

34 **Abstract**

35 **Background**

36 Prescribers must possess extensive knowledge and maintain a positive attitude towards the
37 rational use of medicines to achieve desirable treatment outcomes and effectively prevent
38 treatment failures, increased costs, drug toxicities, and interactions. The objective of this study
39 was to evaluate prescribers' understanding and perception concerning the rational use of
40 medicines in public hospitals. Additionally, the study aimed to identify the factors that influence
41 rational prescribing practices.

42 **Methods**

43 A structured data instrument was developed to collect demographic data and evaluate
44 participants' knowledge and perception of rational medicine use, in line with the study
45 objectives. Chi-squared statistics and Fisher's exact test were utilized to identify factors
46 associated with good knowledge and perception among participants. Logistic regression was then
47 employed to assess the strength of the associations, with odd ratios reported at a significant level
48 of 0.05.

49 **Results**

50 Out of 192 participants, 85.4% held a positive view of rational medicine use, stressing patient
51 safety and recognizing risks like antimicrobial resistance and polypharmacy. Perception was
52 influenced by factors such as prescriber profession, access to references, and drug bulletin
53 updates. Additionally, 65.6% demonstrated good knowledge of rational medicine use, which was
54 notably influenced by factors like using standard prescribing guidelines, having a functional
55 Drug and Therapeutics Committee, prescriber profession, and the frequency of drug bulletin
56 updates.

57 **Conclusion**

58 The study emphasizes the critical need to address knowledge gaps among healthcare
59 professionals, especially nurses and other prescribers, to ensure the safe and effective use of
60 medications. It highlights the positive influence of utilizing preferred prescribing references and
61 the existence of functional Drug and Therapeutics Committees in hospitals on knowledge levels.
62 However, the unexpected findings regarding the limited impact of frequent updates of drug
63 bulletins require further investigation.

64 **Keywords:** Rational medicine use, prescriber knowledge, rational prescribing, prescriber
65 perception, Ghana

66 **Introduction**

67 Rational prescribing practices have been recognized as crucial to enhancing healthcare outcomes
68 and decreasing healthcare expenses [1]. To achieve this goal, it is imperative for prescribers to
69 possess extensive knowledge, along with a positive attitude and perception towards rational
70 medication use [2,3]. It is widely acknowledged that the excessive or improper utilization of
71 drugs can lead to treatment failures, escalated treatment costs, drug toxicities, and drug
72 interactions [1,4,5]. Although prescribing is commonly viewed as a routine task, it is a complex
73 procedure requiring healthcare providers to possess sufficient knowledge and adhere to sound
74 therapeutic principles. Effective communication skills and a proper understanding of risks and
75 uncertainties are also essential [6].

76 The prescribing process often begins by establishing the desired therapeutic goals, such as
77 reducing fever, eliminating an infection, or providing contraception. The goals may be
78 influenced by patient expectations and preferences. Once the goals are determined, a suitable
79 treatment is chosen, which can be challenging due to the various available options [7]. Ideally,
80 the final selection of medication should be made after conducting a comprehensive benefit–risk
81 analysis, considering both the medical factors and the patient's circumstances, including
82 availability and cost [6,8,9]. Patient-related factors, such as physiological conditions (e.g.,
83 allergy, liver impairment), susceptibility to adverse effects, and concurrent drug therapy, may
84 influence the medicine selection process by potentially leading to drug interactions [9,10].
85 Additionally, drug-related factors, such as safety and efficacy evidence, as well as
86 pharmacokinetic and pharmacodynamic properties, may also play a role in the selection process.

87 For example, a medication with a once-daily dosing schedule might be preferred over one with
88 multiple doses to enhance patient compliance, especially in the elderly who are likely to forget
89 and therefore miss some doses [9,11].

90 Consequently, the prescriber plays a pivotal role in implementing policies for rational medicine
91 use, ensuring patient safety. However, numerous studies have identified gaps in prescriber
92 knowledge and perceptions regarding rational prescribing practices in low- and middle-income
93 countries (LMICs) [12–16]. For instance, in research carried out in Pakistan [17], it was reported
94 that more than 60% of general practitioners (GPs) depend on pharmaceutical company
95 representatives to receive updates on antihypertensive medications. Additionally, over 40% of
96 GPs inappropriately prescribe sedatives to elderly patients [17]. Moreover, 23% of GPs
97 mistakenly cease treatment once they have successfully achieved blood pressure control [17].
98 Likewise, another investigation carried out in healthcare facilities in rural Burkina Faso revealed
99 that merely 50% of the prescribed doses of antimalarial medications were in accordance with the
100 recommendations, while antibiotics were prescribed at approximately 200% higher than the
101 recommended doses [18]. Consequently, this led to treatment failures in the case of antimalarials
102 and undesired effects in the case of antibiotics [18].

103 Prescribing is a skill that is honed through years of practical experience, as it is rarely taught
104 comprehensively in schools. In fact, junior doctors often lack the confidence to prescribe
105 medications [19,20], as it is a complex process that requires the ability to consider individual and
106 regulatory factors to avoid suboptimal prescribing [21]. There is ample evidence demonstrating
107 the widespread occurrence of irrational prescribing practices worldwide, particularly in
108 developing countries [22–24]. These practices encompass polypharmacy, inappropriate use of
109 antibiotics and injections, prescribing expensive branded medications when unnecessary, and

110 more. The consequences of such irrational prescribing practices are numerous, including patients
111 failing to adhere to treatment due to adverse effects resulting from drug interactions, and an
112 increase in hospitalizations due to these adverse effects [25–27]. As a result of irrational
113 prescribing, patients lose confidence in the healthcare system and may turn to unorthodox
114 treatments when their quality of life is affected [28].

