Journal of Clinical and Nursing Research, 2025, Volume 9, Issue 7
http://ojs.bbwpublisher.com/index.php/JCNR
Online ISSN: 2208-3693
Print ISSN: 2208-3685

Difficulties and Countermeasures of Monitoring Adverse Drug Reactions in Primary Medical Institutions

Yanpeng Duan

Linfen Comprehensive Inspection and Testing Center, Linfen 041000, Shanxi, China

Abstract: Monitoring adverse drug reactions (ADRs) in primary medical institutions is crucial to ensuring medication safety. Currently, this work faces difficulties such as insufficient professional ability of staff, imperfect monitoring systems, and low patient awareness. It is necessary to improve the level of ADR monitoring at the grassroots level and ensure the safety and effectiveness of medication through countermeasures such as strengthening personnel training, optimizing monitoring processes, and raising public awareness.

Keywords: Primary medical institutions; Adverse drug reaction monitoring; Difficulties; Countermeasures

Online publication: August 4, 2025

1. Introduction

Primary medical institutions are the forefront of medication use for the masses, and the monitoring of adverse drug reactions is of great significance. However, due to various factors, these institutions face many challenges in this work. Exploring its difficulties and seeking effective countermeasures can promote better implementation of ADR monitoring at the grassroots level, ensuring medication safety for the grassroots population.

2. Overview of ADR monitoring in primary medical institutions

2.1. Definition and importance of monitoring work

ADR monitoring refers to the process of collecting, reporting, analyzing, and evaluating adverse reactions that occur during normal usage and dosage of medications and are unrelated to the medication's intended purpose. This work is extremely important. Firstly, it concerns patient safety. Through monitoring, potential drug risks can be timely identified, preventing patients from suffering more severe health damage due to ADRs. For example, certain drugs may cause severe allergic reactions in a few patients, which can be life-threatening if not monitored and addressed promptly. Secondly, it provides valuable feedback for drug development, production, and

management. Data from ADR monitoring helps drug manufacturers improve production processes, optimize drug formulations, and informs drug regulatory authorities to adjust drug policies and regulate the drug market. From a macro perspective, it contributes to enhancing the rationality and safety of medication use in the entire healthcare system, promoting medical quality improvement.

2.2. Current status of grassroots monitoring work

Currently, the ADR monitoring work in primary medical institutions exhibits some characteristics. On one hand, there is a gradual increase in monitoring awareness. More and more grassroots healthcare workers are beginning to recognize the importance of ADR monitoring, no longer ignoring abnormal reactions after patient medication. However, there are still many issues in practical implementation. In terms of monitoring quantity, compared to higher-level medical institutions, the number of reported ADR cases from the grassroots level is relatively small. This may be due to various reasons, such as the inaccurate grasp of ADR criteria by some grassroots healthcare workers, leading to the omission of reporting minor ADRs. Regarding monitoring quality, there are instances of incomplete report information. For example, critical information such as the patient's basic details, medication history, specific symptoms of ADRs, and their occurrence times may not be filled in with sufficient detail and accuracy, posing difficulties for subsequent analysis and evaluation work[1]. Additionally, there is a significant imbalance in monitoring work among primary medical institutions. Institutions in economically developed areas tend to have better monitoring practices, while those in remote or economically underserved areas may have weaker personnel allocation and equipment facilities, affecting the implementation of monitoring work.

3. Difficulties in monitoring adverse drug reactions in primary medical institutions

3.1. Professional capabilities of staff

In primary medical institutions, insufficient professional capabilities of staff constitute a significant challenge in monitoring adverse drug reactions. Grassroots healthcare workers often juggle multiple tasks and receive relatively limited professional training in adverse drug reaction monitoring. Many of them do not have a comprehensive understanding of adverse drug reactions, such as inadequate knowledge about potential reactions to newly marketed drugs. Some healthcare workers find it difficult to accurately determine whether certain symptoms are adverse drug reactions, especially when the symptoms are complex or similar to those of the underlying disease. For example, when patients use antibiotics to treat infectious diseases, they may experience symptoms such as fever and rash, which could be part of the disease's natural progression or adverse drug reactions. Grassroots healthcare workers may struggle to distinguish between the two. Furthermore, their ability to analyze and manage adverse reactions is limited. They lack systematic pharmacovigilance knowledge and skills, making it difficult to analyze the mechanisms of adverse reactions from multidisciplinary perspectives such as pharmacology and pathology, and thus to take effective response measures.

