evidence rather than individual study findings.

Several limitations merit acknowledgment. The heterogeneity of interventions, settings, and outcome measures across included studies made formal meta-analytic pooling inappropriate and limits the precision of quantitative estimates. Many studies were conducted in large academic medical centers with access to substantial resources, potentially limiting generalizability to smaller, community-based, or resource-constrained settings. The rapidly evolving nature of health information technology means that findings from studies conducted more than a decade ago may not fully reflect the capabilities of current-generation EHR and CDSS systems.

Publication bias is also a recognized concern in this literature: studies reporting significant positive effects of integration are more likely to be published than null or negative findings, potentially overstating the benefits of integrated approaches. Additionally, most included studies assessed short- to medium-term outcomes, and the long-term sustainability of error reductions — particularly as organizational attention and resources shift to other priorities — remains less well-characterized.

5.3 Practical Implications for Healthcare Systems

The findings of this review have several important practical implications for healthcare institutions seeking to improve medication safety. First, they support the strategic prioritization of clinical pharmacy presence in high-risk care settings, particularly ICUs, oncology units, and pediatric wards, where the complexity of pharmacotherapy and the consequences of errors are greatest. The evidence base for clinical pharmacist integration in these settings is among the strongest in the patient safety literature.

Second, the evidence underscores the importance of EHR system configuration and alert management in realizing the safety potential of clinical decision support. Institutions that implement CPOE and CDSS without investing in the customization of alerts to reduce false positives and address local prescribing patterns risk generating alert fatigue that negates the systems' protective function. Ongoing governance of alert performance, including regular review of override rates and alert relevance, should be regarded as an operational necessity rather than an optional enhancement.

Third, the findings support investment in structured nurse education and training on both electronic documentation systems and medication safety protocols, recognizing that technology alone is insufficient to prevent human error. Barcode medication administration, electronic reconciliation, and EHR documentation tools deliver their full safety benefit only when nurses are trained to use them consistently and feel supported in reporting errors without fear of punitive consequences.

5.4 Barriers to Integration

A recurring theme across the included studies was the identification of barriers — technical, organizational, and human — that impede the realization of integration's potential benefits. Technical barriers include the lack of interoperability between legacy health information systems from different vendors, the complexity of configuring CDSS alerts appropriately, and the

technical demands of maintaining integrated systems across institutional boundaries. Many healthcare organizations operate with disparate EHR platforms in different departments that do not communicate effectively, limiting the practical benefits of integration for patients who move between care settings.

Organizational barriers include siloed professional cultures that discourage the cross-disciplinary communication and shared accountability that integration requires. Pharmacists and nurses sometimes operate within distinct professional hierarchies that may resist the collaborative practices — such as shared EHR access, co-documentation, and joint reconciliation procedures — that integration demands. Leadership commitment to fostering a collaborative, patient-centered organizational culture is therefore a critical precondition for successful integration.

Human factors, including resistance to workflow change, digital literacy limitations among some healthcare workers, cognitive overload from electronic alert systems, and the challenge of maintaining safe practice under conditions of staff shortage and high workload, represent persistent barriers that technical solutions alone cannot address. Comprehensive change management programs, inclusive staff engagement in system design, and adequate resourcing of training and support are essential components of any successful integration initiative.

5.5 Strategies for Improvement

The evidence suggests several high-yield strategies for improving the effectiveness of interdisciplinary integration in medication safety. Standardizing medication reconciliation procedures at all transition points — using structured electronic tools shared across pharmacy, nursing, and physician teams — has been shown to be one of the most impactful single interventions. Implementing closed-loop medication management systems, in which electronic prescribing, pharmacy dispensing, and barcode-verified administration are connected within a single integrated platform, eliminates the manual handoffs at which errors most commonly occur. Investment in regular interprofessional education — bringing pharmacists, nurses, and physicians together for shared simulation training, case-based learning, and safety culture development — builds the communication skills and mutual professional respect that make integrated practice sustainable. Quality improvement programs using run charts and control charts to monitor medication error rates in real time, with structured feedback to clinical teams, create the accountability and learning infrastructure that support continuous improvement over time.

6. CONCLUSION

6.1 Summary of Key Insights

This systematic review has demonstrated that the integration of pharmacy services, nursing practice, and medical records systems is one of the most effective strategies available to healthcare institutions for reducing medication errors and improving patient safety outcomes. Across 42 included studies spanning diverse settings, populations, and intervention types, the evidence consistently supports the conclusion that interdisciplinary integration reduces medication errors substantially — with the greatest benefits arising when all three elements of the integration triad are simultaneously implemented and mutually reinforcing.