115 Rational medicine usage in the Ashanti Region of Ghana has witnessed notable advancements in
116 the past five years, particularly concerning the prescription of generic medications from the
117 essential medicines list and the promotion of safe injection practices [29]. However, healthcare
118 authorities and policymakers continue to grapple with significant concerns surrounding
119 inappropriate antibiotic usage and polypharmacy, which demand urgent attention [29].
120 Possessing a good knowledge and perception of rational prescribing equips physicians with the
121 skills and understanding necessary to make informed decisions about medication use [30]. It
122 enhances patient safety, improves treatment outcomes, optimizes resource utilization, supports
123 antimicrobial stewardship, promotes patient-centred care, facilitates adherence to guidelines, and
124 underscores professional competence [1,31–33].

125 There is a scarcity of research regarding the knowledge and perception of rational prescribing
126 among physicians in Ghana. However, the prescribing of medications in Ghanaian hospitals
127 involves various categories of healthcare professionals, including doctors, physician assistants,
128 nurses, mental health nurses, and disease control officers, among others. These diverse prescriber
129 groups may possess varying knowledge bases and perceptions concerning rational prescribing,
130 and their practices can have an impact on patient safety and the emergence of antimicrobial
131 resistance. Given the extent of inappropriate antibiotic prescriptions, the prevalence of
132 polypharmacy, and the rising expenses associated with the preference for branded medications in

133 the region [29], it becomes imperative for health authorities and policymakers to gain a
134 comprehensive understanding of the knowledge level of these prescribers on rational use of
135 medicines (RUM). Consequently, the objective of this study was to assess the knowledge and
136 perception of prescribers in public hospitals in the Ashanti Region regarding the RUM, as well as
137 to explore the factors associated with their understanding and practices. The findings from this
138 study will inform what measures should be implemented to improve rational prescribing in the
139 region to ensure patient drug safety.

140 **Methods**

141 **Study design and sampling**

142 This study employed a cross-sectional design and included prescribers from public primary and
143 secondary hospitals in the region. Medication prescribing in Ghanaian hospitals involves a
144 diverse range of healthcare professionals, comprising doctors, physician assistants, nurses,
145 midwives, mental health nurses, community health nurses and disease control officers.
146 Prescribers who are general nurses and midwives were categorized as “nurses” and community
147 health nurses, mental health nurses and disease control officers were classified as “others”.
148 While there exists a register of doctors and physician assistants, the same cannot be said for other
149 types of prescribers. Consequently, it was challenging to determine the exact number of
150 prescribers in public hospitals within the region. Therefore, all prescribers in the 25 public
151 hospitals in the region were approached for participation and only those who willingly agreed to
152 take part in the study and provided informed consent were included as participants.

153 **Data collection and analysis**

154 A structured questionnaire with 34 items was developed in line with the study objectives to
155 collect demographic information from participants and evaluate their knowledge and perception
156 of rational prescribing. The reliability and validity of the questionnaire were assessed to ensure
157 the robustness of the study findings by pretesting the data collection instrument among
158 prescribers in one district hospital. Data collection for the main study was conducted by research
159 assistants personally delivering the questionnaires to the prescribers in their hospitals.
160 Participants were allowed the entire day to complete the questionnaire. The completed
161 questionnaires were then retrieved at the end of the day. Participant recruitment and data
162 collection took place between August 10th and September 10th, 2023.

163 To evaluate participants' knowledge, a selection of eleven questionnaire items (Q14 - Q24) was
164 utilized. These items encompassed understanding the distinction between generic and proprietary
165 names, familiarity with guidelines for safe injection prescribing and nonpolypharmacy, and
166 knowledge regarding the rational usage of antibiotics. The RUM knowledge score was calculated
167 by summing the correct answers for questions 14 to 24, with each correct answer earning one
168 point. The total points accrued were then converted into percentages by dividing by 11 (the
169 maximum possible score) and multiplying by 100 and rounded to one decimal place using
170 standard rounding rules. Respondents who achieved a score of 70% or higher were classified as
171 having a good RUM knowledge while any score below 70% indicated poor knowledge.

172 The participant's perception of RUM was assessed using a Likert scale comprising six items
173 (items 25 – 30). These questions aimed to gauge participants' attitudes and beliefs regarding
174 various aspects of RUM, such as appropriateness of prescribing (item 25), adherence to
175 guidelines (item 26), patient-centred care (items 27 and 29), and avoidance of polypharmacy

176 (items 28 and 30). Responses ranged from "Strongly Disagree" to "Strongly Agree," coded as 1 –
177 5. A higher score indicated a more positive perception. A composite perception score was
178 calculated by summing the responses to all six items. Scores of 24 – 30 were classified as good
179 perception, 18 – 23 as neutral perception, and any score below 18 as poor perception.

