



REVIEW ARTICLE

Challenges encountered by healthcare professionals in monitoring adverse events due to medical devices-A review

Nithya Raju, Shruthi Deivigarajan, Sindhuja Santhakumar, Sneha Balamurugan

Abstract

Medical devices can be hazardous despite their positive benefits. Reporting medical device adverse events are voluntary for all healthcare professionals but the number of reported adverse medical events are less when compared with all the available studies in India. Hence it is important to address the reasons and challenges that healthcare professionals face in reporting the events so that safety and quality action can be taken in order to prevent them. Understanding the obstacles to and reasons for patient reporting is necessary and may help increase medication safety. This review provides insight into factors contributing to underreporting of MDAE, such as Health care system capacity related, organizational related barriers, and industry responsiveness. This review might offer helpful data for overcoming barriers in monitoring and supporting hospital quality and safety management.

Keywords: Lack of reporting, Materiovigilance program of India, Medical device adverse events, Poor awareness, Self-implementation of devices.

Introduction

According to WHO, any apparatus, instrument, appliance, substance, reagent for invitro usage, software or other medical objects are considered Medical devices. (Organization, 2019) Technology breakthroughs, including drug-device combo products, automation and wireless innovations, and advanced clinical use of devices, have allowed for a rapid increase in the usage of medical devices in medical facilities all over the world. (Fouretier & Bertram, 2014). Devices can be hazardous despite their positive aspects. The "Materiovigilance Programme of India" is a programme that was started in India at Ghaziabad, on 2015 July 6th, to monitor the negative events resulting from medical device usage and to take the required steps

to address those negative events. (Hoda *et al.*, 2020). The workflow process of the Materiovigilance program of India is illustrated in Figure 1.

The reporting of adverse medical device reactions by healthcare professionals is very rare as per the available literature. Understanding the obstacles to and reasons for patient reporting is necessary and may help increase medication safety. To increase the effectiveness of MDAE management, the promptness of MDAE response, and the effectiveness of multiparty coordination among medical institutions, dealers, and medical device manufacturers, a number of issues still need to be resolved. Reporting MDAE are voluntary for all healthcare professionals, but the number of reported adverse medical events are less when compared with all the available studies in India. Hence it is important to address the reasons and challenges that healthcare professionals face in reporting the events so that safety and quality action can be taken in order to prevent them. This review gives an insight into various challenges healthcare professionals face in reporting from the available literature. The number of reporting centers year-wise in medical India is displayed in Table 1 and Figures 2 and 3.

Challenges in Adverse Event Reporting Owing to Medical Devices

Overview of challenges influenced associated with reporting Adverse events (Al Dweik *et al.*, 2017; Bates *et al.*, 1995; Hazell & Shakir, 2006; Inman, 1976; Varallo *et al.*, 2014) as shown in Figure 4

Department of Pharmacy Practice, Swamy Vivekanandha College of Pharmacy, Namakkal, Tamilnadu, India.

***Corresponding Author:** Nithya Raju, Department of Pharmacy Practice, Swamy Vivekanandha College of Pharmacy, Namakkal, Tamilnadu, India, E-Mail: nithyapharma14@gmail.com

How to cite this article: Raju, N., Deivigarajan, S., Santhakumar, S. Balamurugan, S. (2023). Challenges encountered by healthcare professionals in monitoring adverse events due to medical devices-A review. *The Scientific Temper*, 14(2):479-483.

Doi: 10.58414/SCIENTIFICTEMPER.2023.14.2.37

Source of support: Nil

Conflict of interest: None.




