Monitoring adverse events following influenza vaccination in general practice: Evaluation of different methods to increase the inclusion rate of patients
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Introduction

Influenza vaccination

• Annually ≈ 3 million citizens of the Netherlands

• Key role: general practitioner
Introduction

Lareb

- Monitoring safety of medicines and vaccines
- Spontaneous reporting
- Lareb Intensive Monitoring (LIM)
Introduction

Lareb Intensive Monitoring Influenza vaccination

• Patients register and report adverse events
• Web-based questionnaires
• Key role: general practitioner
• Cohort 2013: inclusion rate 1.8%
Objective

To evaluate whether conventional compared to new methods of informing and approaching the general practitioner resulted in higher inclusion rates of patients
Methods

Three methods to inform general practitioners (n=85)

Study material: flyers with instruction letter

- study material only (conventional: n=60)
- study material and telephone call (n=15)
- study material by personal visit (n=10)
Methods

- Evaluation of process of informing patients
  - Distribution of flyers

- Statistical analyses: Chi-square test
  (Fisher’s exact test)
# Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Patients (n)</th>
<th>Participants (n)</th>
<th>Inclusion rate (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conventional (n=60)*</td>
<td>57145</td>
<td>944</td>
<td>1.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Called (n=15)</td>
<td>9540</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>2.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visited (n=10)</td>
<td>9260</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>2.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>75945</td>
<td>1401</td>
<td>1.84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Of 11 general practitioners of the conventional group there was not one participant

- New methods higher inclusion rates (Chi-square: p<.001)
Results

Evaluation of informing patients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Flyer given (%)</th>
<th>Flyer given: inclusion rate (%)</th>
<th>Flyer on pile: inclusion rate (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conventional (n=36)</td>
<td>77.78</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Called (n=7)</td>
<td>22.22</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>2.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visited (n=5)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Inclusion rates of LIM participants based on different methods of receiving the flyer

• Higher inclusion rates if flyer is handed over square p<.001 (Chi–)
Limitations

• Small groups

• Social acceptable answers
Conclusions

• Inclusion rates of LIM participants highest in called and visited group

• Personal attention by handing over a flyer resulted in higher inclusion rates
Questions???