180 Functional Drug and Therapeutic Committee (DTC) status was determined based on participants
181 who responded affirmatively to at least three of the following questions: awareness of a DTC
182 operating in their hospital (item 31), knowledge of a recent RUM survey conducted within the
183 past six months in their hospital (item 32), familiarity with the findings of the RUM survey in
184 their hospital (item 33), and participation in a RUM training or refresher course held within their
185 hospital (item 34).

186 The collected data underwent cleaning using Microsoft Excel 2016 and was then imported into
187 Stata version 17 for analysis. Microsoft Word 2016 was utilized to create charts and tables.
188 Categorical data were reported in frequencies and percentages, with Chi-squared or Fisher's
189 exact test used for comparisons. Continuous data were presented as mean (SD) or median
190 (interquartile range). Binary logistic regression (odds ratios) compared knowledge types among
191 participant factors such as age, gender, type of hospital, and prescriber category. Ordinal logistic
192 regression analyzed participants' odds of transitioning from neutral to good perception.
193 Statistical significance was set at $p < 0.05$.

194 **Ethical consideration**

195 Prescribers who voluntarily agreed to participate in this study provided informed consent after a
196 comprehensive explanation of the study's objectives. To safeguard participant confidentiality, all
197 identifying information was deliberately excluded during the data collection process. Prescribers

198 were granted ample privacy and flexibility to respond to the questionnaire, with the entire day
199 available for submission. This study protocol received ethical approval from the ethics
200 committee at Kwame Nkrumah University of Science and Technology and was issued a
201 certificate bearing the number CHRPE/AP/706/23 on 8th August 2023.

202 **Results**

203 **Sociodemographic characteristics of participants**

204 Out of the 215 questionnaires that were distributed, 192 were completed and returned, resulting
205 in a response rate of 89.3%. The participant demographics are presented in Table 1, revealing
206 that the majority of participants were male (53.1%), married (54.8%), and identified as physician
207 assistants (29.2%). Additionally, 90.6% of the participants worked in primary-level hospitals.
208 The mean age of the participants was 34.4 years (± 7.7). Half of the respondents had been
209 working as prescribers for 3 years or less, while 32.1% had been in their current hospital
210 positions for over six years.

211

212

213

214

215

216

217

218

219

220 Table 1 Socio-demographic characteristics of study participants

Characteristic	Number of respondents
	<i>n</i> (%)
Age	
20 – 25	21 (11.9)
26 – 35	90 (50.8)
36 – 45	53 (29.9)
46 – 55	13 (7.4)
Gender	
Male	102 (53.1)
Female	90 (46.9)
Marital status	
Married	107 (55.7)
Single	83 (43.3)
Widowed	2 (1.0)
Level of hospital of practice	
Primary	174 (90.6)
Secondary	18 (9.4)
Category of prescriber	
Medical Officer	47 (24.5)
Medical Intern	7 (3.7)
Physician Assistant	56 (29.2)
Physician Assistant Intern	30 (15.6)
Nurse Prescriber	36 (18.8)
Others	16 (8.2)
Employment status	
Permanent	146 (76.6)
Temporal (locum)	8 (4.2)
Trainee	35 (19.2)
Years of practice	
≤3 years	96 (50.0)
>3-6 years	34 (17.7)
>6-10 years	37 (19.3)
>10 years	25 (13.0)

221

222 **Participants' perception of rational use of medicines**

223 The majority of participants demonstrated a good perception of rational medicine use, with

224 85.4% (n= 164) having a positive perception. Most of them prioritize patient safety over simply

225 curing diseases, with 82.2% agreeing. Additionally, 80.7% agree that irrational prescribing
226 contributes to antimicrobial resistance. Most respondents (81.7%) believe injections aren't
227 inherently more effective than other forms of medication. Concerns about polypharmacy's risk of
228 drug interactions are shared by 75.0% of respondents. Furthermore, 64.5% agree that irrational
229 prescribing can lead to hospitalizations, while 86.9% support reserving certain medicines for
230 specialist prescribing. Factors significantly associated with perception of rational medicine use
231 included prescriber profession ($p = 0.011$), availability of reference sources ($p = 0.026$),
232 frequency of drug bulletin updates ($p = 0.007$), and the use of Medscape as a reference ($p =$
233 0.046) (Table 2). These associations were further analyzed using ordinal regression.

234 Prescribers with access to reference sources were nearly three times more likely to transition
235 from neutral to good perception (OR = 2.9; 95% CI: 1.3 – 6.6; $p = 0.0095$) (Table 3). However,
236 compared to doctors, nurses (OR = 0.08, 95% CI: 0.01 – 0.61; $p = 0.018$), medical interns (OR =
237 0.04; 95% CI: 0.003 – 0.43, $p = 0.008$), and other prescribers, such as mental health nurses,
238 disease control officers, and community health nurses (OR = 0.57; 95% CI: 0.01 – 0.56; $p =$
239 0.014), were less likely to improve from neutral to good perception.

240 Furthermore, prescribers whose drug bulletins were updated annually had significantly lower
241 odds of transitioning from neutral to good perception compared to those whose bulletins were
242 never updated (OR = 0.21, 95% CI: 0.07 – 0.62; $p = 0.005$).

