



**Meeting**

[GAA 2004](#)

[Search GAA 2004](#)

[Flyer \(PDF\)](#)

[Email this Article](#)

**Output Options**

[XML](#)

**Meeting Abstract**

**Reporting the discharge  
medication in the discharge  
letter: an explorative survey  
of family doctors**

✉ **S. Harder** - *Institute of Clinical  
Pharmacology at the pharmazentrum  
frankfurt, Johann Wolfgang Goethe  
University Hospital Frankfurt am Main*

✉ **A. Roth-Isigkeit** - *Department of  
Anaesthesiology, University of Schleswig-  
Holstein, Campus Luebeck, Germany*

**Search Medline for**

[Harder S](#)

[Roth-Isigkeit A](#)

Gesellschaft für  
Arzneimittelanwendungsforschung und  
Arzneimittlepidemiologie (GAA) e.V..  
11. Jahrestagung der Gesellschaft für  
Arzneimittelforschung und  
Arzneimittlepidemiologie (GAA) e.V..  
Jena, 30.09.-01.10.2004. Düsseldorf,  
Köln: German Medical Science; 2004.  
Doc 04gaa17

The electronic version of this article is  
the complete one and can be found  
online at:

**Published: 30-09-2004**

© 2004 Harder et al; licensee . This is an Open  
Access article: verbatim copying and redistribution of  
this article are permitted in all media for any  
purpose, provided this notice is preserved along with  
the article's original URL.

**Background and Aim**

In Germany, the discharge medication is usually reported to the general practitioner (GP) by an initial short report (SR) /notification (handed over to the patient) and later by a more detailed discharge letter (DL) of the hospital.

**Material and Method**

We asked N=536 GPs (from Frankfurt/Main and Luebeck) after the typical report format of their patients discharge medication by the local hospitals. The questionnaire asked for 26 items covering (1) the designation of the medication (brand name, generic name) in SR and DL, (2) further specifications e.g. possibilities of generic substitution or supervision of sensible medications, (3) reasons why GPs do not follow the hospitals recommendations and (4) possibilities for an improvement in the medication-related communication between GP and hospitals.

**Results**

39% GPs responded sufficiently to the questionnaire. The majority of the GPs (82%) quoted that in the SR only brand names are given (often or ever) and neither the generic name or any further information on generic substitution is available (seldom or never). 65% of the responders quoted that even in the DL only brand names are given. Only 41% of the responders quoted that further treatment relevant specifications are given (often or ever). 95% responded that new medications or change of custom medication is seldom or never explained in the DL and GP were not explicitly informed about relevant

medication changes. 58% of the responders quoted economic reasons for re-adjustment of the discharge medication e.g. by generic substitution. The majority of responders (83%) are favouring (useful or very useful) a pre-discharge information (e.g. via fax) about the medication and 54% a hot-line to some relevant person in the hospital when treatment problems emerge. 67% of the responders quoted in favour of regular meetings between GPs and hospital doctors regarding actual pharmacotherapy.

### **Conclusion**

In conclusion, our survey pointed to marked deficiencies in reporting the discharge medication to GPs.

Conflict of interest: None