Electronic Supplementary Material 2 – Additional results

Feasibility and educational value of a student-run pharmacovigilance programme – a prospective cohort study

Tim Schutte^{1,2}, Jelle Tichelaar^{1,2}, Michael O. Reumerman¹, Rike van Eekeren^{3,4,5}, Leàn Rolfes^{3,4,5} Eugène P. van Puijenbroek^{3,4,5}, Milan C. Richir^{1,2}, Michiel A. van Agtmael^{1,2}

Corresponding author: Tim Schutte, t.schutte@vumc.nl
Department of Internal Medicine, Section Pharmacotherapy, De Boelelaan 1117, 1081 HZ, Amsterdam, the Netherlands room ZH4A50, Phone +31 20 4448090

¹ Department of Internal Medicine, Section Pharmacotherapy, VU University Medical Center, Amsterdam, the Netherlands

² RECIPE (Research & Expertise Center In Pharmacotherapy Education), Amsterdam, the Netherlands

³ Netherlands Pharmacovigilance Centre Lareb, 's-Hertogenbosch, the Netherlands

⁴ PharmacoTherapy, -Epidemiology and -Economics — Groningen Research Institute of Pharmacy, University of Groningen, Groningen, The Netherlands.

⁵ WHO Collaborating Centre for Pharmacovigilance in Education

Feasibility and educational value of a student-run pharmacovigilance programme – T. Schutte et al.

Baseline c	haracteristics of participating	students		
		Pre-participation	Post-participation	
	Respondents	31	32	
Sex	Female	22 (71.0%)	25 (78.1%)	
	Male	9 (29.0%)	7 (21.9%)	
In which year of	medical school are you?			
	1st year (Bachelor 1)	8 (25.8%)	2 (6.2%)	
	2nd year (Bachelor 2)	6 (19.3%)	7 (21.9%)	
	3rd year (Bachelor 3)	14 (45.2%)	14 (43.8%)	
	4th year (Master 1)	3 (9.7%)	8 (25.0%)	
	5th year (Master 2)	-	1 (3.1%)	
	6th year (Master 3)	-	-	
Have you report	ed an adverse drug reaction before?			
	No		26 (81.3%)	
	Yes		6 (18.7%)	

Table S2-1: Baseline characteristics (pre- and post-participation e-questionnaire).

tems students mentioned as being necessary	for a qualitatively good ADR report.				
	Respondents % (n)		Respondents % (n)		
Patient information (general)	34.5% (10)	Start date of suspected drug	37.9% (11)		
Age / Sex	48.3% (14)	Stop date of suspected drug	24.1% (7)		
Weight/Length	17.2% (5)	Description of the ADR	62.1% (18)		
Patient history	48.3% (14)	Start date of the ADR	27.6% (8)		
Comedication	72.4% (21)	Stop date of the ADR	10.3% (3)		
Comorbidity	24.1% (7)	Latency time	24.1% (7)		
Additional information	17.2% (5)	Action taken	17.2% (5)		
Suspected drug	37.9% (11)	Outcome	17.2% (5)		
	Respondents % (n)				
Summary of product characteristics (SmPC)	60.7% (17)				
Farmacotherapeutisch kompas	57.1% (16)				
Netherlands Pharmacovigilance Centre Lareb	50.0% (14)				
Pubmed	28.6% (8)				
Micromedex solutions©	14.3% (4)				
Other sources	7.1% (2)				
			Respondents % (n)		
			with correct answer		
All ADRs, irrespective of severity, must be rep	72.4% (21)				
Medical doctors should report serious ADEs e	96.6% (28)				
Medical doctors should report serious ADEs e	86.2% (25)				
All serious ADRs are known before a drug is marketed (*No)					
Lareb does not disclose ADR reporter's identif	93.1% (27)				
One can report ADRs anonymously to Lareb (93.1% (27)				
Medical students can report ADRs to Lareb (*	75.9% (22)				
Patients can report ADRs independent of a health professional (*Yes)					
Adverse experiences with cosmetics and special nutritional products may be reported to Lareb (*No)					
One case reported by a doctor does not contr	86.2% (25)				
I know what pharmacovigilance means (*Yes)			51.7% (15)		
I know the meaning of: The black triangle (*Co	37.9% (11)				
I know the meaning of: Dechallenge and Rechallenge (*Correct)					

Table S2-2, Students' skills and knowledge concerning the reporting of adverse drug reactions (ADRs) (cross-sectional). Upper table: Items students considered necessary for a qualitatively good ADR report. Middle table: Resources students would consult when encountering an ADR. Lower table: Percentage of correctly answered questions concerning pharmacology and pharmacovigilance.