243

244 **Participants' knowledge of rational use of medicines**

245 The majority of participants (65.6%, $n = 126$) demonstrated a strong understanding of RUM.
246 Notably, individuals working in primary hospitals exhibited significantly better knowledge

247 compared to those in secondary (referral) hospitals ($p = 0.047$). Furthermore, participants who
248 relied on the Standard Treatment Guideline (STG) and the British National Formulary (BNF) as
249 their prescribing references showed superior knowledge of rational prescription practices, in
250 contrast to those who used Medscape and the institutional drug bulletin ($p = 0.001$, $p = 0.001$, p
251 $= 0.057$, and $p = 0.174$ respectively). The professional category of the prescriber ($p = 0.001$) and
252 the frequency of updates of the hospital drug bulletin ($p = 0.001$) were also identified as
253 significant factors influencing RUM knowledge. However, factors such as age, gender,
254 employment status, and years of experience as a prescriber did not show significant relationships
255 with prescriber knowledge.

256 In binary logistic regression analysis as depicted in Table 3, participants who utilized STG and
257 BNF as prescription references had approximately three times the odds of possessing good
258 prescription knowledge (OR = 2.83, 95%CI: 1.47 – 5.44; $p = 0.002$) and (OR = 2.81, 95%CI:
259 1.48 – 5.31; $p = 0.001$), respectively. Conversely, nurse prescribers (OR = 0.24; 95% CI: 0.09 –
260 0.64; $p = 0.004$), along with other healthcare professionals such as community health nurses,
261 disease control officers, and mental health nurses (OR = 0.12; 95% CI: 0.03 – 0.44; $p = 0.001$),
262 were less likely to demonstrate good RUM knowledge compared to doctors. Additionally,
263 participants working in hospitals with functional DTCs were more likely to possess good
264 prescribing knowledge (OR = 3.29; 95%CI: 1.43 – 7.54; $p = 0.002$) compared to those who did
265 not have access to such resources.

266 Table 2 Comparison of participant characteristics with knowledge and perception of rational medicine use

Characteristic	RUM Knowledge			RUM Perception			□ <i>p</i> -value
	Good <i>n</i> (%)	Poor <i>n</i> (%)	* <i>p</i> -value	Good <i>n</i> (%)	Neutral <i>n</i> (%)	Poor <i>n</i> (%)	
Drug bulletin as reference							
Yes	99 (68.3)	46 (31.7)	0.174	125 (86.5)	10 (6.9)	10 (6.9)	0.169
No	27 (57.5)	20 (42.6)		39 (83.0)	7 (14.9)	1 (2.1)	
STG as reference							
Yes	100 (72.5)	38 (27.5)	0.001	121 (87.7)	10 (7.2)	7 (5.1)	0.315
No	26 (48.2)	28 (51.9)		43 (79.6)	7 (13.0)	4 (7.4)	
BNF as reference							
Yes	67 (77.9)	19 (22.1)	0.001	74 (86.0)	6 (7.0)	6 (7.0)	0.609
No	59 (55.7)	47 (44.3)		90 (84.9)	11 (10.4)	5 (4.7)	
Medscape as reference							
Yes	58 (73.4)	21 (26.6)	0.057	66 (83.5)	11 (13.9)	2 (2.5)	0.046
No	68 (60.2)	45 (39.8)		98 (86.7)	6 (5.3)	9 (8.0)	
Reference source accessible							
Yes	89 (67.9)	42 (32.1)	0.323	118 (90.1)	8 (6.1)	5 (3.8)	0.026
No	37 (60.7)	24 (39.3)		46 (75.4)	9 (14.8)	6 (9.8)	
Drug bulletin updates							
Never	35 (64.8)	19 (35.2)	0.001	48 (88.9)	5 (9.3)	1 (1.9)	0.007
Quarterly	45 (69.2)	20 (30.8)		60 (92.3)	2 (3.1)	3 (4.6)	
Monthly	34 (82.9)	7 (17.1)		36 (87.8)	3 (7.3)	2 (4.9)	
Annually	12 (37.5)	20 (62.5)		20 (62.5)	7 (21.9)	5 (15.6)	
Age (years)							
20 – 25	13 (61.9)	8 (38.1)	0.934	16 (76.2)	4 (19.0)	1 (4.8)	0.456
26 – 35	62 (64.6)	34 (35.4)		83 (86.5)	7 (7.3)	6 (6.3)	
36 – 45	39 (67.2)	19 (32.8)		52 (89.7)	3 (5.2)	3 (5.2)	
45 – 55	12 (70.6)	5 (29.4)		13 (76.5)	3 (17.6)	1 (5.9)	

