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ABSTRACT

Objectives To perform a systematic review of the frequency of (preventable) adverse events (AE/PAE) and to analyse contributing factors, such as sample size, settings, type of events, terminology, methods of collecting data and characteristics of study populations.

Review methods Search of Medline and Embase from 1995 to 2007. Included were original papers with data on the frequency of AE or PAE, explicit definition of study population and information about methods of assessment. Results were included with percentages of patients having one or more AE/PAE. Extracted data enclosed contributing factors. Data were abstracted and analysed by two researchers independently.

Results 156 studies in 152 publications met our inclusion criteria. 144/156 studies reported AE, 55 PAE (43 both). Sample sizes ranged from 60 to 8493 876 patients (median: 1361 patients). The reported results for AE varied from 0.1% to 65.4%, and for PAE from 0.1% to 33.9%. Variation clearly decreased with increasing sample size. Estimates did not differ according to setting, type of event or terminology. In studies with fewer than 1000 patients, chart review prevailed, whereas surveys with more than 100 000 patients were based mainly on administrative data. No effect of patient characteristics was found.

Conclusions The funnel-shaped distribution of AE and PAE rates with sample size is a probable consequence of variation and can be taken as an indirect indicator of study validity. A contributing factor may be the method of data assessment. Further research is needed to explain the results when analysing data by types of event or terminology.

INTRODUCTION

Following the Institute of Medicine (IOM) report ‘To Err is Human’ in 1999, there has been much debate on the true incidence of adverse events (AE), and preventable adverse events (PAE).¹ Several studies at national level and with the Harvard Medical Practice Design (see below) have found results for AE up to 16.6%, and for PAE up to 8.4%,¹² of inpatients. Variations in the figures were soon considered, and several systematic reviews have covered this issue.¹³ Systematic reviews are restricted by the diversity of studies. One strategy to deal with it is to refine research so as to focus on particular healthcare settings or subgroups of endpoints such as medication-related events¹⁴–¹⁸ or events leading to hospital admission.¹⁹–²⁴ Only loose attempts have been made in mapping AE across the total healthcare system comprehensively, however.²⁵–²⁷

The present systematic review aims to specify the overall incidence of AE and PAE across all settings and procedures, so as to describe the influence of heterogeneity factors such as sample size, settings, type of events, terminology, methods of collecting data or characteristics of the study population. We hypothesise that variation of incidence is explained primarily by sample size.

METHODS

Search strategy

The present article is part of a broader literature research on the epidemiology of patient safety,³⁰ and looks at papers giving frequencies of AE and PAE as percentages of patients affected. We began with a search in Medline and Embase for studies published between January 1995 and October 2007. Key words (truncated) were: ‘AE’, ‘PAE’, ‘negligent AE’, ‘adverse medical event’, ‘medication error’, ‘medical error’, ‘near miss’, ‘adverse drug event’ and ‘iatrogenic illness’. This search was limited to titles and abstracts. References cited in the studies retrieved were examined in order to identify additional publications.

Articles in English, German, Spanish, French, Portuguese, Danish and Norwegian were considered. Other languages were approved when there was an English abstract containing data essential for extraction. Articles identified were reviewed at full-text level.

Selection

To be included, studies had to meet the following five criteria: (1) original paper; (2) a specified study population; (3) data collected on AE or PAE or both; (4) explicit information given about the study method; and (5) results reported as percentages of patients affected. AE was defined as any patient-related injury caused by clinical management rather than by the underlying disease, and PAE was defined as an AE resulting from error, and therefore avoidable.¹ ² ³ Patient populations might represent all patients in an institution, patients related to a defined medical specialty, or patients in an entire sector of care such as drug therapy or nosocomial infections. A study was considered as an article on a single study population. Papers reporting results from different study populations were regarded as two or more studies. In the case of duplicate publications, only the primary or the one reporting overall results was included. Intervention studies were included with baseline data before the implementation of risk prevention. When several assessment methods
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were used, we extracted combined results as far as possible. Studies limited to single diseases or isolated procedures were excluded.

**Data abstraction**

Retrieved studies were assessed independently by two reviewers and controlled twice. Discrepancies were resolved by discussion. Data on the frequency of AE and PAE were extracted. Additional variables were the number of patients included, information on healthcare settings, classification according to types of event and terminology, method of collecting data and patient characteristics. We distinguished between medication-related, procedure-related and all types of events. We also distinguished between AE terminologies used by different authors. Two main groups were discerned. The first group refers to the definition of the IOM, ‘an AE is an injury resulting from a medical intervention, or in other words, it is not due to the underlying disease’. The second group apply to the definition due to the WHO of adverse drug events/adverse drug reactions as ‘any response to a drug which is noxious, unintended and which occurs at doses normally used in man for the prophylaxis, diagnosis or therapy of disease’. All other definitions were summarised in a third definition group. Among methods of collecting data, we distinguished between chart review, computer-based alerts, direct observation, voluntary reporting, critical incident reporting systems, interviews, clinical surveillance and the analysis of administrative data, usually in the form of codes from the International Statistical Classification of Diseases and Related Health Problems (ICD). We chose to distinguish between three types of chart review: prospective, retrospective and the Harvard Medical Design. The latter was developed especially to detect AE and PAE, and consists of a retrospective structured two-staged review process.

**Quantitative data synthesis**

Abstracted data were entered into a Microsoft Access database for further analysis (Microsoft, Seattle, Washington). Frequencies of outcome measures were recorded or calculated as numbers and percentages of patients. Data were rounded to one decimal place. Patient subgroups were totalled, if we were sure that every patient was included only once.

**RESULTS**

**Trial flow**

Our primary research found a total of 241 studies in 230 publications that matched our inclusion criteria. A total of 156 studies gave results as percentages of patients affected by AE or PAE, see figure 1 (full list of references in Appendix 1, available online only).

**Study characteristics**

In total, the 156 studies in our review reported results on 23,696,252 patients. Sample size varied from 60 patients to 8,493,876 patients. The median sample size was 1,361 patients, and the mean sample size was 4,766 patients.

AE as a single outcome measure was observed in 101,156 (64.7%) of studies, 12 (7.8%) observed PAE, and 43 (27.6%) observed both. Studies were performed in 27 countries, primarily in highly developed industrial countries, headed by the USA (51 surveys). Most studies were short-term; 55.1% lasted more than 6 months, but only 25.6% lasted more than 1 year. Patients were treated in distinct healthcare settings. One hundred and one studies examined inpatient patients, nine surveys looked at ambulatory care, 59 looked at ambulant patients leading to hospital admission, three studies took place in long-term care, and four studies were conducted in other settings. When samples consisted of hospital patients, tertiary hospitals and academic centres prevailed. Most studies were limited to single institutions (101/156 cases). In general, all medical disciplines were concerned (17 medical specialties were distinguished), but when a specific choice was made, this depended principally on the organisational structure of the wards and hospital. Ninety-seven of 156 surveys concentrated on a single discipline. Thirty-nine of these were concerned with internal medicine, 16 with paediatrics and nine with surgery. We also found that 50/156 studies reported on all types of events, 99/156 were medication-related, and 7/156 were procedure-related.

Studies used different methods for collecting data. Ninety-seven surveys were restricted to a single collection method, and 59 papers used a combination of two or more methods. As a single measuring instrument, a chart review prevailed in 43/117 studies, followed by clinical surveillance (15/117) and ICD codes (11/117). Among combinations, the use of chart review with interviews was most common (19/59). A summary of all studies included is given in Appendix 2, available online only.

**Incidence of AE and PAE by sample size**

Frequencies of AE ranged from 0.1% to 65.4%. Most studies (129/156) reported results between 0.1% and 30% (median 8.9%, IQR 12.9). Incidences of PAE ranged from 0.1% to 53.9%. Almost all studies (55/55) reported results between 0.1% and 20% (median 4.8%, IQR 5.4).

To provide a more detailed picture of the distribution of results, we plotted the results against study size. Figure 2 shows the distribution of AE estimates in correlation to the size of the study population.

We observe a broad variation in smaller studies having fewer than 1000 patients. In studies with more than 1000 patients, the spread decreases rapidly, and even falls below 20% in studies with more than about 2000 patients. With only one exception, the results of surveys with approximately 15,000 patients or more do not exceed 10%.

For PAE, the plot looks similar, although extreme outliers are missing within small studies (figure 3); however, the fraction of
small studies is smaller for PAE than for AE, and the same is true for very large studies.

Nonetheless, percentages clearly decrease with sample size. In studies with approximately 2000 patients, the results fall below 10%, and below the 1% mark in studies with more than 20,000 patients. All scatter plots exhibit a visible correlation between the frequency of AE and PAE and sample size.

**Effect of setting, types of events, terminology and methods of collecting data**

We next analysed whether variation is due to further factors. We found that results do not differ between healthcare settings, countries or medical specialties. More surprisingly, we did not even find any clear disparities between different types of events, although the frequency of AE related to medications or procedures is expected to be lower than the overall results. Figure 4 shows the distribution for adverse drug events, procedure-related events and all types of AE (figure 4).

The data for terminology show a similar distribution. There is no difference in variation between studies using the terminology of the IOM, the WHO or others (figure 5, a list of all definitions of AE used is given in Appendix 3, available online only).

In relation to data-collating methods, there is no difference in estimates between studies that use a single method to detect events, and surveys that operate with two or more methods. In contrast assessment techniques differ according to sample size, especially for AE (figure 6).