3.2. Monitoring system construction

Primary medical institutions face numerous challenges in building monitoring systems. Firstly, the monitoring system is not well-established. Adverse drug reaction monitoring in these institutions often lacks clear and detailed workflows and standards, leading to confusion among healthcare workers about how to carry out their work according to standard procedures. For instance, there are no clear regulations on adverse reaction

information collection, reporting timeframes, or review mechanisms. Secondly, the information management system is outdated. Many primary medical institutions have not established a comprehensive adverse drug reaction information management system and still rely on manual records and paper-based reporting, which are not only inefficient but also prone to information loss and errors. There are also obstacles in communication and collaboration with superior monitoring departments. A timely and effective information transmission mechanism is lacking between primary medical institutions and superior adverse drug reaction monitoring centers, resulting in delays in reporting, feedback, and handling of critical adverse reaction information.

3.3. Patient awareness and cooperation

Low awareness and cooperation among patients regarding adverse drug reaction monitoring also pose difficulties for primary medical institutions. Many patients have a basic understanding of adverse drug reactions, believing that as long as they follow medical advice, there will be no problems, and they are unaware that adverse reactions can occur even with proper medication use. When healthcare workers inquire about their post-medication responses, some patients may not provide accurate information or withhold minor discomfort symptoms due to misunderstandings about adverse reactions. For example, some patients may consider mild headaches or nausea as normal and unnecessary to report to doctors, unaware that these could be signs of adverse drug reactions. Moreover, in some cases, patients may resist adverse drug reaction monitoring, fearing that reporting adverse reactions could affect their treatment or cause trouble for doctors, and thus are unwilling to cooperate with healthcare workers in related investigations and information collection efforts.

4. Analysis of difficulties in adverse drug reaction monitoring in primary medical institutions

4.1. Factors of personnel training and management

Insufficient personnel training and management in primary medical institutions are important factors leading to difficulties in adverse drug reaction (ADR) monitoring. From the perspective of training, primary healthcare workers have relatively few training opportunities. On one hand, due to the heavy workload of primary medical institutions, it is difficult for healthcare workers to take a lot of time to participate in specialized ADR monitoring training [2]. On the other hand, the distribution of training resources is uneven, and primary medical institutions often do not receive sufficient high-quality training resources, such as the lack of professional trainers and advanced training materials. In terms of training content, there is also a disconnect from actual work, as the training content may be too theoretical and lack case analysis and operational guidance tailored to the actual work scenarios of primary medical institutions. From the perspective of personnel management, primary medical institutions lack an effective assessment mechanism for healthcare workers' ADR monitoring work. The performance evaluation of healthcare workers focuses more on clinical treatment effects, and there is not enough emphasis on ADR monitoring work, which makes healthcare workers lack enthusiasm and initiative in carrying out this work.

4.2. Factors of resource investment and allocation

Unreasonable resource investment and allocation are another reason for the difficulties faced by primary medical institutions in ADR monitoring. In terms of funding, primary medical institutions generally face the problem

of funding shortages. Due to limited funds, it is difficult to invest sufficient funds in equipment purchase, personnel training, and information construction for ADR monitoring. For example, it is not possible to purchase advanced drug testing equipment to assist in determining whether adverse reactions are related to drug quality, nor to establish a complete information management system. In terms of human resources, primary medical institutions have a tight staffing situation, and the number of healthcare workers is relatively insufficient. This makes it difficult for healthcare workers to devote enough energy to ADR monitoring while undertaking heavy clinical diagnosis and treatment tasks. Moreover, there are problems in professional staffing, such as the lack of professionals specialized in ADR monitoring, such as pharmacovigilance specialists, which affects the professionalism and accuracy of monitoring work.

4.3. Social environment and propaganda factors

The inadequate social environment and propaganda have also impacted the monitoring of adverse drug reactions (ADRs) in primary medical institutions. From the perspective of the social environment, the entire society has relatively low attention to ADRs, lacking an atmosphere that values drug safety and actively participates in ADR monitoring. For example, media reports on ADRs are relatively scarce and mostly focus on negative events, lacking positive guidance and propaganda. In terms of propaganda, the work targeting the grassroots is insufficient. Propaganda channels are limited, often only posting some promotional posters within medical institutions, lacking widespread promotion in communities and villages. The content is also not easy to understand, with many professional terms that are difficult for ordinary people to comprehend. This leads to patients' insufficient understanding of ADRs, which further affects their cooperation in monitoring work [3].