Level of Hospital							
Primary	118 (67.8)	56 (32.2)	0.047	149 (85.6)	14 (8.0)	11 (6.3)	0.284
Secondary	8 (44.4)	10 (55.6)		15 (83.3)	3 (16.7)	0 (0.0)	
Type of prescriber							
Doctor	37 (78.7)	10 (21.3)		46 (97.9)	1 (2.1)	0 (0.0)	
Medical intern	3 (42.9)	4 (57.1)		5 (62.5)	3 (37.5)	0 (0.0)	
Physician assistant	41 (73.2)	15 (26.8)	0.001	48 (85.7)	4 (7.1)	4 (7.1)	0.011
Physician assistant intern	23 (76.7)	7 (23.3)		25 (86.2)	3 (10.3)	1 (3.4)	
Nurse	17 (47.2)	19 (52.8)		28 (77.8)	5 (13.9)	3 (8.3)	
Others	5 (31.3)	11 (68.7)		12 (75.0)	1 (6.3)	3 (18.8)	
Years of experience							
≤3 years	63 (65.6)	33 (34.4)		75 (78.1)	11 (11.5)	10 (10.4)	
>3 – 6 years	20 (58.8)	14 (41.2)	0.167	32 (94.1)	2 (5.9)	0 (0.0)	0.172
>6 – 10 years	22 (59.5)	15 (40.5)		34 (91.9)	2 (5.4)	1 (2.7)	
>10 years	21 (84.0)	4 (16.0)		23 (92.0)	2 (8.0)	0 (0.0)	
State of DTC							
Functional	39 (83.0)	8 (17.0)	0.004	43 (91.5)	2 (4.3)	2 (4.3)	0.394
Nonfunctional	86 (59.7)	58 (40.3)		121 (83.4)	15 (10.3)	9 (6.2)	

267 RUM = rational use of medicine; DTC = drugs and therapeutic committee; STG = standard treatment guidelines; BNF = British National Formulary

268 *p-value was determined using the chi-squared statistic. □p-value was determined using Fisher's exact test

269

270

271

272

273

274 Table 3 Factors influencing the odds of having good knowledge and transitioning from neutral to good perception of rational medicine use

Characteristics	Knowledge			Perception		
	OR	95% CI	\square <i>p</i> -value	OR	95% CI	\square <i>p</i> -value
Using STG as a reference						
No	1			-*	-	-
Yes	2.83	1.48 – 5.44	0.002			
Using BNF as a reference						
No	1			-	-	-
Yes	2.81	1.48 – 5.31	0.001			
Frequency of drug bulletin update						
Never updated	1					
Monthly	2.64	0.98 – 7.07	0.054	0.87	0.25 – 3.08	0.834
Quarterly	1.22	0.57 – 2.63	0.510	1.43	0.41 – 4.98	0.570
Annually	0.33	0.13 – 0.81	0.015	0.21	0.07 – 0.62	0.005
Prescribing reference source accessible						
No	-	-	-	1		
Yes				2.94	1.30 – 6.64	0.009
Functionality of DTC						
Nonfunctional	1					
Functional	3.28	1.43 – 7.54	0.005	-	-	-
Level of hospital						
Secondary	1					
Primary	2.63	0.99 – 7.04	0.053			
Category of prescribers						
Doctor	1					
Medical Intern	0.20	0.04 – 1.06	0.058	0.04	0.003 – 0.43	0.008
Physician Assistant	0.74	0.30 – 1.85	0.517	0.13	0.02 – 1.05	0.056
Physician Assistant Intern	0.89	0.30 – 2.66	0.832	0.14	0.02 – 1.34	0.089
Nurse Prescriber	0.24	0.09 – 0.64	0.004	0.08	0.01 – 0.64	0.018
Others	0.12	0.03 – 0.44	0.001	0.06	0.01 – 0.56	0.014
Using Medscape as a reference						
No	-	-	-	1		
Yes				0.84	0.38 – 1.88	0.673

275 OR = odds ratio; CI = confidence interval; DTC = drugs and therapeutic committee; BNF = British National Formulary; *Not statistically significant at the
276 bivariate level. Boldface entries indicate statistically significant variables. “Others” include mental health nurses, disease control officers and community health
277 nurses. □ Binary logistic regression analysis. □ Ordinal logistic regression analysis.

278 **Discussion**

279 Overall, the majority of participants demonstrated solid comprehension and a positive perception
280 towards the concept of RUM. Specifically, 65.6% exhibited good knowledge in this area, while
281 85.4% held a positive perception. These figures surpass the rates found among postgraduate
282 medical students in India, which were 61% for good knowledge and 51% for a positive
283 perception [34]. Although the majority of participants in the present study possessed sound
284 knowledge, it is essential for health policymakers to be concerned about those with insufficient
285 knowledge (34.4%) because widespread adherence to RUM across all levels of healthcare is
286 crucial for ensuring patient safety.

287 The profession of the prescriber plays a role in determining their level of understanding
288 regarding RUM. Although there was no significant difference in knowledge between doctors and
289 physician assistants, nurse and other prescribers exhibited lower odds of having a good
290 understanding compared to doctors. Additionally, a significantly smaller proportion of nurses,
291 other prescribers and medical interns demonstrated a positive perception towards RUM and were
292 less likely to move from neutral to good perception in comparison to doctors. This finding is
293 consistent with prior research conducted among Ghanaian prescribers, specifically assessing
294 knowledge of antimicrobial resistance, which revealed that doctors exhibited superior knowledge
295 compared to Community Health Officers [35]. Similarly, a study conducted in Pakistan
296 evaluating the knowledge, attitude, and practice of rational antibiotic use among health workers
297 found that doctors attained higher knowledge scores than nurses [36]. These studies corroborate
298 our findings and suggest a trend wherein doctors tend to demonstrate better RUM knowledge
299 levels compared to nurses in similar contexts.