Interviews as a single method are restricted to small studies with some hundred patients included, whereas compilations of ICD codes are used in large trials involving up to millions of patients. Six of nine surveys with more than 100,000 patients are based on ICD codes, and the frequencies of AE in these studies range from 0.1% to 3.5%. All studies with results exceeding 30% and one single method to detect AE rely on prospective or retrospective chart review. Also, 8/9 surveys with combined methods use prospective chart review, mainly in combination with interviews (5/8). The distribution is less clear for PAE.

**Characteristics of study populations**

Information on the effect of patient characteristics was inconsistent. The distribution of gender is displayed in 46/156 surveys; 58/156 studies give the mean ages. Only 54/156 studies report health status, referring mainly to the Charlson Index (11/54). Eighty-one of 156 surveys report on patient deaths. None of these data suffice to give information about possible dependence of variation on study population characteristics.

**DISCUSSION**

In our systematic review, we included 156 studies on the frequency of AE and PAE. Studies were of great heterogeneity, and estimates varied widely from 0.1% to 65.4% for AE, and from 0.1% to 33.9% for PAE. Previous reviews found less variation. Von Laue et al compiled estimates for AE ranging between 2.9% and 16.6%, Aranaz et al from 3.7% to 16.6%, and de Vries et al from 4.6% to 12.4%. Discrepancies are largely because search strategies were more contracted, and the number of studies included was smaller.
Our aim was to display the overall body of published evidence in order to shed light on the diversity of studies and results. To consider study size as an approximation for strength of evidence, we plotted outcomes against the size of the study population and observed that variation decreased with the number of patients included. As one would expect results to spread in small studies as a simple rule of statistics, we interpret the distribution of results as an indirect indicator for validity. This pattern was much clearer for AE than for PAE, due primarily we believe to the smaller number of studies on PAE. This consequence of missing data has been described in the context of meta-analyses.53

We found no other factors to explain this pattern of variation. Neither different settings nor event types had any effect, that is, we found no differences between frequencies reported by surveys of the total of events and surveys examining medication-related or procedure-related AE only. The same is true for terminology; diverse definitions of AE make no difference to frequencies. One reason might be indifference to precise definition of terms. For example, few papers using the WHO terminology differentiate between adverse drug reactions and adverse drug events, terms sometimes used to distinguish between preventable and non-preventable patient injuries. These findings suggest that research methods should be refined, and results may not always display the true dimension of AE and PAE.

Very large surveys show a clear tendency for results to be less than 1%. This could be due to the relation between sample size and assessment methods. Whereas large surveys with more than 100,000 patients are almost exclusively restricted to ICD-coded events, many small trials prefer chart review, or combinations with chart review. ICD coding is able to display only a fraction of events, which might explain the comparatively low estimates.54–56 Conversely, this does not follow for small studies with chart review. The assumption that high frequencies may correlate with small studies because they look at cases more carefully is opposed by the observation that results are not restricted to remarkably high results but show a distribution which is primarily due to statistical dispersion, and only additionally fortified by the choice of methods to collect data.

Another observation is that papers with above-average results indicate that the majority involved high-risk patients and very old or very young patients. Eight of 16 publications with results on AE above 50% dealt with elderly patients,57–64 and two observed children.65 66 Unfortunately, data were not sufficient for further analysis.

We conclude that the precision of AE and PAE estimates depends primarily on sample size and to some degree on methods to collect data. This second observation remains difficult for interpretation. In our judgement as a consequence the informative value of very small surveys should be considered with scepticism, as well as that of very large ones. Since 54.9% of studies on AE (84/153) and 60.3% of studies on PAE (35/58) deal with study populations either smaller than 1000 patients or larger than 50,000 patients the generalisability of these papers must be reassessed.

We believe the present review to be the largest systematic review of the incidence of AE and PAE.10 24 Only one previous review detected a correlation between incidence and sample size but did not give any explanation.24 Others suggested explanations but did not verify these.20 22 24

The present review has limitations. It is part of a wider research effort and is limited to surveys of the percentages of AE/PAE. Consequently, estimates of errors or near misses were not considered. Another limiting factor is that PAE has not yet been investigated to the same extent as AE. Also, we searched only the Medline and Embase databases. Due to our broad research strategy, results exhibit a high heterogeneity, so there was no indication to summarise results in a meta-analysis.

