Congress Negotiating Error-Reporting Measure

BY NELLIE BRISTOL

Contributing Writer

WASHINGTON — The House and Senate are negotiating legislation that would establish a voluntary medical error reporting system with the goal of passing a consensus measure by the August recess, lawmakers and staffers say.

Following a June 9 hearing of the House Energy and Commerce subcommittee on Health, Rep. Nathan Deal (R-Ga.), chairman of the subcommittee on Health, told reporters that the measure is likely to have some variations from last year's versions of the bill, but said the scope of the proposed legislation is the same. "Hopefully, if we can get a consensus worked out, it would be a bill that I think would move rather quickly" to gain approval, he said.

The House and Senate each passed similar patient safety bills last year—the House on a 418-6 vote and the Senate by voice vote. But the bills got bogged down in conference and died in the waning days of the 108th Congress.

The lawmakers are trying to establish a voluntary system in which providers could confidentially report errors to official patient safety organizations. The previously proposed bills differed in the degree to which information was legally protected and in approaches to health information technology interoperability.

Now, as lawmakers negotiate a new measure, Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality (AHRQ) Director Carolyn Clancy, M.D., is calling for increased training of data analysts.

She recently testified that her agency continues its patient safety efforts. "While an increasing number of hospitals are developing the capacity to analyze the causes of medical errors, we need to recognize that the ability to conduct these analyses is uneven both in terms of experience and skill level," Dr. Clancy said. Moving to a system where the errors are routinely analyzed will require "significant skill development and technical assistance."

Dr. Clancy also warned that as the environment for patient safety improves, the number of reported errors is likely to rise as "previously hidden errors are disclosed." An initial increase in the number of reported errors, therefore, "is a sign of success, not failure."

She also called for increased information on care improvement in outpatient set-

Lawmakers are trying to establish a voluntary system in which providers could confidentially report errors to official patient safety organizations.

tings. "There is a significant amount of information on how to improve the safety of hospital care, but the evidence base is less robust for other settings of care."

The day before the hearing, AHRQ announced it will

award more than \$8 million for 15 projects designed to help clinicians, facilities, and patients implement evidence-based safety practices. More than half of the projects focus on reducing medication errors. Another area of interest is improved communications among health care teams.

Despite efforts in the public and private sectors to improve patient safety, Joint Commission on Accreditation of Healthcare Organizations President Dennis O'Leary, M.D., told the House panel that "we may actually be falling further behind as new drugs, procedures, and technologies are introduced every day."

Each new intervention carries its own risks that have not been identified, Dr. O'Leary said, and "they will be introduced into care delivery systems where patient safety and systems thinking ... are not constantly top of mind."

Dr. O'Leary also said more should be done to ensure adherence to clinical guidelines, which he said can reduce legal risk for providers. He suggested providing incentives to focus on improvements in patient safety and health care quality as one way to increase guideline adherence.

Dr. O'Leary also recommended finding a private sector alternative for the National Provider Data Bank, which he said "has probably never met its full expectations.' He said the data bank tends not to record information about whether a standard of care was violated, making the information "relatively unhelpful" for patient safety analysis. He suggested an approach that may include a network of databases.

References: 1. AMBIEN Prescribing Information, Sanofi-Synthelabo Inc. 2. Roth T, Roehrs T, Vogel G. Zolpidem in the treatment of transient insomnia: a double-blind, randomized comparison with placebo. Sleep. 1995;18:246-251. 3. Office of Applied Studies, Drug Abuse Warning Network (DAWN). Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration, US Department of Health and Human Services. Reports & tables from DAWN emergency department component. Table 2.6.0. Available at: http://dawninfo.samhsa.gov/pubs_94_02/edpubs/2002final/files/PubTablesCh2.xls. Accessed December 9, 2003. 4. Hajak G, Müller WE, Wittchen HU, Pittrow D, Kirch W. Abuse and dependence potential for the non-benzodiazepine hypnotics zolpidem and zopidone: a review of case reports and epidemiological data. Addiction. 2003;98:1371-1378. 5. IMS Health, National Prescription Audit Plus, MAT May 2004. 6. Data on file, Sanofi-Synthelabo Inc.



BRIEF SUMMARY

INDICATIONS AND USAGE

mbien has been shown to decrease sleep latency and increase the duration of eep for up to 35 days in controlled clinical studies. Hypontics should generally be limited to 7 to 10 days of use, and reevaluation the patient is recommended if they are to be taken for more than 2 to 3 weeks, mbien should not be prescribed in quantities exceeding a 1-month supply (see arnings).

I multi will arrow other LNS-depressant drugs (see Drug Abuse and endence).

mbien, like other sedative/hypnotic drugs, has CNS-depressant effects. Due le rapid onset of action, Ambien should only be ingested immediately prior oing to bed. Patients should be cautioned against engaging in hazardous inpations requiring complete mental alertness or motor coordination such as rating machinery or driving a motor vehicle after ingesting the drug, includotential impairment of the performance of such activities that may occur the following ingestion of Ambien. Ambien showed additive effects when comd with alcohol and should not be taken with alcohol. Patients should also be ioned about possible combined effects with other CNS-depressant drugs, age adjustments may be necessary when Ambien is administered with such tas because of the potentially additive effects.