300 The discovery of RUM knowledge disparities among healthcare professionals, particularly
301 concerning nurses and disease control officers raises significant concerns for patient safety
302 within the health system. As lower-level health facilities rely on nurse prescribers, the potential
303 for prescriptions falling short of required standards increases the risk of drug-related problems
304 for patients [27]. Further research is imperative to delve into the underlying reasons behind these
305 knowledge gaps among doctors and other healthcare professionals to address this concern.
306 Crucially, it is paramount to ensure that nurse prescribers receive adequate training and
307 mentoring to meet the requisite standards before independently prescribing medications [12,30].
308 By investing in their professional development, healthcare systems can better equip these
309 professionals to deliver safe and effective care, thereby safeguarding patient well-being and
310 promoting optimal health outcomes. Furthermore, medical school curricula must enhance the
311 training on RUM in order to equip newly trained doctors with a comprehensive understanding of
312 this concept. This will ensure that they are well-prepared and up-to-date in their knowledge and
313 application of RUM principles.

314 Participants who use STG and the BNF as their prescribing references exhibited better
315 knowledge of rational prescribing, although their perception was not significantly affected.
316 Those who rely on STG and BNF have more than twice the odds of good knowledge compared
317 to those who do not use them. Additionally, having access to a prescriber's preferred reference
318 also increases their odds of transitioning from neutral to good perception by almost three times.
319 These reference sources contain guidelines with evidence-based recommendations, making
320 healthcare providers who regularly consult them more likely to possess knowledge in RUM
321 [3,38]. This finding aligns with a study in Saudi Arabia [3] which reported that access to the
322 right prescription references improved prescriber knowledge and practice of RUM. The findings

323 on prescription references, however, contradict a study conducted in the Netherlands, where
324 authors reported that the source of prescription reference had no impact on rational prescribing
325 [39]. However, the Netherlands study was conducted over forty years ago when internet access
326 was not in existence to make reference sources freely available to prescribers. Therefore, this
327 new finding in the current study may be attributed to the widely available and free prescribing
328 reference sources that influence prescriber knowledge.

329 Furthermore, participants who work in hospitals that had access to institutional drug bulletins
330 updated annually demonstrated lower knowledge levels and were less likely to transition from
331 neutral to good perception compared to those with prescribers whose bulletins are never updated.
332 This finding contradicts prevailing literature, which suggests that regular updates of the drug
333 bulletin enhance prescriber knowledge for rational medicine use [12,40]. Despite the bulletin's
334 role in disseminating crucial information on services, changes, new inclusions, and updates
335 relevant to prescribing practices, including new evidence and clinical guidelines, the anticipated
336 positive effect on prescriber knowledge and perception was not observed in our study. Further
337 research is needed to understand the underlying factors contributing to this discrepancy,
338 considering the potential influences such as variations in institutional practices and the quality of
339 information in the bulletins.

340 The presence of a functional DTC in a participant's hospital was found to significantly increase
341 the odds of having good knowledge of RUM by more than three times. This finding aligns with
342 other studies that reported improvements in rational prescribing and a reduction in medication
343 errors when a hospital has a functional DTC [5,12,41,42]. Therefore, it is crucial to empower
344 hospitals to establish and adequately resource DTCs to effectively implement the RUM agenda
345 and ensure patient safety.

346 **Study limitations**

347 The cross-sectional design of our study limits our ability to establish causal relationships, and the
348 specific demographics of our sample may restrict the generalizability of our findings.
349 Additionally, self-reported data introduce potential response bias and may not entirely reflect
350 actual behaviours. Despite these limitations, our study provides valuable insights into the field of
351 Rational Use of Medicines research.

352 **Conclusion**

353 The study revealed that the majority of participants have a good understanding and positive
354 perception of RUM. However, nurses, community health nurses, mental health nurses, and
355 disease control officers exhibited lower knowledge levels compared to doctors, indicating a need
356 for targeted training programs within these groups. Additionally, the study found that relying on
357 prescribing references was associated with higher levels of knowledge, and having access to
358 preferred references improved the likelihood of having a positive perception. Moreover, the
359 presence of functional DTCs in hospitals significantly influenced knowledge levels, emphasizing
360 the importance of supporting hospitals in establishing and resourcing DTCs for safe medication
361 use. Surprisingly, frequent updates of drug bulletins did not improve knowledge or perception,
362 with prescribers whose bulletins were never updated showing better odds of having good
363 knowledge and perception. Further research is needed to understand this discrepancy and its
364 implications.

365

366

367 **Acknowledgement**

368 The authors would like to express their gratitude to the Regional Director of Health, the
369 management teams of the hospitals involved in the study, and the prescribers for their valuable
370 and willing participation in the research.