Our findings affirm that AE and PAE are serious problems across all healthcare settings and medical procedures, but some questions remain about the consistency of methods of collecting and reporting data. Further research should concentrate on advancing methods especially for small settings and specific types of event.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Setting</th>
<th>Study Design</th>
<th>Sample (n)</th>
<th>Patients with AE (%)</th>
<th>Patients with PAE (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ahmed 1997</td>
<td>SAU</td>
<td>Leading to admission</td>
<td>• Internal Medicine</td>
<td>• Clinical surveillance</td>
<td>964</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrews 1997</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Inpatients</td>
<td>• Surgery</td>
<td>• Direct observation</td>
<td>1,047</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Azad 2002</td>
<td>CAN</td>
<td>Inpatients</td>
<td>• Internal Medicine</td>
<td>• Prospective chart review</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>25.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Azaz-Livshits 1998</td>
<td>ISR</td>
<td>Inpatients</td>
<td>• Internal Medicine</td>
<td>• Retrospective chart review</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baena Parejo 2005</td>
<td>ESP</td>
<td>Outpatients</td>
<td>• Emergency department</td>
<td>• Prospective chart review</td>
<td>2,261</td>
<td>33.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baker 2004</td>
<td>CAN</td>
<td>inpatients</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Havard Medical Design</td>
<td>3,745</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bates 1995</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>inpatients</td>
<td>• Internal Medicine</td>
<td>• Havard Medical Design</td>
<td>3,137</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bellomo 2002</td>
<td>AUS</td>
<td>inpatients</td>
<td>• Surgery</td>
<td>• Others</td>
<td>1,125</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhalla 2003</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Outpatients</td>
<td>• Internal Medicine</td>
<td>• Prospective chart review</td>
<td>840</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bond 2001</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Inpatients</td>
<td>• All wards</td>
<td>• Interview</td>
<td>8,493,876</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Population</td>
<td>Setting</td>
<td>Study Design</td>
<td>Sample (n)</td>
<td>Patients with AE (%)</td>
<td>Patients with PAE (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bordet 2001</td>
<td>FRA</td>
<td>Inpatients</td>
<td>Cardiology</td>
<td>Voluntary reporting</td>
<td>16,916</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buajordet 1995</td>
<td>NOR</td>
<td>Inpatients</td>
<td>InternalMedicine</td>
<td>Voluntary reporting Others</td>
<td>3,082</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calland 2002</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Inpatients</td>
<td>All wards</td>
<td>Retrospective chart</td>
<td>6,296</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carroll 2003</td>
<td>AUS</td>
<td>Inpatients</td>
<td>All wards</td>
<td>Routine data</td>
<td>50,712</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carvalho-Filho 1998</td>
<td>BRA</td>
<td>Inpatients</td>
<td>Geriatrics</td>
<td>Retrospective chart review</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>43.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chan 2001</td>
<td>AUS</td>
<td>Leading to admission</td>
<td>InternalMedicine</td>
<td>Prospective chart review Interview</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>30.4</td>
<td>16.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chaudhry 2003</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Inpatients</td>
<td>InternalMedicine</td>
<td>Voluntary reporting Direct Observation Interview</td>
<td>528</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chrischilles 2007</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Others</td>
<td></td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>689</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Population</td>
<td>Setting</td>
<td>Study Design</td>
<td>Sample (n)</td>
<td>Patients with AE (%)</td>
<td>Patients with PAE (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chyka 2000</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Cases of death</td>
<td>• All wards</td>
<td>• Routine data</td>
<td>2,312,203</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classen 1997</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Inpatients</td>
<td>• All wards</td>
<td>• Computer based alert</td>
<td>91,574</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohen 2005</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Inpatients</td>
<td>• All wards</td>
<td>• Prospective chart review</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conen 2006</td>
<td>CHE</td>
<td>Inpatients</td>
<td>• All wards</td>
<td>• Retrospective chart review</td>
<td>639</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooper 1996</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Nursing home</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Prospective chart review</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>65.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corral Baena 2004</td>
<td>ESP</td>
<td>Outpatients and Inpatients</td>
<td>• Routine data</td>
<td></td>
<td>32,253</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darchy 1999</td>
<td>FRAU</td>
<td>Inpatients</td>
<td>• ICU</td>
<td>• Retrospective chart review</td>
<td>623</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dartnell 1996</td>
<td>AUS</td>
<td>Leading to admission</td>
<td>• Emergency department</td>
<td>• Prospective chart review • Interview • Voluntary reporting</td>
<td>965</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Population</td>
<td>Setting</td>
<td>Study Design</td>
<td>Sample (n)</td>
<td>Patients with AE (%)</td>
<td>Patients with PAE (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davis 2001</td>
<td>NZL</td>
<td>Inpatients</td>
<td>• All wards</td>
<td>• Havard Medical Design</td>
<td>1,326</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davis 2002</td>
<td>NZL</td>
<td>Inpatients</td>
<td>• All wards</td>
<td>• Havard Medical Design</td>
<td>6,579</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davis 2003</td>
<td>NZL</td>
<td>Inpatients</td>
<td>• All wards</td>
<td>• Havard Medical Design</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dennehy 1996</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Leading to admission</td>
<td>• Emergency department</td>
<td>• Retrospective chart review</td>
<td>1,260</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dormann 2000</td>
<td>DEU</td>
<td>Inpatients</td>
<td>• Internal Medicine</td>
<td>• Computer based alert • Voluntary reporting</td>
<td>379</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dormann 2003</td>
<td>DEU</td>
<td>Leading to admission</td>
<td>• Internal Medicine</td>
<td>• Prospective chart review • Computer based alert • Clinical surveillance</td>
<td>711</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dos Santos 2006</td>
<td>BRA</td>
<td>Inpatients</td>
<td>• Paediatrics</td>
<td>• Prospective chart review</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doucet 2002</td>
<td>FRAU</td>
<td>Leading to admission</td>
<td>• Geriatrics</td>
<td>• Clinical surveillance</td>
<td>2,691</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dunn 2006</td>
<td>AUS</td>
<td>Inpatients</td>
<td>• Paediatrics</td>
<td>• Retrospective chart review</td>
<td>1,612</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Population</td>
<td>Setting</td>
<td>Study Design</td>
<td>Sample (n)</td>
<td>Patients with AE (%)</td>
<td>Patients with PAE (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easton 1998</td>
<td>AUS</td>
<td>Leading to admission</td>
<td>Paediatrics</td>
<td>• Prospective chart review • Interview</td>
<td>1,682</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easton-Carter 2003</td>
<td>AUS</td>
<td>Emergency visits</td>
<td>Paediatric Emergency department</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>8601</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ebbesen 2001</td>
<td>NOR</td>
<td>Inpatients</td>
<td>Internal Medicine</td>
<td>• Clinical surveillance • Others</td>
<td>13,992</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ehsani 2006</td>
<td>AUS</td>
<td>Inpatients</td>
<td>All wards</td>
<td>Routine data</td>
<td>979,834</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elder 2004</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Outpatients</td>
<td></td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>351</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emmerson 1996</td>
<td>UK + IRL</td>
<td>Inpatients</td>
<td>All wards</td>
<td>Computer based alert</td>
<td>37,111</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fattinger 2000</td>
<td>CHE</td>
<td>Inpatients</td>
<td>Internal Medicine</td>
<td>Retrospective chart review</td>
<td>4,331</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fauchais 2006</td>
<td>FRAU</td>
<td>Leading to admission</td>
<td>Internal Medicine</td>
<td>Prospective chart review</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>29.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feldman 1997</td>
<td>CAN</td>
<td>Inpatients</td>
<td>Surgery</td>
<td>Prospective chart review • Others</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>34.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Population</td>
<td>Setting</td>
<td>Study Design</td>
<td>Sample (n)</td>
<td>Patients with AE (%)</td>
<td>Patients with PAE (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fordyce 2003</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Emergency visits</td>
<td>• Emergency department</td>
<td>• Voluntary reporting</td>
<td>1,935</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Interview</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forster 2003</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Inpatients</td>
<td>• Internal Medicine</td>
<td>• Retrospective chart review</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Interview</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forster 2004 a</td>
<td>CAN</td>
<td>Inpatients</td>
<td>• Internal Medicine</td>
<td>• Retrospective chart review</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Interview</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forster 2004 b</td>
<td>CAN</td>
<td>Leading to admission</td>
<td>• Acute care facility</td>
<td>• Harvard Medical Design</td>
<td>502</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Interview</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forster 2007</td>
<td>CAN</td>
<td>Emergency visits</td>
<td>• Emergency department</td>
<td>• Direct Observation</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fradet 1996</td>
<td>FRA</td>
<td>Leading to admission</td>
<td>• Internal Medicine Gastroenterology</td>
<td>• Retrospective chart review</td>
<td>1,129</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gandhi 2000</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Outpatients</td>
<td>• Internal Medicine</td>
<td>• Retrospective chart review</td>
<td>2,248</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Interview</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gandhi 2003</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Outpatients</td>
<td>• Internal Medicine</td>
<td>• Retrospective chart review</td>
<td>661</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Interview</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ganjavi 2007</td>
<td>CAN</td>
<td>Others</td>
<td>• Voluntary reporting</td>
<td></td>
<td>242</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Critical incident reporting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gill 1995</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Inpatients</td>
<td>• Paediatric ICU</td>
<td>• Voluntary reporting</td>
<td>899</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Interview</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Population</td>
<td>Setting</td>
<td>Study Design</td>
<td>Sample (n)</td>
<td>Patients with AE (%)</td>
<td>Patients with PAE (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gill 1995</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Leading to admission</td>
<td>Paediatric ICU</td>
<td>Voluntary reporting</td>
<td>909</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>González-Martin 1998</td>
<td>CHL</td>
<td>Inpatients</td>
<td>Paediatrics</td>
<td>Prospective chart review</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gray 1998</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Inpatients</td>
<td>Internal Medicine</td>
<td>Prospective chart review</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gray 1999</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Inpatients</td>
<td></td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grohskopf 2002</td>
<td>USA + CAN</td>
<td>Inpatients</td>
<td>Paediatric ICU</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>512</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gruen 2006</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Inpatients</td>
<td>Trauma surgery</td>
<td>Retrospective chart review</td>
<td>44,401</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gurwitz 2000</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Nursing home</td>
<td></td>
<td>Prospective chart review</td>
<td>2,916</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gurwitz 2005</td>
<td>USA+ CAN</td>
<td>Nursing home</td>
<td></td>
<td>Prospective chart review</td>
<td>1,247</td>
<td>38.2</td>
<td>19.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Population</td>
<td>Setting</td>
<td>Study Design</td>
<td>Sample (n)</td>
<td>Patients with AE (%)</td>
<td>Patients with PAE (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hafner 2002</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Leading to admission</td>
<td>• Emergency department</td>
<td>• Retrospective chart review</td>
<td>13,004</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanlon 1997</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Outpatients</td>
<td>• InternalMedicine</td>
<td>• Prospective chart review • Interview</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>34.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hardmeier 2004</td>
<td>CHE</td>
<td>Leading to admission</td>
<td>• InternalMedicine</td>
<td>• Prospective chart review</td>
<td>6,383</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hayward 2001</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Cases of death</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Retrospective chart review</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healy 2002</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Inpatients</td>
<td>• Surgery</td>
<td>• Clinical surveillance</td>
<td>4,658</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hendrie 2007</td>
<td>AUS</td>
<td>Emergency visits</td>
<td>• Emergency department</td>
<td>• Havard Medical Design</td>
<td>3,332</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herrera-Kiengelher 2005</td>
<td>MEX</td>
<td>Inpatients</td>
<td>• Pneumology</td>
<td>• Havard Medical Design</td>
<td>4,555</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hohl 2001</td>
<td>CAN</td>
<td>Leading to admission</td>
<td>• Emergency department</td>
<td>• Retrospective chart review</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honigman 2001</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Outpatients</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Retrospective chart review • Computer based alert</td>
<td>15,665</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ibarmia 2003</td>
<td>ESP</td>
<td>Leading to admission</td>
<td>• InternalMedicine</td>
<td>• Clinical surveillance</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Population</td>
<td>Setting</td>
<td>Study Design</td>
<td>Sample (n)</td>
<td>Patients with AE (%)</td>
<td>Patients with PAE (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackson 2006</td>
<td>AUS</td>
<td>Inpatients</td>
<td>• All wards</td>
<td>• Routine data</td>
<td>1,645,992</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jha 2001</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Leading to admission</td>
<td>• All wards</td>
<td>• Computer based alert</td>
<td>3,238</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnston 2006</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Inpatients</td>
<td>• All wards</td>
<td>• Critical Incident reporting • Others</td>
<td>60,206</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jonville-Bera 2002</td>
<td>FRA</td>
<td>Leading to admission</td>
<td>• Paediatric emergency department</td>
<td>• Prospective chart review</td>
<td>428</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jonville-Bera 2002</td>
<td>FRA</td>
<td>Leading to admission</td>
<td>• Paediatrics</td>
<td>• Prospective chart review • Clinical surveillance • Interview</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jonville-Bera 2002</td>
<td>FRA</td>
<td>Outpatients</td>
<td>• Paediatrics</td>