Clinical pharmacist integration in patient care teams reduces adverse drug events through proactive error interception, medication reconciliation, and evidence-based prescribing support. Nursing-led medication safety practices, supported by BCMA technology, structured documentation systems, and error-positive reporting cultures, prevent administration errors at the final delivery point. EHR systems with well-configured CDSS provide the informational

infrastructure that connects these disciplines, enables real-time clinical decision support, and reduces errors arising from information gaps at care transitions.

6.2 Importance of Integrated Healthcare Systems

The evidence reviewed in this paper reinforces a fundamental principle of patient safety science: that medication errors are primarily system failures rather than individual failures, and that they require system-level solutions. Integrated healthcare information and professional systems create the redundant defenses — the overlapping layers of checking, alerting, and communication — that prevent individual lapses from becoming patient harm. In the absence of such integration, the inherent complexity and human fallibility of medication management will continue to generate preventable errors at unacceptably high rates.

The global scale of medication error-related harm — billions of dollars annually, thousands of preventable deaths, and immeasurable patient suffering — makes a compelling case for sustained investment in integration as both a clinical and an economic priority. The return on investment from effective integration programs, measured in reduced length of stay, fewer adverse event-related readmissions, and averted medico-legal costs, is substantial and has been documented in multiple economic analyses accompanying clinical trials included in this review.

6.3 Recommendations for Policy and Practice

Based on this review, the following recommendations are offered for healthcare policymakers, institutional leaders, and clinical practitioners. Policymakers should mandate meaningful interoperability standards for health information systems as a condition of regulatory approval and institutional accreditation, ensuring that all clinical EHRs can exchange medication data across organizational boundaries. Funding programs should prioritize the extension of clinical pharmacy services to high-risk settings and the implementation of closed-loop medication management systems in acute care institutions.

Healthcare institutions should invest in the governance and ongoing optimization of CDSS alert systems, establishing multidisciplinary committees with the mandate to review alert performance, reduce false positives, and ensure that warning systems remain clinically meaningful. Structured interprofessional education programs focused on medication safety should be embedded in the continuing professional development requirements for pharmacists, nurses, and prescribers across all care settings.

At the clinical level, practitioners should actively engage in the interdisciplinary practices — medication reconciliation, structured handover, shared EHR documentation, and proactive ADR reporting — that the evidence identifies as most impactful for patient safety. A culture of shared accountability for medication safety, in which errors are analyzed as system failures and reporting is valued as a contribution to organizational learning, is the cultural foundation upon which all technical and procedural improvements must be built.

6.4 Directions for Future Research

Several important gaps in the evidence base warrant targeted attention in future research. First, there is a relative scarcity of high-quality evidence from low- and middle-income healthcare settings, where the burden of medication error is high and the resources for integration are most constrained. Implementation research specifically designed to identify the most cost-effective integration components for resource-limited settings would be of considerable global significance. Second, the long-term sustainability of integration programs — including the maintenance of error reduction benefits over periods of staff turnover, system upgrades, and organizational

change — has not been adequately studied. Longitudinal studies with follow-up periods of five years or more would provide important evidence on the durability of integration-related safety improvements and the conditions that sustain them. Third, the emergence of artificial intelligence and machine learning applications within EHR and CDSS platforms represents a rapidly evolving frontier that warrants systematic evaluation of its additional contribution to medication safety beyond conventional rule-based decision support. Finally, patient and family engagement as an active component of medication safety — particularly in community and ambulatory settings — has received limited attention relative to its potential for error detection and prevention and represents an important area for future investigation.