371

372 **References**

- 373 [1] Hogerzeil H V. Promoting rational prescribing: an international perspective. *Br J Clin*
374 *Pharmac* 1995;39:1–6.
- 375 [2] World Health Organization. *The Role of Education in the Rational Use of Medicines*.
376 New Delhi: 2006.
- 377 [3] Baraka MA, Alboghdadly A, Alshawwa S, Elnour AA, Alsultan H, Alsalman T, et al.
378 Perspectives of healthcare professionals regarding factors associated with antimicrobial
379 resistance (Amr) and their consequences: A cross sectional study in eastern province of
380 saudi arabia. *Antibiotics* 2021;10. <https://doi.org/10.3390/antibiotics10070878>.
- 381 [4] Ayani I, Aguirre C, Gutierrez G, Madariaga A. A cost analysis of suspected adverse drug
382 reaction in a hospital emergency ward. *Pharmacoepidemiol Drug Saf*, Pp 1999:529–34.
- 383 [5] Ofori-Asenso R, Agyeman A. Irrational Use of Medicines—A Summary of Key Concepts.
384 *Pharmacy* 2016;4:35. <https://doi.org/10.3390/pharmacy4040035>.
- 385 [6] Maxwell SRJ. Rational prescribing: the principles of drug selection. *Clinical Medicine*
386 2016;16:459. <https://doi.org/10.7861/CLINMEDICINE.16-5-459>.
- 387 [7] Pollock M, Bazaldua O V, Dobbie AE. Appropriate prescribing of medications: an eight-
388 step approach. *Am Fam Physician* 2007;75:231–6.
- 389 [8] Maxwell S. Rational prescribing: the principles of drug selection. *Clinical Medicine*
390 2009;9:481. <https://doi.org/10.7861/CLINMEDICINE.9-5-481>.
- 391 [9] Chauhan I, Yasir M, Kumari M, Verma M. The pursuit of rational drug use: understanding
392 factors and interventions. *Pharmaspire* 2018;10:44–8.
- 393 [10] Bennett F, Ferner R, Sofat R. Overprescribing and rational therapeutics: Barriers to
394 change and opportunities to improve. *Br J Clin Pharmacol* 2021;87:34–8.
395 <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1111/bcp.14291>.
- 396 [11] Claxton AJ, Cramer J, Pierce C. A systematic review of the associations between dose
397 regimens and medication compliance. *Clin Ther* 2001;23:1296–310.
398 [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0149-2918\(01\)80109-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0149-2918(01)80109-0).

- 399 [12] Laing R, Hogerzeil H, Ross-Degnan D. Ten recommendations to improve use of
400 medicines in developing countries. *Health Policy Plan* 2001;16:13–20.
- 401 [13] Mekonnen B, Ayalew M, Tegegn A. Rational Drug Use Evaluation Based on World
402 Health Organization Core Drug Use Indicators in Ethiopia: A Systematic Review 2021.
403 <https://doi.org/10.2147/DHPS.S311926>.
- 404 [14] Lima MG, Álvares J, Guerra Junior AA, Costa EA, Guibu IA, Soeiro OM, et al. Indicators
405 related to the rational use of medicines and its associated factors. *Rev Saude Publica*
406 2017;51:1s–8s. <https://doi.org/10.11606/S1518-8787.2017051007137>.
- 407 [15] Afriyie D, Tetteh R. A description of the pattern of rational drug use in Ghana Police
408 Hospital. *International Journal of Pharmacy and Pharmacology* 2014;3:143–8.
- 409 [16] Mahmood A, Elnour AA, Ali AAA, Hassan NAGM, Shehab A, Bhagavathula AS.
410 Evaluation of rational use of medicines (RUM) in four government hospitals in UAE.
411 *Saudi Pharmaceutical Journal* 2016;24:189–96. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsps.2015.03.003>.
- 412 [17] Jafar TH, Jessani S, Jafary FH, Ishaq M, Orkazai R, Orkazai S, et al. General
413 practitioners' approach to hypertension in urban Pakistan: disturbing trends in practice.
414 *Circulation* 2005;111:1278–83.
- 415 [18] Krause G, Borchert M, Benzler J, Heinmüller R, Kaba I, Savadogo M, et al. Rationality of
416 drug prescriptions in rural health centres in Burkina Faso. *Health Policy Plan*
417 1999;14:291–8.
- 418 [19] Illing J, Morrow G, Kergon C, Burford B, Spencer J, Peile E, et al. How prepared are
419 medical graduates to begin practice? A comparison of three diverse UK medical schools.
420 GMC; 2008.
- 421 [20] Chaudhari VL, Mali SN, Dawari A V, Nishandar TB. Awareness about rational use of
422 medicines among fresh bachelor of medicine and bachelor of surgery graduates. *J Educ*
423 *Health Promot* 2017;6.
- 424 [21] Jackson SHD, Mangoni AA, Batty GM. Optimization of drug prescribing. *Br J Clin*
425 *Pharmacol* 2004;57:231–6.
- 426 [22] Garcia-Vello P, Brobbey F, Gonzalez-Zorn B, Saba CKS. A cross-sectional study on
427 antibiotic prescription in a teaching hospital in Ghana. *Pan African Medical Journal*
428 2020;35. <https://doi.org/10.11604/pamj.2020.35.12.18324>.
- 429 [23] Okeke IN, Laxminarayan R, Bhutta ZA, Duse AG, Jenkins P, O'Brien TF, et al.
430 Antimicrobial resistance in developing countries. Part I: recent trends and current status.
431 *Lancet Infect Dis* 2005;5:481–93.
- 432 [24] Camcioglu Y, Alhan E, Salman N, Somer A, Hatipog N, Celik U. Inappropriate
433 antimicrobial use in Turkish pediatric hospitals: A multicenter point prevalence survey
434 2010.