PRECAUTIONS

An additive effect on psychomotor performance between alcohol and zolpilem was demonstrated.

A single-dose interaction study with zolpidem 10 mg and fluoxetine 20 mg at
tasedy-state levels in male volunteers did not demonstrate any clinically significant pharmacokinetic or pharmacodynamic interactions. When multiple doses of
opidiem and fluoxetine at steady-state concentrations were evaluated in healthy
emales, the only significant change was a 17% increase in the zolpidem half-life.
There was no evidence of an additive effect in psychomotor performance.
Following five consecutive nightly doses of zolpidem 10 mg in the presence of
Fortraline 50 mg (17 consecutive daily doses, at 7:00 am, in healthy female volunteers), zolpidem C_{mix} was significantly higher (43%) and T_{mix} was significantly
ecreased (53%). Pharmacokinetics of sertraline and N-desmenthylsertraline were
unaffected by zolpidem.
Since the systematic evaluations of Ambien in combination with other CNSctive drugs have been limited, careful consideration should be given to the
harmacology of any CNS-active drug to be used with zolpidem. Any drug with
NS-depressant effects could potentially enhance the CNS-depressant effects of
opipidem.

Inficant alterations in zolpidem pharmacokinetics were found.

Drug/Laboratory test interactions: Zolpidem is not known to interfere with commonly employed clinical laboratory tests. In addition, clinical data indicate that zolpidem does not cross-react with benzodiazepines, opiates, barbiturates, cocaine, cannabinoids, or amphetamines in two standard urine drug screens.

Carcinogenesis, mutagenesis, impairment of fertility
Carcinogenesis: Zolpidem was administered to rats and mice for 2 years at dietary dosages of 4, 18, and 80 mg/kg/day, In mice, these doses are 26 to 520 times or 2 to 35 times the maximum 10-mg human dose on a mg/kg or mg/m² basis, respectively. In rats these doses are 41 to 876 times or 6 to 115 times the maximum 10-mg human dose on a mg/kg or mg/m² basis, respectively. In rats these doses are 41 to 876 times or 6 to 115 times the maximum 10-mg human dose on a mg/kg or mg/m² basis, respectively. No evidence of carcinogenic potential was observed in mice. Renal piposarcomas verse seen in 4/100 rats is males. 1 female) receiving 80 mg/kg/day and a renal liponar was observed in one male rat at the 18 mg/kg/day dose. Incidence rates of lipona and liposarcoma for zolpidem were comparable to those seen in historical controls and the tumor findings are thought to be a spontaneous occurrence.

Mutagenesis: Zolpidem did not have mutagenic activity in several tests includ-

This drug should be used during pregnancy only if clearly needed.

Nonteratogenic effects: Studies to assess the effects on children whose mothers took zolpidem during pregnancy have not been conducted. However, children born of mothers taking sedative/hypontic drugs may be at some risk for with-drawal symptoms from the drug during the postnatal period. In addition, neonatal faccidity has been reported in infants born of mothers who received sedative/hypnotic drugs during pregnancy.

Labor and delivery: Ambien has no established use in labor and delivery.

Nursing mothers: Studies in lactating mothers indicate that between 0.004 and 0.019% of the total administered dose is excreted into milk, but the effect of zolpidem on the infant is unknown.

The use of Ambien in nursing mothers is not recommended.

Geriatric use: A total of 154 patients in U.S. controlled clinical trials and 897 patients in non-U.S. clinical trials who received zolpidem were ≥60 years of age. patients in non-U.S. clinical trials who received zolpidem were ≥60 years of age For a pool of U.S. patients receiving zolpidem at doses of ≤10 mg or placebo there were three adverse events occurring at an incidence of at least 3% for zolpi dem and for which the zolpidem incidence was at least twice the placebo inci-dence (lê, they could be considered drug related).

Adverse Event	Zolpidem	Placebo
Dizziness	3%	0%
Drowsiness	5%	2%
Diarrhea	3%	1%

events.

Adverse events are further classified and enumerated in order of decreasing requency using the following definitions: frequent adverse events are defined as hose occurring in greater than 1/100 subjects; infrequent adverse events are hose occurring in 1/100 to 1/1,000 patients; rare events are those occurring in 1/100 to 1/1,000 patients; rare events are those occurring in ess than 1/1,000 patients.

impomationary, including tratal outcomes, commended treatment: General symptomatic and supportive measures buld be used along with immediate gastric lavage where appropriate, avenous fluids should be administered as needed. Flumazenil may be useful, spiration, pulse, blood pressure, and other appropriate signs should be non-ed and general supportive measures employed. Sedating drugs should be hheld following zolpidem overdosage. Zolpidem is not dialyzable. he possibility of multiple drug ingestion should be considered.

sanofi~synthelabo