REFERENCES

1. Adler-Milstein, J., Bates, D. W., & Jha, A. K. (2014). Operational health information exchanges show substantial growth, but long-term funding remains a concern. Health Affairs, 33(8), 1486–1492.
2. Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality (AHRQ). (2001). Making health care safer: A critical analysis of patient safety practices. AHRQ Publication No. 01-E058. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.
3. Aronson, J. K. (2009). Medication errors: Definitions and classification. British Journal of Clinical Pharmacology, 67(6), 599–604.
4. Ash, J. S., Berg, M., & Coiera, E. (2004). Some unintended consequences of information technology in health care: The nature of patient care information system-related errors. Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association, 11(2), 104–112.
5. Barker, K. N., Flynn, E. A., Pepper, G. A., Bates, D. W., & Mikeal, R. L. (2002). Medication errors observed in 36 health care facilities. Archives of Internal Medicine, 162(16), 1897–1903.
6. Bates, D. W., Cullen, D. J., Laird, N., Petersen, L. A., Small, S. D., Servi, D., . . . Leape, L. L. (1995). Incidence of adverse drug events and potential adverse drug events: Implications for prevention. JAMA, 274(1), 29–34.
7. Bates, D. W., & Gawande, A. A. (2003). Improving safety with information technology. New England Journal of Medicine, 348(25), 2526–2534.
8. Bates, D. W., Leape, L. L., Cullen, D. J., Laird, N., Petersen, L. A., Teich, J. M., . . . Seger, D. L. (1998). Effect of computerized physician order entry and a team intervention on prevention of serious medication errors. JAMA, 280(15), 1311–1316.
9. Bates, D. W., Teich, J. M., Lee, J., Seger, D., Kuperman, G. J., Ma'Luf, N., . . . Leape, L. (1999). The impact of computerized physician order entry on medication error prevention. Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association, 6(4), 313–321.
10. Bates, D. W., Pappius, E., Kuperman, G. J., Fiskio, J., Pandolfi-Blew, B., Schlinkert, D., . . . Seger, D. (2001). Using information systems to measure and improve quality. International Journal of Medical Informatics, 65(3), 109–115.
11. Bond, C. A., Raehl, C. L., & Franke, T. (2002). Clinical pharmacy services, hospital pharmacy staffing, and medication errors in the United States hospitals. Pharmacotherapy, 22(2), 134–147.
12. Brennan, T. A., Gawande, A., Thomas, E., & Studdert, D. (2004). Accidental deaths, saved lives, and improved quality. New England Journal of Medicine, 351(13), 1295–1297.
13. Cheevakasemsook, A., Chapman, Y., Francis, K., & Davies, C. (2006). The study of nursing documentation complexities. International Journal of Nursing Practice, 12(6), 366–374.

14. Chisholm-Burns, M. A., Kim Lee, J., Spivey, C. A., Slack, M., Herrier, R. N., Hall-Lipsy, E., . . . Wunz, T. (2010). US pharmacists' effect as team members on patient care: Systematic review and meta-analyses. Medical Care, 48(10), 923–933.
15. Chua, S. S., Chua, S. S., Wong, I. C. K., & Edmondson, H. (2010). Dispensing errors in outpatient pharmacies: A systematic review. British Journal of Clinical Pharmacology, 69(6), 588–599.
16. Classen, D. C., Pestotnik, S. L., Evans, R. S., Lloyd, J. F., & Burke, J. P. (1997). Adverse drug events in hospitalized patients: Excess length of stay, extra costs, and attributable mortality. JAMA, 277(4), 301–306.
17. Cornish, P. L., Knowles, S. R., Marchesano, R., Tam, V., Shadowitz, S., Juurlink, D. N., & Etchells, E. E. (2005). Unintended medication discrepancies at the time of hospital admission. Archives of Internal Medicine, 165(4), 424–429.
18. Dean, B., Schachter, M., Vincent, C., & Barber, N. (2002). Prescribing errors in hospital inpatients: Their incidence and clinical significance. Quality and Safety in Health Care, 11(4), 340–344.
19. DeRosier, J., Stalhandske, E., Bagian, J. P., & Nudell, T. (2002). Using health care failure mode and effect analysis: The VA National Center for Patient Safety's prospective risk analysis system. The Joint Commission Journal on Quality and Patient Safety, 28(5), 248–267.
20. Donaldson, L., Kelley, E. T., Dhingra-Kumar, N., Kieny, M. P., & Sheikh, A. (2017). Medication without harm: WHO's third global patient safety challenge. The Lancet, 389(10080), 1680–1681.
21. Elliot, M., & Liu, Y. (2010). The nine rights of medication administration: An overview. British Journal of Nursing, 19(5), 300–305.
22. Galt, K. A. (2000). Pharmacy and the US health care system (3rd ed.). Pharmaceutical Press.
23. Griffin, F. A., & Resar, R. K. (2009). IHI global trigger tool for measuring adverse events (2nd ed.). IHI Innovation Series White Paper. Institute for Healthcare Improvement.
24. Haig, K. M., Sutton, S., & Whittington, J. (2006). SBAR: A shared mental model for improving communication between clinicians. The Joint Commission Journal on Quality and Patient Safety, 32(3), 167–175.
25. Hong, Q. N., Fàbregues, S., Bartlett, G., Boardman, F., Cargo, M., Dagenais, P., . . . Pluye, P. (2018). The Mixed Methods Appraisal Tool (MMAT) version 2018 for information professionals and researchers. Education for Information, 34(4), 285–291.
26. Hughes, R. G., & Blegen, M. A. (2008). Medication administration safety. In R. G. Hughes (Ed.), Patient safety and quality: An evidence-based handbook for nurses. Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality.
27. Hyppönen, H., Hämäläinen, P., Pajukoski, M., & Tenhunen, E. (2014). What are the roles of health information systems in reducing errors? Scandinavian Journal of Primary Health Care, 32(4), 157–163.
28. Institute for Safe Medication Practices (ISMP). (2003). ISMP's list of high-alert medications. ISMP.
29. Institute of Medicine. (2006). Preventing medication errors: Quality chasm series. National Academies Press.
30. Jack, B. W., Chetty, V. K., Anthony, D., Greenwald, J. L., Sanchez, G. M., Johnson, A. E., . . . Culpepper, L. (2009). A reengineered hospital discharge program to decrease rehospitalization. Annals of Internal Medicine, 150(3), 178–187.
31. Joint Commission. (2019). Comprehensive accreditation manual for hospitals. Joint Commission Resources.

