

From: _____
To: _____
Subject: Re: Review of Guidelines on practice-specific issues - Guideline 1 References
Date: Monday, 4 April 2011 3:56:33 PM

Dear Madam / Sir,

I should like to comment on item (g) an evidence-based reference work on complementary and alternate medicines. You suggest:

- . Herbs and Natural Supplements: An evidence based guide. Braun and Cohen;
- or
- . Herbal Medicines. Barnes, Anderson and Phillipson; or
- . e-MIMS; or
- . AusDI Advanced.

I believe that the Board should take into account research performed by the NPS on this matter: " Review of the Quality of Complementary Medicines Information Resources: Summary Report".

See:

http://www.nps.org.au/_data/assets/pdf_file/0005/69656/CMsInfoSummary.pdf

"Six resources identified as the highest quality (Tier 1). This ranking was based on their total score, and scores for all domains: technical quality, content quality and clinical utility being above the upper 95% confidence interval of the mean of all short-listed resources. They were (in rank order):

1. Natural Standard Professional Database package (includes access to all levels of monographs [Professional, Bottom Line, Harvard, as well as other content that was not short-listed]). This package also allows access to a CM-drug interaction checker.
2. Natural Medicines Comprehensive Database (Health Professional Edition) - This package also allows access to a CM-drug interaction checker.
3. Natural Standard Professional Database - Professional monographs.
4. Herbal Medicines & Dietary Supplements package (each resource can be independently accessed through MedicinesComplete).
5. Natural Standard Professional Database. Bottom line monographs.
6. MedlinePlus: Drugs, Supplements & Herbal Information - Uses content for a subset of bottom line monographs from Natural Standard Professional Database

There were three resources identified as high quality (Tier 2). This was based on their total score, and two of the scores for the domains: technical quality, content quality and clinical utility being above the upper 95% confidence interval of the mean of all short-listed resources. They were:

1. Barnes et al. Herbal Medicines (available as part of MedicinesComplete). 3rd ed. 2007.
2. Natural and Alternative Treatments: EBSCO.
3. Braun and Cohen. Herbs and natural supplements. An evidence-based guide 2nd ed. 2007."

Finally, I do not believe e-MIMS is an appropriate resource. See appended report.

Cheers

Ken

Dr Ken Harvey

-----Original Message-----

From: Ken Harvey [_____](#)
Sent: Thursday, 16 December 2010 8:34 AM
To: '
Subject: Re: Complementary drugs in MIMS not validated

Complementary drugs in MIMS not validated 15-Dec-2010

<http://www.australiandoctor.com.au/articles/F5/0C06E2F5.asp>

By Sarah Colyer

Complementary medicines listed in MIMS [a commonly used electronic reference used by health professionals] are being misleadingly represented as if they have been assessed by health authorities, an expert claims.

Dr Ken Harvey, adjunct senior lecturer at the school of public health at Melbourne's La Trobe University, said doctors might not realise that information on listed complementary medicines in MIMS was provided by the products' manufacturers, and received no independent validation.

This information was "potentially erroneous and harmful", he told Australian Doctor.

MIMS disclaimers currently state that product information has been provided by pharmaceutical companies and is "approved by the Therapeutic Goods Administration".

However, Dr Harvey said this disclaimer did not accurately reflect the difference between prescription products, which underwent a detailed assessment before TGA approval, and listed complementary medicines, which were not routinely checked by the TGA.

Dr Harvey said MIMS should be required to disclose that information on complementary products has "not been independently assessed by Australian health authorities".

He raised the concerns after finding some health websites were promoting a complementary product known as Urinary Tract Support, using information sourced from eMIMS, under the impression it had been validated.

His complaint follows a government brief released earlier this month, which revealed that 90% of complementary medicines subjected to post-market reviews by the TGA were found to be non-compliant with regulatory requirements.

Just 26% of newly listed complementary medicines were subject to review last year, according to the document, which was released under freedom of information laws and marked "in-confidence".

MIMS declined to comment at the time of writing.