Figure 1: Systematic process in reporting medical device adverse events

Table 1: Number of reporting in medical device monitoring centres

YEAR	No. of MDMCs	No. of Reports
Since 2015-2017 (From SCTIMST, Kerala)	10	347
IPC National Coordination Centre		
2018	10	687
2019	36	1116
2020	50	1384
2021	150	3473
2022	293	5078




Figure 2: Year-wise medical device adverse events reporting trend




Figure 3: MDMCs centres across India year wise

Health care system capacity related	Organizational related barrier	Industry responsiveness
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lack of attention to the importance of identifying the error. Inadequate monitoring of patient. Inadequate record of the device utilised in patients Poor awareness. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lack of feedback on submitted reports. Confusions and difficulties regarding reporting procedures. Lack of system for MDAE reporting. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Purchasing contracts constraint device choice No feedback regarding the defected devices. Lack of effect on advancement of the device.

Figure 4: Overview of challenges influenced associated with reporting Adverse events (Al Dweik *et al.*, 2017; Bates *et al.*, 1995; Hazell & Shakir, 2006; Inman, 1976; Varallo *et al.*, 2014)

Factors contributing to under reporting of MDAE

Factors contributing to under-reporting of adverse events owing to Medical devices as shown in Figure 5.

Healthcare Functioning Related

Inadequate Attention to the Importance of Identifying the Event

Identifying adverse related to medical devices was not consciously thought of as a duty and many MDAEs weren't identified, affecting patient safety and quality of life (Gagliardi *et al.*, 2018). Thus, individual physicians and other healthcare professionals should broadly share the information regarding the identification, reporting and its significance to other healthcare professionals, patients and various stakeholders (Maisel, 2004).

Inadequate Monitoring of Patient

The majority of studies in which HCPs claimed that they did not keep track of negative outcomes for specific patients who had devices implanted after the first healing phase (Shuren & Califf, 2016). Identifying deficient monitoring from the doctor inserting devices and the incomplete of immediate monitoring and MDAE detection by other doctors (Maisel, 2006). MDAEs, which might occur for days and some months after the fixation of devices, might not be considered (AJ, 2012). The only real monitoring that occurs is when we administer something and then check in to see if it has healed and the issue has been resolved (Somberg *et al.*, 2014).




Figure 5: Factors contributing to under-reporting of adverse events owing to Medical devices

Inadequate Record of the Device Utilized in Patients

The patients in many studies complained that the information concerning implanted devices or any other medical devices was missing from patient medical records (Samuel *et al.*, 2016). Thus, it would be challenging to replace recalled devices and to determine which patient received the respective devices (Kingston *et al.*, 2004; Waring, 2005). Hence instead of reporting MDAEs, they continued using them and managing their own techniques to resolve AE rather than reporting it to the MDMCs (Hartnell *et al.*, 2012).

Poor Awareness

Many qualitative and quantitative studies have shown that the underreporting is due to poor awareness regarding the MDAE reporting system. Such poor awareness is due to various challenges (Lawton *et al.*, 2012). It is mainly due to unawareness of:

- The implementation program of materiovigilance has inadequate knowledge about MDRs. Negative attitude towards the reporting of AE.
- lack of time and interest.
- Considering adverse events as non-serious and unaware about the potential effects it could cause.
- There is no education and training about the Materiovigilance concept and its reporting system among various healthcare professionals, stakeholders and the general public (Polisena *et al.*, 2015).

Hence, the above factors highlight the necessity for the HCPs and every personnel to have the required education and regular training about the entire concept of reporting system with continual public enlightenment and awareness campaigns on spontaneous reporting of MDAE and encourage them about the significance of reporting rates (Auerbach & Silverstein, 2003). (Sandelowski, 2000). There was a lack of transition from adequate information and a supportive attitude to good MDAE reporting practices (Butterfield *et al.*, 2005).

Organizational Related Barrier

Lack of Feedback on Submitted Reports

From two investigations performed by (Jung *et al.*, 2008) (Ivers *et al.*, 2012), patients worries about the improper and




Figure 6: Factors contributing to lack of system reporting

lack of submitted MDAE reports and 33% of subjects from a study conducted in UK said that they are expecting the comment from the reported MDR and 1.8% thought that receiving less-than-detailed feedback could make them reluctant to report and submit the reports in the future (Jung *et al.*, 2008). Individual opinions regarding the likelihood, prevalence, time interval, course and root cause of MDAE were not known due to the lack of impact and feedback on reporting (Ivers *et al.*, 2012). Feedback systems could improve patient reporting of MDRs by making patients more familiar with the system and by laying out clear reporting procedures (Ouriel *et al.*, 2014).