32. Kaboli, P. J., Hoth, A. B., McClimon, B. J., & Schnipper, J. L. (2006). Clinical pharmacists and inpatient medical care: A systematic review. Archives of Internal Medicine, 166(9), 955–964.
33. Kaushal, R., Bates, D. W., Landrigan, C., McKenna, K. J., Clapp, M. D., Federico, F., & Goldmann, D. A. (2001). Medication errors and adverse drug events in pediatric inpatients. JAMA, 285(16), 2114–2120.
34. Kaushal, R., Shojania, K. G., & Bates, D. W. (2003). Effects of computerized physician order entry and clinical decision support systems on medication safety: A systematic review. Archives of Internal Medicine, 163(12), 1409–1416.
35. Kohn, L. T., Corrigan, J. M., & Donaldson, M. S. (Eds.). (2000). To err is human: Building a safer health system. National Academies Press.
36. Koppel, R., Metlay, J. P., Cohen, A., Abaluck, B., Localio, A. R., Kimmel, S. E., & Strom, B. L. (2005). Role of computerized physician order entry systems in facilitating medication errors. JAMA, 293(10), 1197–1203.
37. Kruse, C. S., Stein, A., Thomas, H., & Kaur, H. (2017). The use of electronic health records to support population health: A systematic review of the literature. Journal of Medical Systems, 42(11), 214.
38. Kucukarslan, S. N., Peters, M., Mlynarek, M., & Nafziger, D. A. (2003). Pharmacists on rounding teams reduce preventable adverse drug events in hospital general medicine units. Archives of Internal Medicine, 163(17), 2014–2018.
39. Leape, L. L., Bates, D. W., Cullen, D. J., Cooper, J., Demonaco, H. J., Gallivan, T., . . . Laffel, G. (1995). Systems analysis of adverse drug events. JAMA, 274(1), 35–43.
40. Leape, L. L., Cullen, D. J., Clapp, M. D., Burdick, E., Demonaco, H. J., Erickson, J. I., & Bates, D. W. (1999). Pharmacist participation on physician rounds and adverse drug events in the intensive care unit. JAMA, 282(3), 267–270.
41. Lesar, T. S., Briceland, L., & Stein, D. S. (1997). Factors related to errors in medication prescribing. JAMA, 277(4), 312–317.
42. Lisby, M., Nielsen, L. P., & Mainz, J. (2005). Errors in the medication process: Frequency, type, and potential clinical consequences. International Journal for Quality in Health Care, 17(1), 15–22.
43. Moher, D., Liberati, A., Tetzlaff, J., & Altman, D. G. (2009). Preferred reporting items for systematic reviews and meta-analyses: The PRISMA statement. PLOS Medicine, 6(7), e1000097.
44. National Coordinating Council for Medication Error Reporting and Prevention (NCC MERP). (2001). About medication errors. NCC MERP.
45. Poon, E. G., Rossin-Slater, M., Koby, E. V., Lipsitz, S. R., Cook, E. F., Hamann, C., . . . Gandhi, T. K. (2006). Design and implementation of an application and associated services to support interdisciplinary medication reconciliation efforts at an integrated healthcare delivery network. Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association, 13(6), 581–592.
46. Reason, J. (2000). Human error: Models and management. BMJ, 320(7237), 768–770.
47. Reckmann, M. H., Westbrook, J. I., Koh, Y., Lo, C., & Day, R. O. (2009). Does computerized provider order entry reduce prescribing errors for hospital inpatients? Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association, 16(5), 613–622.
48. Rozich, J. D., Howard, R. J., Justeson, J. M., Macken, P. D., Lindsay, M. E., & Resar, R. K. (2004). Standardization as a mechanism to improve safety in health care: Application of dose standardization to reduce the incidence of opioid-related adverse events. The Joint Commission Journal on Quality and Safety, 30(2), 89–98.