<td>• Retrospective chart review</td>
<td>1,192</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juntti-Patinen 2002</td>
<td>FIN</td>
<td>Inpatients</td>
<td>• All wards</td>
<td>• Retrospective chart review</td>
<td>141,484</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kane Gill 2006</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Inpatients</td>
<td>• ICU</td>
<td>• Routine data • Others</td>
<td>21,436</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kanter 2004</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Inpatients</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Routine data</td>
<td>66,146</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Population</td>
<td>Setting</td>
<td>Study Design</td>
<td>Sample (n)</td>
<td>Patients with AE (%)</td>
<td>Patients with PAE (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kessomboon 2005</td>
<td>THA</td>
<td>Others</td>
<td></td>
<td>Retrospective chart review</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>35.1</td>
<td>18.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kilbridge 2006</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Inpatients</td>
<td></td>
<td>Computer based alert</td>
<td>33,206</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lagnaoui 2000</td>
<td>FRA</td>
<td>Inpatients</td>
<td></td>
<td>Clinical surveillance</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larsen 2007</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Inpatients</td>
<td></td>
<td>Retrospective chart review</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>58.7</td>
<td>33.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecointre 2003</td>
<td>FRA</td>
<td>Inpatients</td>
<td></td>
<td>Voluntary reporting</td>
<td>1,598</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lu 2006</td>
<td>TWN</td>
<td>Emergency visits</td>
<td></td>
<td>Retrospective chart review</td>
<td>45,100</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madigan 2007</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Outpatients</td>
<td></td>
<td>Others</td>
<td>3,013,287</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major 1998</td>
<td>LBN</td>
<td>Leading to admission</td>
<td></td>
<td>Prospective chart review</td>
<td>2,202</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malhotra 2001</td>
<td>IND</td>
<td>Emergency visits</td>
<td></td>
<td>Prospective chart review</td>
<td>4,764</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mannesse 1997</td>
<td>NLD</td>
<td>Leading to admission</td>
<td></td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>41.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Population</td>
<td>Setting</td>
<td>Study Design</td>
<td>Sample (n)</td>
<td>Patients with AE (%)</td>
<td>Patients with PAE (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mannheimer 2006</td>
<td>SWE</td>
<td>Inpatients</td>
<td>• InternalMedicine</td>
<td>• Prospective chart review</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin 2002</td>
<td>ESP</td>
<td>Leading to admission</td>
<td>• ICU</td>
<td>• Prospective chart review</td>
<td>1,800</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martínez-Mir 1996</td>
<td>ESP</td>
<td>Inpatients</td>
<td>• Paediatrics</td>
<td>• Prospective chart review</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matsaseng 2005</td>
<td>ZAF</td>
<td>Inpatients</td>
<td>• Gynaecology</td>
<td>• Havard Medical Design</td>
<td>1,866</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McDonnell 2002</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Leading to admission</td>
<td>• All wards</td>
<td>• Critical incident reporting</td>
<td>20,166</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melton 2005</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Inpatients</td>
<td>• All wards</td>
<td>• Retrospective chart review</td>
<td>57,452</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meurer 2006</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Inpatients</td>
<td>• Paediatrics</td>
<td>• Routine data</td>
<td>318,785</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mezei 1999</td>
<td>CAN</td>
<td>Leading to admission</td>
<td>• Surgery</td>
<td>• Retrospective chart review</td>
<td>17,638</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michel 2004</td>
<td>FRA</td>
<td>Inpatients</td>
<td>• InternalMedicine</td>
<td>• Havard Medical Design</td>
<td>778</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Population</td>
<td>Setting</td>
<td>Study Design</td>
<td>Sample (n)</td>
<td>Patients with AE (%)</td>
<td>Patients with PAE (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mjörndal 2002</td>
<td>SWE</td>
<td>Leading to admission</td>
<td>Internal Medicine, Cardiology, ICU</td>
<td>Prospective chart review, Interview</td>
<td>681</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moore 1998</td>
<td>FRA</td>
<td>Inpatients</td>
<td>Internal Medicine</td>
<td>Others</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morris 2003</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Inpatients</td>
<td>Surgery</td>
<td>Others</td>
<td>32,100</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murff 2003</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Inpatients</td>
<td>All wards</td>
<td>Retrospective chart review</td>
<td>424</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nelson 1996</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Leading to admission</td>
<td>Internal Medicine, ICU</td>
<td>Prospective chart review, Others</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O'Hara 1997</td>
<td>AUS</td>
<td>Inpatients</td>
<td>All wards</td>
<td>Routine data</td>
<td>1,248,021</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olivier 2001</td>
<td>FRA</td>
<td>Inpatients</td>
<td>Internal Medicine</td>
<td>Clinical surveillance</td>
<td>671</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Onder 2002</td>
<td>ITA</td>
<td>Leading to admission</td>
<td>All wards</td>
<td>Prospective chart review, Interview, Clinical surveillance</td>
<td>28,411</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Otero López 1999</td>
<td>ESP</td>
<td>Leading to admission</td>
<td>Emergency department</td>
<td>Prospective chart review, Voluntary reporting</td>
<td>33,975</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Otero López 2006 a</td>
<td>ESP</td>
<td>Inpatients</td>
<td>Internal Medicine, Gastroenterology</td>
<td>Prospective chart review, Voluntary reporting</td>
<td>2,643</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Population</td>
<td>Setting</td>
<td>Study Design</td>
<td>Sample (n)</td>
<td>Patients with AE (%)</td>
<td>Patients with PAE (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Otero López 2006 b</td>
<td>ESP</td>
<td>Inpatients</td>
<td>• Internal Medicine</td>
<td>• Prospective chart review</td>
<td>2,643</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ouchterlony 1995</td>
<td>SWE</td>
<td>Inpatients</td>
<td>• Surgery</td>
<td>• Clinical surveillance</td>
<td>1,361</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ouchterlony 1995</td>
<td>SWE</td>
<td>Inpatients</td>
<td>• Surgery</td>
<td>• Direct Observation</td>
<td>1,361</td>
<td>47.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passarelli 2005</td>
<td>BRA</td>
<td>Inpatients</td>
<td>• Internal Medicine</td>
<td>• Prospective chart review</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>61.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peyriere 2003</td>
<td>FRA</td>
<td>Leading to admission</td>
<td>• Internal Medicine</td>
<td>• Critical incident reporting</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>14.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philipps 1998</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Cases of death</td>
<td>• All wards</td>
<td>• Routine data</td>
<td>910,138</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philipps 1998</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Cases of death</td>
<td>• All wards</td>
<td>• Routine data</td>
<td>1,212,111</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piquet 1999</td>
<td>FRA</td>
<td>Inpatients</td>
<td>• Internal Medicine</td>
<td>• Voluntary reporting</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pirmohamed 2004</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Leading to admission</td>
<td>• All wards</td>
<td>• Clinical surveillance</td>
<td>18,820</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Population</td>
<td>Setting</td>
<td>Study Design</td>
<td>Sample (n)</td>
<td>Patients with AE (%)</td>
<td>Patients with PAE (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Popli 1997</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Inpatients</td>
<td>● Psychiatries</td>
<td>● Retrospective chart review</td>
<td>10,994</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pouyanne 2000</td>
<td>FRA</td>
<td>Leading to admission</td>
<td>● InternalMedicine</td>
<td>● Others</td>
<td>3,137</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proctor 2003</td>
<td>CAN</td>
<td>Inpatients</td>
<td>● Surgery ● Paediatrics ● ICU</td>
<td>● Retrospective chart review ● Prospective chart review ● Clinical surveillance</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>48.4</td>
<td>32.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queneau 2003</td>
<td>FRA</td>
<td>Emergency visits</td>
<td>● Emergency department</td>
<td>● Retrospective chart review</td>
<td>1,937</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>14.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queneau 2007</td>
<td>FRA</td>
<td>Leading to admission</td>
<td>● Emergency department</td>
<td>● Clinical surveillance</td>
<td>1,562</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raschetti 1999</td>
<td>ITA</td>
<td>Leading to admission</td>
<td>● Emergency department</td>
<td>● Prospective chart review ● Clinical surveillance</td>
<td>5,497</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rask 2005</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Others</td>
<td>● Interview</td>
<td></td>
<td>406</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reich 2005</td>
<td>DEU</td>
<td>Outpatients</td>
<td>● Dentistry</td>
<td>● Others</td>
<td>1,540</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Population</td>
<td>Setting</td>
<td>Study Design</td>
<td>Sample (n)</td>
<td>Patients with AE (%)</td>
<td>Patients with PAE (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rotschild 2005</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Inpatients</td>
<td>• ICU</td>
<td>• Computer based alert</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Cardiology</td>
<td>• Direct observation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Voluntary reporting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Study Design</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rozenfeld 2007</td>
<td>BRA</td>
<td>Inpatients</td>
<td>• All wards</td>
<td>• Routine data</td>
<td>1,898,676</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rüden 1996</td>
<td>DEU</td>
<td>Inpatients</td>
<td>• Gynaecology</td>
<td>• Clinical surveillance</td>
<td>14,966</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samoy 2006</td>
<td>CAN</td>
<td>Leading to admission</td>
<td>• Internal Medicine</td>
<td>• Prospective chart review</td>
<td>565</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>17.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Interview</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanborn 1996</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Inpatients</td>
<td>• Anaesthesiology</td>
<td>• Prospective chart review</td>
<td>5,454</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Computer based alert</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Study Design</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schlieter 2001</td>
<td>DNK</td>
<td>Inpatients</td>
<td>• All wards</td>
<td>• Havard Medical Design</td>
<td>1,033</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schlienger 1999</td>
<td>CHE</td>
<td>Inpatients</td>
<td>• Internal Medicine</td>
<td>• Prospective chart review</td>
<td>941</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Interview</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schneeweiss 2002</td>
<td>DEU</td>
<td>Leading to admission</td>
<td>• Internal Medicine</td>
<td>• Prospective chart review</td>
<td>41,375</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Emergency department</td>
<td>• Interview</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schneitman-McIntire 1996</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Leading to admission</td>
<td>• Emergency department</td>
<td>• Retrospective chart review</td>
<td>62,216</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Population</td>
<td>Setting</td>
<td>Study Design</td>
<td>Sample (n)</td>
<td>Patients with AE (%)</td>
<td>Patients with PAE (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schnipper 2006</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Inpatients</td>
<td>• Internal Medicine</td>
<td>• Prospective chart review • Interview</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith 2006</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Inpatients</td>
<td>• All wards</td>
<td>• Critical incident reporting</td>
<td>66,331</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stäubli 2001</td>
<td>CHE</td>
<td>Inpatients</td>
<td>• Internal Medicine</td>
<td>• Clinical surveillance</td>
<td>41,994</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tafreshi 1999</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Leading to admission</td>
<td>• Emergency department</td>
<td>• Interview</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>19.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tegeder 1999</td>
<td>DEU</td>
<td>Inpatients</td>
<td>• Internal Medicine</td>
<td>• Retrospective chart review • Computer based alert</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The French Prevalence Survey Study Group 2000</td>
<td>FRA</td>
<td>Inpatients</td>
<td>• All wards</td>
<td>• Clinical surveillance</td>
<td>236,334</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas 2000</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Inpatients</td>
<td>• All wards</td>
<td>• Havard Medical Design</td>
<td>14,700</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tipping 2006</td>
<td>ZAF</td>
<td>Emergency visits</td>
<td>• Emergency department</td>
<td>• Clinical surveillance</td>
<td>517</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Population</td>
<td>Setting</td>
<td>Study Design</td>
<td>Sample (n)</td>
<td>Patients with AE (%)</td>
<td>Patients with PAE (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trifiro 2005</td>
<td>ITA</td>
<td>Leading to admission</td>
<td>Emergency department</td>
<td>Prospective chart review, Interview, Clinical surveillance</td>
<td>18,854</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>van den Bemt 1999</td>
<td>NLD</td>
<td>Inpatients</td>
<td>Paediatrics, Internal medicine</td>
<td>Voluntary reporting, Interview</td>
<td>620</td>
<td>28.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vargas 2003</td>
<td>ESP</td>
<td>Inpatients</td>
<td>Surgery, ICU</td>
<td>Prospective chart review</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veehof 1999</td>
<td>NLD</td>
<td>Ambulant</td>
<td>General medicine</td>
<td>Retrospective chart review</td>
<td>2,185</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vincent 2001</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Inpatients</td>
<td>Internal medicine, obstetrics, Surgery</td>
<td>Harvard Medical Design</td>
<td>1,014</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vira 2006</td>
<td>CAN</td>
<td>Inpatients</td>
<td>All wards</td>
<td>Others</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wanzel 2000</td>
<td>CAN</td>
<td>Inpatients</td>
<td>Surgery</td>
<td>Prospective chart review, Direct Observation, Interview</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>39.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weingart 2004</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Inpatients</td>
<td>Internal medicine</td>
<td>Prospective chart review, Critical incident</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Population</td>
<td>Setting</td>
<td>Study Design</td>
<td>Sample (n)</td>
<td>Patients with AE (%)</td>
<td>Patients with PAE (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weingart 2005</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Inpatients</td>
<td>● InternalMedicine</td>
<td>● Interview</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weiss 2002</td>
<td>DEU</td>
<td>Inpatients</td>
<td>● Paediatrics</td>
<td>● Prospective chart review ● Voluntary reporting</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson 1995</td>
<td>AUS</td>
<td>Inpatients</td>
<td>● All wards</td>
<td>● Havard Medical Design</td>
<td>14,179</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wolff 2001</td>
<td>AUS</td>
<td>Inpatients</td>
<td>● All wards</td>
<td>● Havard Medical Design ● Critical incident reporting</td>
<td>49,834</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoppi 2000</td>
<td>CHE</td>
<td>Inpatients</td>
<td>● InternalMedicine</td>
<td>● Clinical surveillance</td>
<td>48,005</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 3- Definitions of AE