Confusions and Difficulties Regarding Reporting Procedures

Four quantitative and qualitative analyses found issues with the system of reporting and its procedures. In the UK, the proportions citing difficulties ranged from 14.9 to 83%. (Vidi *et al.*, 2011) Subjects in the UK study, for instance, complained about the following:

- Paper formats are laborious, inconsistent with online forms, and available only in English.
- Reporting by telephone, mails were restricted to the working days, which was irksome and onerous.
- Issues with the technical systems and online reporting frequently resulted in a loss of information (Vidi *et al.*, 2011).

Lack of System for MDAE Reporting

Medical professionals cited a lack of reporting procedures as a deterrent to interpreting an MDAE (Rao *et al.*, 2008). The HCPs may be discouraged from determining whether an adverse event has occurred or not if they are unable to access the online system (Mandl *et al.*, 2014) (Figure 6).

Industry responsiveness

Purchasing Contracts Constraint Device Choice

Participants reported that even when a device was not the best option or produced less than ideal-patient results, they were forced to use it under hospital or health region

purchasing agreements with producers (Wiig *et al.*, 2014). As a result, although an MD was due MDAEs, doctors working on the purchases might be impossible to move to the alternative equivalent instrument on the purchase (Gauld, 2016). Because of those restrictions, they might also be less reliable in interpreting MDAEs. Due to large purchases, the purchasing group was able to negotiate a lower price from the implant manufacturer (Amoore, 2014). The complication risk increases temporarily, according to the author's experience, if surgeons are forced to switch implants as a result of a contract. Thus, cohere the commercial sense to look the revised expenses for the following months to years with their follow-up care (Ward & Clarkson, 2004).

Lack of Effect on the Advancement of the Device

The lack of feedback participants received after reporting MDAEs to physicians that it is not their duty to interpret adverse events and that they must instead carry on to come up with remedy or, use different devices (Commission, 2005). When the manufacturer finally took notice, they modified the design of the product. However, that most likely took more than three years. They spent a lot of money developing the product, and now they have a lot of inventory on hand (Group *et al.*, 2009). There is far less pressure on the corporation to change if there is a high cost to the change and consumers have found a solution (Desveaux & Gagliardi, 2018).

Conclusion

This review emphasizes the necessity for intervention studies that concentrate on teaching health care professionals about MDAE. Challenges faced by healthcare professionals in reporting MDAE are administration, healthcare professionals, self-implementation of devices, counter-fit devices, and poor awareness. Poor adverse event reporting practices were linked to a lack of training, inadequate expertise, and limited job experience. Healthcare professionals must be educated and trained on patient-centered aspects of medical surveillance to deliver adequate care while maximising patient safety to meet these obstacles. This review might offer helpful data for overcoming barriers in monitoring and supporting hospital quality and safety management.

Acknowledgement

We are very grateful to acknowledge our Principal, Dr. G. Muruganathan, M. Pharm., Ph.D., and Dr. P. Sharmila Nirojini, HOD, Department of Pharmacy Practice of Swamy Vivekanandha College of Pharmacy for their Valuable suggestions and guidance for this review.

Author Contributions

Mrs.Nithya Raju conceptualised and the title and content, Ms.Shruthi deivigarajan, and Ms.Sindhuja santhakumar drafted the manuscript. Mrs.Nithya Raju and Ms.Sneha done proof reading and approved the final manuscript.