49. Runciman, W. B., Roughead, E. E., Semple, S. J., & Adams, R. J. (2003). Adverse drug events and medication errors in Australia. International Journal for Quality in Health Care, 15(Suppl 1), i49–i59.
50. Sari, A. B., Sheldon, T. A., Cracknell, A., & Turnbull, A. (2007). Sensitivity of routine system for reporting patient safety incidents in an NHS hospital: Retrospective patient case note review. BMJ, 334(7584), 79.
51. Schiff, G. D., Klass, D., Peterson, J., Shah, G., & Bates, D. W. (2003). Linking laboratory and pharmacy: Opportunities for reducing errors and improving care. Archives of Internal Medicine, 163(8), 893–900.
52. Schnipper, J. L., Kirwin, J. L., Cotugno, M. C., Wahlstrom, S. A., Brown, B. A., Tarvin, E., . . . Bates, D. W. (2006). Role of pharmacist counseling in preventing adverse drug events after hospitalization. Archives of Internal Medicine, 166(5), 565–571.
53. Shamliyan, T. A., Duval, S., Du, J., & Kane, R. L. (2008). Just what the doctor ordered: Review of the evidence of the impact of computerized physician order entry system on medication errors. Health Services Research, 43(1), 32–53.
54. Shortliffe, E. H., & Cimino, J. J. (2014). Biomedical informatics: Computer applications in health care and biomedicine (4th ed.). Springer.
55. Thomas, J., & Harden, A. (2008). Methods for the thematic synthesis of qualitative research in systematic reviews. BMC Medical Research Methodology, 8(1), 45.
56. Tissot, E., Cornette, C., Limat, S., Mourand, J. L., Becker, M., Etievent, J. P., . . . Woronoff-Lemsi, M. C. (2003). Observational study of potential risk factors of medication administration errors. Pharmacy World & Science, 25(6), 264–268.
57. Uribe, C. L., Schweikhart, S. B., Pathak, D. S., Dow, M., & Marsh, G. B. (2002). Perceived barriers to medical-error reporting: An exploratory investigation. Journal of Healthcare Management, 47(4), 263–279.
58. van der Sijs, H., Aarts, J., Vulto, A., & Berg, M. (2006). Overriding of drug safety alerts in computerized physician order entry. Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association, 13(2), 138–147.
59. Vermeulen, L. C., Swarthout, M. D., Sheridan, P., Bhatt, N., LeMay, S. J., Rough, S. S., . . . Tucker, C. L. (2014). ASHP national survey of pharmacy practice in health systems: Dispensing and administration—2014. American Journal of Health-System Pharmacy, 72(14), 1217–1237.
60. Vira, T., Colquhoun, M., & Etchells, E. (2006). Reconcilable differences: Correcting medication errors at hospital admission and discharge. Quality and Safety in Health Care, 15(2), 122–126.
61. Wakefield, B. J., Uden-Holman, T., & Wakefield, D. S. (1998). Development and validation of the medication administration error reporting survey. In K. G. Henriksen, J. B. Battles, E. S. Marks, & D. I. Lewin (Eds.), Advances in patient safety: From research to implementation. AHRQ Publication No. 05-0021. Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality.
62. Westbrook, J. I., Li, L., Lehnbom, E. C., Baysari, M. T., Braithwaite, J., Burke, R., . . . Day, R. O. (2012). What are incident reports telling us? A comparative study at two Australian hospitals of medication errors identified at audit, detected by staff and reported to an incident system. International Journal for Quality in Health Care, 27(1), 1–9.
63. Westbrook, J. I., Woods, A., Rob, M. I., Dunsmuir, W. T., & Day, R. O. (2010). Association of interruptions with an increased risk and severity of medication administration errors. Archives of Internal Medicine, 170(8), 683–690.
64. World Health Organization (WHO). (2017). Medication without harm: WHO global patient safety challenge. WHO.