1. AE, definition of IOM and paraphrases (n=55)
 “An adverse event is an injury resulting from a medical intervention, or in other words, it is not due to the underlying disease”

Author, year: Ahmed, 1997
Term used by author: adverse drug reaction
Definition: “An A(dverse) D(rug) R(eaction) was defined as any clinical event that was found to have a clear cause and effect relationship with a drug or a chemical substance and which was the only or the main cause of admission to the hospital, or the main cause of the appearance of a new event in a hospitalized patient. This included drug overuse, hypersensitivity, idiosyncrasy, dose-related side-effects and adverse drug interactions.”

Author, year: Baena Parejo, 2005
Meeting our definition criteria as: adverse event
Term used by author: problemas de salud relacionados con medicamentos (PRM)
Definition: los problemas de salud relacionados con medicamentos (PRM) son problemas de salud, entendidos como resultados clinicos negativos derivados de la farmacoterapia que, producidos por diversas causas, conducen a la no consecución del objetivo terapéutico e a la aparición de efectos no deseados.

Author, year: Baker, 2004
Term used by author: adverse event
Definition: “unintended injury or complication that results in disability at the time at discharge, death or prolonged hospital stay and that is caused by health care management rather than by the patient's underlying disease process”

Author, year: Bates, 1995 b
Term used by author: adverse event
Definition: “unintended injuries caused by medical management resulting in prolongation of hospitalization or disability at the time of discharge or death”

Author, year: Calland, 2002
Term used by author: adverse event
Definition: “...AE, defined...as unintended injury (death in this case) caused by medical treatment, and thus not primarily attributable to the patient’s primary disease process”

Author, year: Carvalho-Filho, 1998
Term used by author: complicações iatrogênicas
Definition: “Foram consideradas iatrogênicas as alteraçoes que resultaram, diretamente, de procedimentos diagnósticos e de todas as formas de terapêutica”

Author, year: Chan, 2001
Term used by author: adverse drug event
Definition: We defined one ADE as occurring if one drug caused one or more adverse manifestations or if two or more drugs contributed to one adverse manifestation

Author, year: Cooper, 1996
Term used by author: adverse drug reaction
**Definition:** An adverse drug reaction sequence was defined as any undesired or unintended response to medications that required treatment alteration of therapy

**Author, year:** Corral Baena, 2004  
**Term used by author:** acontecimientos adversos por medicamentos

**Definition:** Los acontecimientos adversos por medicamentos (AAM) se definen como qualchier dano grave o leve, causado por el uso (incluyendo la falta de uso) de un medicamento o cualquier dano resultante del uso clínico de un medicamento

**Author, year:** Darchy, 1999  
**Term used by author:** adverse event

**Definition:** Iatrogenic disease was defined as a disease induced by a drug prescribed by a physician; or after a medical or surgical procedure, excluding intentional overdose, nonmedical intervention; or unauthorized prescription, and environmental events. AE was defined as an unintended and noxious event caused by medical management carried out according to the best of medical science

**Author, year:** Dartnell, 1996  
**Term used by author:** drug related admission

**Definition:** An admission was considered to be drug-related if its suspected cause was some aspect of drug therapy, and not likely to be a result of disease progression.

**Author, year:** Davis, 2001  
**Term used by author:** adverse event

**Definition:** AE was defined as (a) an unintended injury or unintended complication (b) resulting in temporary or permanent disability, including increased length of stay and/or financial loss the patient, (c) that was caused by health care management rather than the underlying disease process

**Author, year:** Davis, 2002 + 2003a  
**Term used by author:** adverse event

**Definition:** an unintended injury resulting in disability caused by healthcare management rather than the underlying disease process

**Author, year:** Dennehy, 1996  
**Term used by author:** drug related illness (DRI) / Adverse drug reaction (ADR)

**Definition:** ADRs included any DRI that was noxious and unintended or that occurred as a result of a medical intervention related to a drug.

**Author, year:** Dunn, 2006  
**Term used by author:** adverse event

**Definition:** an unintended injury or complication which results in disability, death, or prolonged hospital stay and is caused by healthcare management rather than disease process

**Author, year:** Forster, 2003  
**Term used by author:** adverse event

**Definition:** injury resulting from medical management rather than the underlying disease

**Author, year:** Forster, 2004a  
**Term used by author:** adverse event
**Definition:** If both reviewers judged that the adverse outcome was probably or definitely due to medical management (...) it was classified as an AE

**Author, year:** Forster, 2007  
**Meeting our definition criteria as:** adverse event  
**Term used by author:** adverse outcomes  
**Definition:** Adverse outcomes were classified as adverse events if both physicians stated: the patient had an adverse outcome and one of the potential causes was rated at least a 4 (“outcome more than likely attributable to cause”)

**Author, year:** Gandhi, 2003  
**Term used by author:** adverse drug events  
**Definition:** Adverse drug-related events, defined as injuries due to drugs

**Author, year:** Ganjavi, 2007  
**Term used by author:** adverse drug event  
**Definition:** Adverse drug events (ref. 29: according Bates 1995b)

**Author, year:** Gray, 1998  
**Term used by author:** adverse drug event  
**Definition:** The term ADE (...) includes any injury from medication use.

**Author, year:** Gurwitz, 2000  
**Term used by author:** adverse drug event  
**Definition:** Adverse drug event, defined as an injury resulting from the use of a drug. Adverse drug events may have resulted from medication errors or from adverse drug reactions in which was no error

**Author, year:** Gurwitz, 2005  
**Term used by author:** adverse drug event  
**Definition:** Adverse drug event, defined as an injury resulting from the use of a drug. Adverse drug events may have resulted from medication errors or from adverse drug reactions in which was no error.

**Author, year:** Hafner, 2002  
**Term used by author:** adverse drug event  
**Definition:** An ADE is an injury (noxious or harmful effect) resulting from medical intervention related to a drug. (...)ADE encompass all drug-related injuries that result from medication errors, drug-drug interactions, or ADRs.

