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Background
Opioid Medication has the potential to provide relief for patients with chronic pain when all other modalities have failed. There is significant risk of abuse and misuse of opioid therapy for treatment of chronic pain. Urine Drug Screening (UDS) is one method used to monitor for misuse or diversion. There is little evidence regarding testing frequency.

Gap Analysis

Literature Review
Evidence support UDS monitoring, however there is a lack of research regarding the frequency of testing (McEachern et al., 2019) resulting in confusion as to the best practice and the standard of care (Owen et al., 2012).

PICO(T) Objectives
In adult patients prescribed a scheduled II opioid medication for chronic pain (P) how does the rate of aberrancy in urine drug screens performed four times a year (I) compare to the rate in patients having less than four urine drugs screens a year (C) affect patient compliance monitoring (O)?

Framework
Johns Hopkins Nursing EBP Model

Methods
• Quality Improvement Method
• Retrospective EHR Chart Review
• 24 month - 311 record review

Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Positive Drug Screen</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 per year</td>
<td>9 (22.5%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 per year</td>
<td>17 (22.1%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 per year</td>
<td>31 (24.2%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 per year</td>
<td>31 (47.0%)</td>
<td>0.002</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion
• No statistical risk identified by demographic variables
• Cost is a concern as treatment may cause a financial burden
• Healthcare providers need education on reading UDS to avoid misinterpretation
• Adherence to clinic protocols is essential for patient safety

Conclusion
The QI project supports the clinic’s policy of testing 4 times a year. Nurses can bridge gap and improve policy compliance by overseeing the monitoring process.

Practice Implications
• Continue with 4 UDS per year to monitor compliance
• Need for modified randomized/testing schedule
• Education for test interpretation
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