References

- AJ, C. (2012). Robertsson (). Graves S. *et al.* *Knee replacement//lancet*, 379(9823), 1331-1340.
- Al Dweik, R., Stacey, D., Kohen, D., & Yaya, S. (2017). Factors affecting patient reporting of adverse drug reactions: a systematic review. *British journal of clinical pharmacology*, 83(4), 875-883.
- Amoore, J. N. (2014). A structured approach for investigating the causes of medical device adverse events. *Journal of medical engineering*, 2014.
- Auerbach, C., & Silverstein, L. B. (2003). *Qualitative data: An introduction to coding and analysis* (Vol. 21). NYU press.
- Bates, D. W., Cullen, D. J., Laird, N., Petersen, L. A., Small, S. D., Servi, D., Laffel, G., Sweitzer, B. J., Shea, B. F., & Hallisey, R. (1995). Incidence of adverse drug events and potential adverse drug events: implications for prevention. *Jama*, 274(1), 29-34.
- Butterfield, L. D., Borgen, W. A., Amundson, N. E., & Maglio, A.-S. T. (2005). Fifty years of the critical incident technique: 1954-2004 and beyond. *Qualitative research*, 5(4), 475-497.
- Commission, I. E. (2005). Medical electrical equipment-Part 1: General requirements for basic safety and essential performance. *IEC 60601-1: 2005*.
- Desveaux, L., & Gagliardi, A. R. (2018). Comparing the application of two theoretical frameworks to describe determinants of adverse medical device event reporting: secondary analysis of qualitative interview data. *BMC Health Services Research*, 18, 1-14.
- Fourtiet, A., & Bertram, D. (2014). New regulations on medical devices in Europe: what to expect? *Expert Review of Medical Devices*, 11(4), 351-359.
- Gagliardi, A. R., Ducey, A., Lehoux, P., Turgeon, T., Ross, S., Trbovich, P., Easty, A., Bell, C., & Urbach, D. (2018). Factors influencing the reporting of adverse medical device events: qualitative interviews with physicians about higher risk implantable devices. *BMJ quality & safety*, 27(3), 190-198.
- Gauld, R. (2016). Healthcare system restructuring in New Zealand: Problems and proposed solutions. *Asia Pacific Journal of Health Management*, 11(3), 75-80.
- Group, W. A. F. P. S. D., Sherman, H., Castro, G., Fletcher, M., Hatlie, M., Hibbert, P., Jakob, R., Koss, R., Lewalle, P., & Loeb, J. (2009). Towards an International Classification for Patient Safety: the conceptual framework. *International journal for quality in health care*, 21(1), 2-8.
- Hartnell, N., MacKinnon, N., Sketris, I., & Fleming, M. (2012). Identifying, understanding and overcoming barriers to medication error reporting in hospitals: a focus group study. *BMJ quality & safety*, 21(5), 361-368.
- Hazell, L., & Shakir, S. A. (2006). Under-reporting of adverse drug reactions. *Drug safety*, 29(5), 385-396.
- Hoda, F., Verma, R., Arshad, M., Siddiqui, A. N., Khan, M. A., Akhtar, M., & Najmi, A. K. (2020). Materiovigilance: concept, structure and emerging perspective for patient's safety in India. *Drug Research*, 70(09), 429-436.
- Inman, W. (1976). Assessment drug safety problems. In *Epidemiological issues in reported drug-induced illnesses* (pp. 17-24). McMaster University Library Press Honolulu.
- Ivers, N., Jamtvedt, G., Flottorp, S., Young, J. M., Odgaard-Jensen, J., French, S. D., O'Brien, M. A., Johansen, M., Grimshaw, J., & Oxman, A. D. (2012). Audit and feedback: effects on professional practice and healthcare outcomes. *Cochrane database of systematic reviews*(6).
- Jung, W., Rillig, A., Birkemeyer, R., Miljak, T., & Meyerfeldt, U.