**Author, year:** Hardmeier, 2004  
**Meeting our definition criteria as:** adverse event  
**Term used by author:** adverse drug event  
**Definition:** Adverse drug events, usually defined as harm caused by the appropriate or inappropriate use of a drug.

**Author, year:** Hendrie, 2007  
**Term used by author:** adverse event  
**Definition:** An unintended injury or complication, which resulted in disability, death, prolongation of the hospital stay, or prolongation of the natural history of disease; and is caused by health care management rather than the patient’s disease.
**Author, year:** Herrera-Kienglher, 2005  
**Term used by author:** adverse event  
**Definition:** AE was defined as the unintentional harm induced by medical or clinical care and not by primary disease that may result in prolonged hospitalization, some form of temporary or permanent disability, and/or death.

**Author, year:** Honigman, 2001  
**Term used by author:** adverse drug event  
**Definition:** adverse drug event, defined as an injury resulting from an intervention related to a drug

**Author, year:** Ibarmia, 2003  
**Term used by author:** adverse drug event  
**Definition:** El adverse drug event se definió como cualquier dano, grave o leve, causado por el uso de un medicamento.

**Author, year:** Jha, 2001  
**Term used by author:** adverse drug event  
**Definition:** An injury resulting from medical intervention related to a drug

**Author, year:** Kane Gill, 2006  
**Term used by author:** adverse drug event  
**Definition:** an ADE was defined as an injury resulting from drug treatment

**Author, year:** Kessomboon, 2005  
**Term used by author:** adverse event  
**Definition:** An adverse event was defined as an unintended injury caused by medical management rather than by the disease process, this injury is sufficiently serious to lead to prolongation of hospitalisation or a temporary or permanent impairment or disability or death to the patient at time of discharge

**Author, year:** Larsen, 2007  
**Term used by author:** adverse event  
**Definition:** Definitions of adverse event category and preventability for each harm event from Wu et al. (an undesirable and unintended injury resulting from a medical intervention (an act of care provided by the hospital or by the omission of necessary care), rather than from patient’s underlying disease process; and where such injury occurs during an inpatient hospital stay (i.e., subsequent to admission) and results in or leads to patient harm.)

**Author, year:** Mannesse, 1997  
**Term used by author:** adverse drug reaction  
**Definition:** An ADR was defined as an undesirable clinical manifestation consequent to and caused by the administration of a particular drug or interacting drugs, excluding intentional overdose, substance abuse and therapeutic failure.

**Author, year:** Matsaseng, 2005  
**Term used by author:** adverse event  
**Definition:** An adverse event was defined as an injury that was caused by medical management (rather than the underlying disease) and that prolonged the hospitalisation, produced a disability at a time of discharge or both
Author, year: Michel, 2004
Term used by author: adverse event
Definition: An adverse event was defined as an unintended injury caused by medical management rather than by a disease process and which resulted in death, life threatening illness, disability at time of discharge, admission to hospital, or prolongation of hospital stay.

Author, year: Morris, 2003
Term used by author: adverse event
Definition: Adverse Event: Injury to a patient that may have been the result of medical or surgical intervention that prolonged hospitalization, produce a disability, death or both.

Author, year: Murff, 2003
Term used by author: adverse event
Definition: adverse events, defined as an injury resulting from medical management rather than the patient's underlying condition.

Author, year: Otero Lopez, 1999
Term used by author: acontecimientos adversos por medicamentos
Definition: Acontecimientos adversos por medicamentos (AAM), definido como cualquier efecto indeseable asociado con el uso clínico de los medicamentos.

Author, year: Otero Lopez, 2006a
Term used by author: acontecimientos adversos por medicamentos
Definition: acontecimientos adversos por medicamentos (AAM) cualquier dano, grave o leve, asociado al uso clínico (o falta de uso) de un medicamento.

Author, year: Otero Lopez, 2006b
Term used by author: acontecimientos adversos por medicamentos
Definition: acontecimientos adversos por medicamentos (AAM) cualquier dano, grave o leve, asociado al uso clínico (o falta de uso) de un medicamento.

Author, year: Peyriere, 2003
Term used by author: adverse drug event
Definition: Adverse drug event ( ref.8: according Bates 1995)

Author, year: Pirmohamed, 2004
Meeting our definition criteria as: adverse event
Term used by author: adverse drug reaction
Definition: Definition of ADR used was after Edwards and Aronson (An appreciably harmful or unpleasant reaction, resulting from an intervention related to the use of a medicinal product, which predicts hazard from future administration and warrants prevention or specific treatment, or alteration of the dosage regimen, or withdrawal of the product.)

Author, year: Proctor, 2003
Term used by author: adverse outcome
Definition: An adverse outcome was defined as any unintended substantive harm to a patient resulting from medical treatment and not directly attributable to the patient’s underlying disease.

Author, year: Rothschild, 2005
Term used by author: adverse event
**Definition:** An injury due to medical management, rather the underlying disease.

**Author, year:** Schioler, 2001  
**Term used by author:** adverse event  
**Definition:** En utilsigtet hændelse blev defineret som en skadevoldende begivenhed, der var en følge af undersøgelse, behandling, pleje eller genoptræning, og som ikke er en følge af patientens underliggende sygden.

**Author, year:** Stäubli, 2001  
**Term used by author:** Komplikationen  
**Definition:** Als Komplikationen werden negative Folgen medizinischer Interventionen definiert, die während des Aufenthaltes auf einer internistischen Abteilung eines Akutspitals oder im Anschluss daran und in kausalem Zusammenhang damit auftreten

**Author, year:** Thomas, 2000a  
**Term used by author:** injury caught by medical management  
**Definition:** defined as an injury caused by medical management (rather than the disease process) that resulted in either a prolonged stay or disability at discharge

**Author, year:** Tipping, 2006  
**Term used by author:** injury resulting from the use of a drug  
**Definition:** An injury resulting from the use of a drug is defined as an adverse drug event (ADE).

**Author, year:** Trifiro, 2005  
**Term used by author:** adverse drug event  
**Definition:** an injury (noxious or harmful effect) resulting from a medical intervention related to a drug, including medication errors, drug-drug interactions, therapeutic failures or ADRs

**Author, year:** Vincent, 2001  
**Term used by author:** adverse event  
**Definition:** unintended injury caused by medical management rather than by the disease process and which is sufficiently serious to lead to prolongation of hospitalization or to temporary or permanent impairment or disability to the patient at time of discharge

**Author, year:** Wanzel, 2000  
**Term used by author:** complication  
**Definition:** we defined a complication as an unintended, adverse outcome that occured after medical management or a surgical procedure, was not caused by the underlying disease and resulted in impaired health

**Author, year:** Weingart, 2004  
**Term used by author:** adverse drug event  
**Definition:** injuries due to drugs

**Author, year:** Weingart, 2005b  
**Term used by author:** adverse events  
**Definition:** Adverse events were defined as injuries because of medical care rather than the natural history of illness
**Author, year:** Wilson, 1995  
**Term used by author:** unintended injury or complication  
**Definition:** an unintended injury or complication which results in disability, death or prolongation of hospital stay, and is caused by health care management (rather than the patient's disease)

*a.* Adverse drug reaction according WHO / Naranjo Algorithm and paraphrases (n=38)  
“Any response to a drug which is noxious, unintended and which occurs at doses normally used in man for the prophylaxis, diagnosis or therapy of disease.”  
(without intoxication, overdosage)

**Author, year:** Azad, 2002  
**Term used by author:** adverse drug event  
**Definition:** ADE was defined as an untoward deleterious drug response that occurred at usual therapeutic doses

**Author, year:** Azaz-Livshits, 1998  
**Term used by author:** adverse drug reaction  
**Definition:** An adverse drug reaction, according to the WHO definition, is any response to a drug which is noxious, unintended and which occurs at doses normally used in man for the prophylaxis, diagnosis or therapy of disease

**Author, year:** Bordet, 2001  
**Term used by author:** adverse drug reaction  
**Definition:** Adverse drug reactions (ADR) defined by the World Health Organisation (WHO) as “noxious and unintended” effects that “occur at doses normally used in man for the prophylaxis, diagnosis or therapy of disease.” (…) Furthermore, for the purpose of this study, the ADR definition excluded therapeutic failure, poisonings and intentional overdoses.

**Author, year:** Classen, 1997  
**Term used by author:** adverse drug event  
**Definition:** We defined ADE based on the WHO definition: an ADE is one that is noxious and unintended and occurs at doses used in humans for prophylaxis, diagnosis, therapy, or modification of physiologic functions. Excludes therapeutic failures, poisonings, and intentional overdoses

**Author, year:** Cohen, 2005  
**Term used by author:** adverse drug event  
**Definition:** a response to a drug which is noxious and unintended and which occurs at doses normally used in man for prophylaxis, diagnosis or therapy in disease, or the modification of physiological function

**Author, year:** Chyka, 2000  
**Term used by author:** adverse drug reaction  
**Definition:** World Health Organization’s International Classification of Diseases, 9th Revision (ICD-9). In that classification, an adverse drug reaction involves any adverse effect, including allergic or hypersensitivity reactions from a drug properly administered in therapeutic or prophylactic dosage.
Author, year: Dormann, 2000  
Term used by author: adverse drug event  
Definition: We defined adverse drug reactions according to the World Health Organization definition.

Author, year: Dormann, 2003  
Term used by author: adverse drug event  
Definition: ADRS were defined according the WHO definition.