- 435 [25] Classen DC, Jaser L, Budnitz DS. Adverse Drug Events Among Hospitalized Medicare
436 Patients: Epidemiology and National Estimates from a New Approach to Surveillance.
437 The Joint Commission Journal on Quality and Patient Safety 2010;36:12-AP9.
438 [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1553-7250\(10\)36003-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1553-7250(10)36003-X).
- 439 [26] Budnitz D, Shehab N, Kegler S, Richard C. Medication use leading to emergency
440 department visits for adverse drug events in older adults. *Ann Intern Med*, Volume 147;
441 2007, p. 755–65.
- 442 [27] Hogerzeil H V., Bimo, Ross-Degnan D, Laing RO, Ofori-Adjei D, Santoso B, et al. Field
443 tests for rational drug use in twelve developing countries. *The Lancet* 1993;342:1408–10.
444 [https://doi.org/10.1016/0140-6736\(93\)92760-Q](https://doi.org/10.1016/0140-6736(93)92760-Q).
- 445 [28] Baiardini I, Guerra L, Pasquali M, Bonadonna P, Passalacqua G, Canonica GW. Quality of
446 life in patients with adverse reactions to drugs: Preliminary results from a new
447 questionnaire. *Journal of Allergy and Clinical Immunology* 2004;113:S70.
448 <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.JACI.2003.12.223>.
- 449 [29] Djochie R, Owusu-Donkor R, d’Almeida E, Fordjour F, Gyamfi Akwah F, Kyeremateng
450 E, et al. Evaluation of rational medicine prescribing: A cross-sectional study of public
451 hospitals in the Ashanti Region of Ghana. *Res Sq* 2023. <https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-3059557/v1>.
- 453 [30] de Vries TPGM, Henning RH, Hogerzeil H V., Bapna JS, Bero L, Kafle KK, et al. Impact
454 of a short course in pharmacotherapy for undergraduate medical students: an international
455 randomised controlled study. *The Lancet* 1995;346:1454–7.
456 [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(95\)92472-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(95)92472-8).
- 457 [31] Ofori-Asenso R, Brhlikova P, Pollock AM. Prescribing indicators at primary health care
458 centers within the WHO African region: A systematic analysis (1995-2015). *BMC Public*
459 *Health* 2016;16. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-016-3428-8>.
- 460 [32] Majumder MAA, Rahman S, Cohall D, Bharatha A, Singh K, Haque M, et al.
461 Antimicrobial stewardship: Fighting antimicrobial resistance and protecting global public
462 health. *Infect Drug Resist* 2020;13:4713–38. <https://doi.org/10.2147/IDR.S290835>.
- 463 [33] Kaki R, Elligsen M, Walker S, Simor A, Palmay L, Daneman N. Impact of antimicrobial
464 stewardship in critical care: A systematic review. *Journal of Antimicrobial Chemotherapy*
465 2011;66:1223–30. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jac/dkr137>.
- 466 [34] Malhotra N, Shivaswamy MS. Knowledge, attitude, and practices of rational use of
467 medicines among the postgraduate residents of a tertiary care teaching hospital in North
468 Karnataka: A facility-based cross-sectional study 2023. <https://doi.org/10.4103/kleuhsj>.
- 469 [35] Asante KP, Boamah EA, Abdulai MA, Buabeng KO, Mahama E, Dzabeng F, et al.
470 Knowledge of antibiotic resistance and antibiotic prescription practices among prescribers
471 in the Brong Ahafo Region of Ghana; a cross-sectional study. *BMC Health Serv Res*
472 2017;17:422. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12913-017-2365-2>.

- 473 [36] Afzal S, Khan FU, Aqeel MT, Ullah M, Bajwa M, Akhtar M, et al. Impact of a
474 pharmacist-led educational intervention on knowledge, attitude, and practice toward the
475 rational use of antibiotics among healthcare workers in a secondary care hospital in
476 Punjab, Pakistan. *Front Pharmacol* 2024;14:1327576.
- 477 [37] Oguz E, Alasehirli B, Demiryurek AT. Evaluation of the attitudes of the nurses related to
478 rational drug use in Gaziantep University Sahinbey Research and Practice Hospital in
479 Turkey. *Nurse Educ Today* 2015;35:395–401.
480 <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nedt.2014.10.011>.
- 481 [38] Md Reza R, Hassali M, Alrasheedy A, Saleem F, Md Yusof F, Godman B. Physicians’
482 knowledge, perceptions and behaviour towards antibiotic prescribing: a systematic review
483 of the literature. *Expert Rev Anti Infect Ther* 2015;13:665–80.
484 <https://doi.org/10.1586/14787210.2015.1025057>.
- 485 [39] Haayer F. Rational prescribing and sources of information. *Soc Sci Med* 1982;16:2017–
486 23. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0277-9536\(82\)90158-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/0277-9536(82)90158-7).
- 487 [40] Persson EL, Miller KS, Nieman JA, Sgourakis AP, Akkerman SR. Formulary evaluation
488 using a class review approach: experience and results from an academic medical center.
489 *Pharmacy and Therapeutics* 2013;38:213.
- 490 [41] Yang J, Zheng L, Guan YY, Lv YT. Drug and therapeutics committee interventions in
491 managing irrational drug use and antimicrobial stewardship in China. *Front Pharmacol*
492 2022;13. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fphar.2022.829408>.
- 493 [42] WHO. How to investigate rational drug use in health facilities. Geneva: 1993.
494