5. Countermeasures for ADR monitoring in primary medical institutions

5.1. Enhancing professional quality of staff

To enhance the professional quality of staff in primary medical institutions, multiple approaches are needed. Firstly, training opportunities should be increased. Superior medical institutions and drug vigilance departments can organize more ADR monitoring training for primary healthcare workers, adopting a combination of online and offline methods to accommodate their work characteristics. For instance, dedicated online training courses can be developed to enable grassroots healthcare workers to learn during fragmented time. The training content should focus on practicality, combining actual cases to explain in detail the criteria for judging ADRs, analysis methods, and response measures. Experts with rich practical experience should be invited to teach to improve the quality of training. Secondly, a comprehensive assessment mechanism should be established. The ADR monitoring work should be incorporated into the performance appraisal system of primary healthcare workers, with clear assessment criteria such as the quantity and quality of ADR reports. Healthcare workers who excel in ADR monitoring should be rewarded with recognition, bonuses, etc., to enhance their enthusiasm.

5.2. Improving monitoring system construction

Improving the monitoring system construction of primary medical institutions is key to enhancing the level of ADR monitoring work. Firstly, a sound monitoring system should be established. Clear standard procedures for each link of the ADR monitoring work should be defined, including information collection, reporting, review, analysis, etc. For example, it should be stipulated how long healthcare workers must report after discovering an

ADR and what information the report should contain. Simultaneously, an internal supervision and error correction mechanism should be established to ensure that monitoring work follows institutional norms. Secondly, the construction of an information management system should be strengthened. Primary medical institutions should increase funding to introduce advanced ADR information management systems, enabling electronic management of ADR information [4]. The system should have functions such as information entry, inquiry, statistical analysis, etc., to improve the efficiency and accuracy of information processing. Additionally, the security of the information system should be ensured to protect patients' privacy information. Thirdly, communication and collaboration with superior monitoring departments should be strengthened. A regular information exchange mechanism should be established, where primary medical institutions timely report collected ADR information to superior departments, and superior departments should also promptly provide feedback on processing results and guidance.

5.3. Enhance patient understanding and cooperation

Enhancing patients' understanding and cooperation in adverse drug reaction monitoring requires a multifaceted approach. Firstly, it is necessary to increase publicity efforts. Utilize various promotional channels, such as community outreach, rural radio, television advertisements, and online platforms, to widely disseminate knowledge about adverse drug reactions. The promotional content should be easy to understand, adopting formats like comics and short videos to vividly introduce to patients what adverse drug reactions are, why monitoring is necessary, and how to cooperate with medical staff in monitoring efforts. For instance, short videos about common adverse drug reactions can be produced and played in hospital waiting areas, community activity centers, and other locations. Secondly, healthcare workers should strengthen patient education during routine medical consultations. Before prescribing medication, patients should be informed in detail about possible adverse reactions, taught how to observe and report them, and reassured about any concerns they may have. For example, when writing prescriptions, doctors can briefly explain common adverse reactions to patients and advise them to inform medical staff promptly if they experience any discomfort [5].

6. Conclusion

Although adverse drug reaction monitoring in primary medical institutions faces many challenges, targeted countermeasures can gradually improve the situation. Continuously strengthening personnel capabilities, improving the system, and enhancing patient awareness can effectively enhance the quality of monitoring work, ensuring safe drug use for the grassroots population and promoting the healthy development of primary healthcare.

Disclosure statement

The author declares no conflict of interest.

References

[1] Liu A, Li X, Ding S, et al., 2021, Analysis of Adverse Drug Reaction Reports From Primary Medical Institutions in Dongguan City From 2015 to 2019. Strait Pharmaceutical Journal, 33(11): 201–203.

[2] Diao K, Lv H, 2021, Problems and Countermeasures of Adverse Drug Reaction Monitoring in Primary Medical Institutions. Popular Standardization, (13): 204–206.

[3] Lin Q, Huang M, Chen R, 2021, Discussion on the Role of Medical Institutions in Adverse Drug Reaction Monitoring and Management. Chinese Medical Management Science, 11(01): 87–90.

[4] Qi J, Yao X, Bai Y, 2020, Analysis of Influencing Factors Restricting Adverse Drug Reaction Monitoring in Medical Institutions and Discussion on Countermeasures. Electronic Journal of Clinical Medical Literature, 7(20): 176–182.

[5] Li H, Du J, Zhang G, et al., 2021, Analysis of Adverse Drug Reactions in a Primary Medical Institution in a Remote and Poverty-Stricken Area Over Five Years. Chinese Community Doctors, 37(06): 10–11.