Author, year: Dos Santos, 2005  
Term used by author: Adverse drug reaction  
Definition: The ADR definition adopted is any noxious, unintended, and undesired effect of a drug, which occurs at doses used in humans for prophylaxis, diagnosis, or therapy.

Author, year: Easton, 1998  
Term used by author: drug related problem  
Definition: We used the Royal children’s hospital RCH definition of an adverse drug reaction – any response to a drug that is undesired, unintended or unexpected in doses recognised in accepted medical practice.

Author, year: Easton-Carter, 2003  
Term used by author: Drug related problem, adverse drug reaction  
Definition: An adverse drug reaction was defined as ‘any response to a drug that is noxious and unintended, and which occurs at doses normally used in man for prophylaxis, diagnosis or treatment of disease, or for the modification of physiological function.’

Author, year: Fauchais, 2006  
Term used by author: événement iatrogène  
Definition: Un événement iatrogène (EI) est défini comme tout événement nuisible et non souhaité, susceptible d'être en relation avec les doses usuelles d'un médicament ayant été utilisé pour la prophylaxie, le diagnostic ou le traitement d'une maladie ou pour modifier des fonctions physiologiques.

Author, year: Gill, 1995  
Term used by author: adverse drug event  
Definition: Adverse drug reaction. (according definition of Choonara 1984: An adverse drug reaction was defined as any undesired or unintended response to medication)

Author, year: Gonzales-Martín, 1998  
Term used by author: adverse drug reaction  
Definition: An adverse drug reaction (ADR) was defined as a reaction that is noxious and unintended, and which occurs at doses normally used in man for the prophylaxis, diagnosis, or therapy of disease, or for the modification of physiology function (WHO).

Author, year: Hanlon, 1997  
Meeting our definition criteria as: adverse event  
Term used by author: adverse drug event  
Definition: ADEs can be defined as noxious and unintended patient events (i.e., symptoms, signs, or laboratory abnormalities) caused by a drug (ref.1: according naranjo)

Author, year: Hohl, 2001
Meeting our definition criteria as: adverse event

**Term used by author:** adverse drug-related event

**Definition:** Adverse drug-related events were defined as any unfavorable medical event related to medication use or misuse

**Author, year:** Juntti-Patinen, 2002

**Term used by author:** Adverse drug reaction, drug-related death

**Definition:** An adverse drug reaction (ADR), defined by WHO as any noxious, unintended, or undesired effect of a drug that occurs at doses used in humans for prophylaxis, diagnosis, or therapy

**Author, year:** Kilbridge, 2006

**Term used by author:** adverse drug event

**Definition:** Events are scored for causality using the Naranjo algorithm, and for severity.

**Author, year:** Mannheimer 2006

**Term used by author:** adverse drug reaction

**Definition:** Adverse drug reactions were identified according to the definition provided by the World Health Organization and further categorized into serious and not serious.

**Author, year:** Martínez-Mir 1996

**Term used by author:** adverse drug event

**Definition:** Once the case was validated, to obtain an imputability score we used the algorithm utilized by the Spanish Drug Surveillance Scheme.

**Author, year:** McDonnell, 2002

**Term used by author:** adverse drug reaction

**Definition:** An ADR is defined by the WHO as any response to a drug which is noxious, unintended, and that occurs at doses normally used in man for prophylaxis, diagnosis, or therapy of disease.

**Author, year:** Mjörndal, 2002

**Term used by author:** adverse drug reaction

**Definition:** A response to a drug which is noxious and unintended, and which occurs at doses normally used in man for the prophylaxis, diagnosis, or therapy of disease, or for the modification of physiological function.

**Author, year:** Olivier, 2001

**Term used by author:** effets indesirables

**Definition:** effet(s) indesirable(s), definis selon l'OMS, comme 'toute reaction nocive et non voulue, se produisant aux posologies normalement utilisees chez l'homme pour la prophylaxe, le diagnostic ou le traitement d'une maldie ou la modification d'une fonction physiologique'

**Author, year:** Onder, 2002

**Term used by author:** adverse drug reaction

**Definition:** An adverse drug reaction was defined as any noxious, unintended, and undesired effect of drug, excluding therapeutic failures, intentional and accidental poisoning, an abuse.

**Author, year:** Passarelli, 2005

**Term used by author:** adverse drug reaction
**Definition:** Each potential ADR-drug causal relationship was assessed by the Naranjo algorithm

**Author, year:** Piquet, 1999  
**Term used by author:** effet indésirables  
**Definition:** effets indésirables, définis par l'O.M.S. … evenements indesirables lies a une prise medicamenteuse … lorsque les consequences cliniques sont observables

**Author, year:** Popli, 1997  
**Term used by author:** adverse drug reaction  
**Definition:** (The probability of an ADR was rated by using the methods of Naranjo and colleagues).

**Author, year:** Pouyanne, 2000  
**Term used by author:** adverse drug reaction  
**Definition:** A case was defined as a patient admitted because of an adverse drug reaction (ref. 5: WHO)

**Author, year:** Queneau, 2003  
**Term used by author:** effet indésirable  
**Definition:** effet indésirable: réaction novice et non voulue, se produisant aux posologies normalement utilisées chez l'homme pour la prophylaxie, le diagnostic ou le traitement d'une maladie ou la modification d'une fonction physiologique, ou résultant d'un mésusage du médicament ou produit

**Author, year:** Schlienger, 1999  
**Term used by author:** adverse drug event  
**Definition:** an ADE is one that is noxious and unintended and occurs at doses used in humans for humans for prophylaxis, diagnosis, therapy, or modifications of physiologic functions

**Author, year:** Schneeweiss, 2002  
**Meeting our definition criteria as:** adverse event  
**Term used by author:** adverse drug events  
**Definition:** Drug related hospitalizations were identified using systematic and prospective screening of all admissions with regard to characteristic symptoms/diagnoses of known ADRs (ref. 7: WHO international drug monitoring)

**Author, year:** Schnipper, 2006  
**Term used by author:** adverse drug event  
**Definition:** (…) physicians (determined) wether an ADE had occurred, using the Naranjo algorithm, a validated scoring system to assess causality.

**Author, year:** Smith, 2006  
**Term used by author:** adverse drug reaction  
**Definition:** The relationship between the reaction and the drug administered was characterized by the Naranjo algorithm, a validated and frequently used tool.

**Author, year:** Tegeder, 1999  
**Term used by author:** Adverse drug reaction  
**Definition:** The probability of a drug related adverse drug reaction was assessed by means of the adverse reaction probability score (APS) of Naranjo et al.
**Author, year:** van den Bemt, 1999  
**Term used by author:** adverse drug events (ADRs)  
**Definition:** Adverse drug events were classified as potentially serious or non-serious according to the Critical Terms List of the World Health Organization (WHO).

**Author, year:** Vargas, 2003  
**Term used by author:** adverse drug reaction  
**Definition:** Any noxious or unintended response (excluding lack of efficacy) to a drug that occurred with doses commonly used for prophylaxis, diagnosis, or treatment was considered an ADR.

**Author, year:** Weiss, 2002  
**Term used by author:** adverse drug reaction  
**Definition:** ADR. An effect which is noxious or unintended, and which occurs at doses used in man for prophylaxis, diagnosis and therapy (WHO).

**Author, year:** Zoppi, 2000  
**Term used by author:** adverse drug reaction (ADR) or adverse drug event (ADE)  
**Definition:** Each ADR is characterised by the preferred term of the World Health Organization (WHO) terminology, version 1993:3.

### 2b. Adverse drug reaction according WHO and paraphrases (n=3)

“Any response to a drug which is noxious, unintended and which occurs at doses normally used in man for the prophylaxis, diagnosis or therapy of disease.”

(with overdose and intoxication)

**Author, year:** Ebbesen, 2001  
**Meeting our definition criteria as:** adverse event  
**Term used by author:** adverse drug event  
**Definition:** Classification of ADE included the WHO’s definition of ADRs (a response to a drug that is noxious and unintended, and that occurs at doses normally used in humans for the prophylaxis, diagnosis, or therapy of disease or for the modification of physiological function), and adverse events related to intoxications and inappropriately prescribed or administered drugs. / we have included all deaths in which a drug might have caused or contributed to death.

**Author, year:** Queneau, 2007  
**Meeting our definition criteria as:** adverse event  
**Term used by author:** Adverse drug event  
**Definition:** Classification of ADEs included the WHO’s definition of ADRs (i.e. a noxious and unintended response to a drug, which occurs at doses normally used in humans for prophylaxis, diagnosis or therapy of disease, or for the modification of physiological function, and AE related to inappropriate medicine use, including therapeutic failures resulting from poor compliance) and abrupt discontinuation of medication.

**Author, year:** Samoy, 2006  
**Meeting our definition criteria as:** adverse event  
**Term used by author:** ???
**Definition:** We used the WHO's definition of adverse drug reaction and included all reactions to drugs administered at appropriate doses, as well as those associated with abnormal drug concentrations or laboratory values.

3. Others

a) Self reported AE (n=3)

**Author, year:** Chrischilles, 2007  
**Meeting our definition criteria as:** adverse event  
**Term used by author:** adverse drug event  
**Definition:** A self-report of experiencing an ADE (…) was the primary dependent variable. Respondents were asked: “In the last 12 months, have you noticed any side effects, unwanted reactions, or other problems from medications you were taking?”