- (2008). Advances in remote monitoring of implantable pacemakers, cardioverter defibrillators and cardiac resynchronization therapy systems. *Journal of interventional cardiac electrophysiology*, 23, 73-85.
- Kingston, M. J., Evans, S. M., Smith, B. J., & Berry, J. G. (2004). Attitudes of doctors and nurses towards incident reporting: a qualitative analysis. *Medical Journal of Australia*, 181(1), 36-39.
- Lawton, R., McEachan, R. R., Giles, S. J., Sirriyeh, R., Watt, I. S., & Wright, J. (2012). Development of an evidence-based framework of factors contributing to patient safety incidents in hospital settings: a systematic review. *BMJ quality & safety*, 21(5), 369-380.
- Maisel, W. H. (2004). Medical device regulation: an introduction for the practicing physician. *Annals of internal medicine*, 140(4), 296-302.
- Maisel, W. H. (2006). Pacemaker and ICD generator reliability: meta-analysis of device registries. *Jama*, 295(16), 1929-1934.
- Mandl, K. D., McNabb, M., Marks, N., Weitzman, E. R., Kelemen, S., Eggleston, E. M., & Quinn, M. (2014). Participatory surveillance of diabetes device safety: a social media-based complement to traditional FDA reporting. *Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association*, 21(4), 687-691.
- Organization, W. H. (2019). Decommissioning medical devices.
- Ouriel, K., Fowl, R. J., Davies, M. G., Forbes, T. L., Gambhir, R. P., & Ricci, M. A. (2014). Disease-specific guidelines for reporting adverse events for peripheral vascular medical devices. *Journal of Vascular Surgery*, 60(1), 212-225.
- Polisena, J., Gagliardi, A., & Clifford, T. (2015). How can we improve the recognition, reporting and resolution of medical device-related incidents in hospitals? A qualitative study of physicians and registered nurses. *BMC Health Services Research*, 15(1), 1-9.
- Rao, S. V., Califf, R. M., Kramer, J. M., Peterson, E. D., Gross, T. P., Pepine, C. J., Williams, D. O., Donohoe, D., Waksman, R., & Mehran, R. (2008). Postmarket evaluation of breakthrough technologies. *American heart journal*, 156(2), 201-208.
- Samuel, A. M., Rath, V. K., Grauer, J. N., & Ross, J. S. (2016). How do orthopaedic devices change after their initial FDA premarket approval? *Clinical Orthopaedics and Related Research*, 474, 1053-1068.
- Sandelowski, M. (2000). Whatever happened to qualitative description? *Research in nursing & health*, 23(4), 334-340.
- Shuren, J., & Califf, R. M. (2016). Need for a national evaluation system for health technology. *Jama*, 316(11), 1153-1154.
- Somberg, J. C., McEwen, P., & Molnar, J. (2014). Assessment of cardiovascular and noncardiovascular medical device recalls. *The American Journal of Cardiology*, 113(11), 1899-1903.
- Varallo, F. R., Guimarães, S. d. O. P., Abjaude, S. A. R., & Mastroianni, P. d. C. (2014). Causes for the underreporting of adverse drug events by health professionals: a systematic review. *Revista da Escola de Enfermagem da USP*, 48, 739-747.
- Vidi, V. D., Matheny, M. E., & Resnic, F. S. (2011). Post-marketing device safety surveillance. *Contemporary clinical trials*, 32(3), 307-308.
- Ward, J. R., & Clarkson, P. J. (2004). An analysis of medical device-related errors: prevalence and possible solutions. *Journal of medical engineering & technology*, 28(1), 2-21.
- Waring, J. J. (2005). Beyond blame: cultural barriers to medical incident reporting. *Social science & medicine*, 60(9), 1927-1935.
- Wiig, S., Aase, K., Von Plessen, C., Burnett, S., Nunes, F., Weggelaar, A. M., Anderson-Gare, B., Calltorp, J., Fulop, N., & QUASER-team. (2014). Talking about quality: exploring how 'quality' is conceptualized in European hospitals and healthcare systems. *BMC Health Services Research*, 14, 1-12.