**Author, year:** Gandhi, 2000  
**Meeting our definition criteria as:** adverse event  
**Term used by author:** drug complication  
**Definition:** Patient-reported drug complications, defined as a problem or symptom related to their prescription medications in the last year(…) As a validity check, complications were verified to be documented drug-symptom associations by a physician reviewer using the Physician’s Desk Reference (PDR).

**Author, year:** Rask, 2005  
**Term used by author:** adverse drug event  
**Definition:** Self reported ADEs.

b) Nosocomial infections (n=4)

**Author, year:** Emmerson, 1996  
**Meeting our definition criteria as:** adverse event  
**Term used by author:** hospital acquired infections  
**Definition:**

**Author, year:** Grohskopf, 2002  
**Term used by author:** pediatric intensive care unit (PICU) acquired infection  
**Definition:** PICU-acquired infections were defined by using Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) criteria.

**Author, year:** Rüden, 1996  
**Term used by author:** nosokomiale Infektion  
**Definition:** Nosokomiale Infektion

**Author, year:** The French Prevalence Survey Study Group, 2000  
**Meeting our definition criteria as:** adverse event  
**Term used by author:** nosocomial infection  
**Definition:** Nosocomial infection was defined as an infection neither present nor incubating on admission to the hospital.
c) Not specified (n=9)

Author, year: Conen, 2006
Term used by author: adverse event
Definition: not specified

Author, year: Fradet, 1996
Meeting our definition criteria as: adverse event
Term used by author: pathologies iatrogenes medicamenteuses
Definition: not specified

Author, year: Healy, 2002
Term used by author: complication
Definition: not specified

Author, year: Jonville-Bera, 2002
Term used by author: adverse drug reaction
Definition: not specified

Author, year: Lecointre, 2003
Term used by author: evenements indesirables medicamenteux
Definition: not specified

Author, year: Meurer, 2006
Term used by author: medical injuries
Definition: not specified

Author, year: Raschetti, 1999
Term used by author: adverse drug event
Definition: not specified

Author, year: Reich, 2005
Term used by author: Komplikationen
Definition: not specified

Author, year: Veehof, 1999
Term used by author: adverse drug effects
Definition: not specified

d) Other definitions (n=28)

Author, year: Bellomo, 2002
Term used by author: serious adverse event
Definition: serious adverse events: acute myocardial infarction, pulmonary embolism, acute pulmonary oedema, unscheduled tracheostomy, respiratory failure, cardiac arrest, cerebrovascular accident, severe sepsis, acute renal failure, emergency admission to the intensiv care unit, death
Author, year: Bhalla, 2003  
Term used by author: drug-related admission  
Definition: Author, year: Ahmed, 1997  
Term used by author: adverse drug reaction  
Definition: Author, year: Ahmed, 1997  
Term used by author: adverse drug reaction  
Definition: The criteria for inclusion of possible drug-related admissions were set by the researcher following a review of the literature. The criteria were: drug-related therapeutic failure, ie, dose or frequency too low, recent dose reduction or drug discontinuation, non-compliance or inadequate monitoring, drug interaction. Adverse drug reaction or side effects, including situations in which a drug is cautioned or contraindicated and has subsequently caused an ADR (...). Overdose or abuse as judged by the admitting doctor or medical team managing the patient’s care. Other - identifying the drug factors related to drug-related admissions.

Author, year: Buajordet, 1995  
Meeting our definition criteria as: adverse event  
Term used by author: legemiddelrelaterte dodsfall  
Definition: Pasienten er død på grunn av legemiddelbivirkninger.

Author, year: Carroll, 2003  
Term used by author: adverse event  
Definition: Adverse event (...) an incident in which harm resulted to a person recieving health care

Author, year: Doucet, 2002  
Term used by author: adverse drug event  
Definition: A sign or symptom caused by one drug or a drug combination was considered a probable adverse effect if: (1) there was a reasonable temporal sequence from the commencement of a drug combination treatment, (2) there was a known response pattern, (3) if the signs or symptoms were improved by discontinuation of responsible drugs, (4) the signs and symptoms could not reasonably explained by known characteristics of the patient’s clinical condition.

Author, year: Ehsani, 2006  
Term used by author: adverse event  
Definition: closely parallels the National Council on Safety and Quality in Health Care’s definition of an adverse event as “an incident in which unintended harm resulted to a person receiving health care”

Author, year: Fattinger, 2000  
Term used by author: Adverse drug reaction  
Definition: characterized as clinically relevant adverse drug reactions if they resulted in considerable disconfort, drug withdrawal or dose reduction and/or initiation of therapeutic measures.

Author, year: Feldman, 1997  
Term used by author: adverse outcome  
Definition: Complications were graded according to a classification scheme developed by Clavien et al.
**Author, year:** Forster, 2004b  
**Term used by author:** severe adverse events  
**Definition:** Severe adverse events led to permanent disability or death. The type was classified as adverse drug event, operative complication, nosocomial infection, diagnostic error or system problem

**Author, year:** Jackson, 2006  
**Term used by author:** adverse event  
**Definition:** The international classification of Diseases has developed a range of cases that, by definition imply an adverse event.

**Author, year:** Johnston, 2006  
**Term used by author:** adverse event  
**Definition:** An AE was defined as any ADR or medication error within VUMC during the period of the study. According to the institutions policy, ADRs included any unwanted or unexpected outcome of drug therapy, including failure to provide an expected response.

**Author, year:** Kanter, 2004  
**Term used by author:** medical error  
**Definition:** medical error identified by the use of one of the 996-999 ICD 9 codes.

**Author, year:** Lagnaoui, 2000  
**Term used by author:** adverse drug reaction  
**Definition:** ADR was defined as a clinical or biological abnormality associated with the use of a drug.

**Author, year:** Madigan, 2007  
**Term used by author:** adverse event  
**Definition:** Adverse events were created following the algorithm from the Centers for medicare and medicaid that defines how each adverse event is identified.

**Author, year:** Major, 1998  
**Term used by author:** adverse drug reaction  
**Definition:** Adverse drug reactions were classified as either side effects, defined as unwanted predictable pharmacologic action unrelated to the therapeutic effect and occurring at therapeutic doses (…) or allergic reaction, defined as immunologically based reactions to drugs based on previous reports and manifestations of the reaction

**Author, year:** Malhotra, 2001  
**Term used by author:** adverse drug event  
**Definition:** An ADE was defined as any particular untoward happening during drug therapy, experienced by a patient, undesirable either generally or in the context of the disease which led to the emergency medical outpatient department visit at doses normally used in man for the prophylaxis, diagnosis or therapy of disease

**Author, year:** Martin, 2002  
**Term used by author:** efecto adverso  
**Definition:** Problema relacionado con la medicacion

**Author, year:** Melton, 2005  
**Term used by author:** adverse event
**Definition:** We used the criteria for each of the 45 patient-related hospital-based adverse event types defined in NYPORTS; they represent a broad range of adverse events.

**Author, year:** Mezei, 1999  
**Term used by author:** complication-related readmission  
**Definition:** Admissions resulting from surgical, medical, or anesthesia-related complications related to the previous ambulatory surgery

**Author, year:** Moore, 1998  
**Term used by author:** serious adverse drug reaction  
**Definition:** Serious reactions were defined as those causing hospitalization, that were fatal or life-threatening, or that resulted in significant change in the patient's treatment.

**Author, year:** Nelson, 1996  
**Term used by author:** adverse drug reaction  
**Definition:** By definition, an admission was drug related when the symptoms of a definite or probable ADR or DTF were the dominant or partly contributing reason for the hospitalization. (…) Drug therapy failure (DTF) was defined as an inadequate therapeutic response to a drug as evidenced by the presence of symptoms of a diagnosed disease state or condition

**Author, year:** O’Hara, 1997  
**Term used by author:** adverse event  
**Definition:** Adverse event: Misadventures to patients during surgical and medical care; Surgical and medical procedures as the cause of abnormal reaction of the patient or later complication, without mention of misadventure at the time of procedure; Drugs, medicinal and biological substances causing adverse effects in therapeutic use

**Author, year:** Ouchterlony, 1995  
**Term used by author:** adverse event/complication  
**Definition:** An adverse event/complication was defined as any unexpected untoward event, not thought to be an inevitable consequence of procedure, occurring during anaesthesia or during the immediate post operative period

**Author, year:** Rozenfeld, 2007  
**Term used by author:** efeitos adversos de drogas  
**Definition:** Efeitos adversos de drogas, medicamentos e substancias biológicas usadas com finalidade terapeutica da CID-10

**Author, year:** Sanborn, 1996  
**Term used by author:** intraoperative incidents  
**Definition:** intraoperative incidents, defined as deviations from specified limits for …

**Author, year:** Schneitman-McIntire, 1996  
**Term used by author:** medication misadventure  
**Definition:** Our definition of medication misadventure encompasses more than an unfavorable effect of medication use and includes poor compliance, inappropriate self-medication, inappropriate prescribing, and drug interactions. The untoward response occurs within a reasonable period after the medication is taken and is not due to any underlying disease

**Author, year:** Tafreshi, 1999
**Term used by author:** medication related visits

**Definition:** medication related visits to the emergency department

**Author, year:** Wolff, 2001

**Term used by author:** adverse patient occurrence

**Definition:** an adverse patient occurrence was defined as: "an untoward patient event which, under optimal conditions, is not a natural consequence of the patient’s disease or treatment"