

Adverse drug reactions

Coleman, Jamie; Pontefract, Sarah

DOI:

[10.7861/clinmedicine.16-5-481](https://doi.org/10.7861/clinmedicine.16-5-481)

License:

None: All rights reserved

Document Version

Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

Citation for published version (Harvard):

Coleman, J & Pontefract, S 2016, 'Adverse drug reactions', *Clinical Medicine*, vol. 16, no. 5, pp. 481-485.
<https://doi.org/10.7861/clinmedicine.16-5-481>

[Link to publication on Research at Birmingham portal](#)

Publisher Rights Statement:

Checked 18/11/2016

General rights

Unless a licence is specified above, all rights (including copyright and moral rights) in this document are retained by the authors and/or the copyright holders. The express permission of the copyright holder must be obtained for any use of this material other than for purposes permitted by law.

- Users may freely distribute the URL that is used to identify this publication.
- Users may download and/or print one copy of the publication from the University of Birmingham research portal for the purpose of private study or non-commercial research.
- User may use extracts from the document in line with the concept of 'fair dealing' under the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988 (?)
- Users may not further distribute the material nor use it for the purposes of commercial gain.

Where a licence is displayed above, please note the terms and conditions of the licence govern your use of this document.

When citing, please reference the published version.

Take down policy

While the University of Birmingham exercises care and attention in making items available there are rare occasions when an item has been uploaded in error or has been deemed to be commercially or otherwise sensitive.

If you believe that this is the case for this document, please contact UBIRA@lists.bham.ac.uk providing details and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate.

AUTHOR QUERIES

Title: Adverse drug reactions

Authors: Jamie J Coleman and Sarah K Pontefract

1. Check all names and affiliations are listed correctly.
2. ‘Their use if more limited to identify a small increase in the rate of common events such as myocardial infarction or stroke’ – please clarify this sentence, it seems incomplete.
3. Define TPMT in Table 1.

Adverse drug reactions

Authors: Jamie J Coleman^A and Sarah K Pontefract^B

ABSTRACT

Adverse drug reactions (ADRs) remain a challenge in modern healthcare, particularly given the increasing complexity of therapeutics, an ageing population and rising multimorbidity. This article summarises some of the key facts about ADRs and explores aspects relating to their prevention, diagnosis, reporting and management in current clinical practice.

Basics of adverse drug reactions

An adverse drug reaction (ADR) can be defined as ‘an appreciably harmful or unpleasant reaction resulting from an intervention related to the use of a medicinal product; adverse effects usually predict hazard from future administration and warrant prevention, or specific treatment, or alteration of the dosage regimen, or withdrawal of the product’.¹ Since 2012, the definition has included reactions occurring as a result of error, misuse or abuse, and to suspected reactions to medicines that are unlicensed or being used off-label in addition to the authorised use of a medicinal product in normal doses.² While this change potentially alters the reporting and surveillance carried out by manufacturers and medicines regulators, in clinical practice it should not affect our approach to managing ADRs.

Seminal research undertaken in the late 20th and early 21st century in the USA and the UK demonstrated that ADRs are a common manifestation in clinical practice, including as a cause of unscheduled hospital admissions, occurring during hospital admission and manifesting after discharge.^{3–6} The incidence of ADRs has remained relatively unchanged over time, with research suggesting that between 5 and 10% of patients may suffer from an ADR at admission, during admission or at discharge, despite various preventative efforts. Inevitably, the event frequency is associated with the method used to identify such events and the majority of ADRs do not cause serious systemic manifestations. Nevertheless, this frequency of potential harm needs to be considered carefully because it has associated morbidity and mortality, can be financially costly and has a potentially negative effect on the prescriber-patient relationship.

Authors: ^A Professor of clinical pharmacology and medical education, University of Birmingham and honorary consultant physician, University Hospitals Birmingham NHS Foundation Trust, Birmingham, UK; ^B research pharmacist, University of Birmingham, Birmingham, UK

Medicines that have been particularly implicated in ADR-related hospital admissions include antiplatelets, anticoagulants, cytotoxics, immunosuppressants, diuretics, antidiabetics and antibiotics. Fatal ADRs, when they occur, are often attributable to haemorrhage, the most common suspected cause being an antithrombotic/anticoagulant co-administered with a non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drug (NSAID).⁷

Classification of adverse drug reactions

Traditionally ADRs have been classified into two types:

- 1 Type A reactions – sometimes referred to as augmented reactions – which are ‘dose-dependent’ and predictable on the basis of the pharmacology of the drug
- 2 Type B reactions – bizarre reactions – which are idiosyncratic and not predictable on the basis of the pharmacology.⁸

Key points

Adverse drug reactions (ADRs) – unintended, harmful events attributed to the use of medicines – occur as a cause of and during a significant proportion of unscheduled hospital admissions.

A careful medication history can assist a prescriber in understanding the patient’s previous experiences with drug treatment particularly in identifying previous ADRs that may preclude re-exposure to the drug.

Preventing ADRs depends on avoiding treatment in cohorts of patients who are at increased susceptibility or providing treatment under a therapeutic plan that reduces the risk of an adverse effect (eg co-administration of other drugs, monitoring blood test results).

Spontaneous reporting (using the Yellow Card Scheme in the UK) based on the suspicion of an ADR is an important part of pharmacovigilance but, overall, ADRs are vastly underreported across healthcare settings and sectors. If in doubt, it is best to submit a report.

KEYWORDS: Adverse drug reactions, clinical pharmacology, drug-related side effects and adverse reactions, pharmacovigilance, adverse drug reaction reporting systems ■

1 Although still widely quoted, this basic classification does
 2 not work for all ADRs, such as with chronic adverse effects
 3 associated with cumulative drug exposure (eg osteoporosis with
 4 long-term corticosteroid treatment) or withdrawal reactions (eg
 5 rebound hypertension with centrally-acting antihypertensive
 6 cessation). An alternative and perhaps more comprehensive
 7 classification scheme is 'DoTS', which classifies reactions
 8 dependent on the **D**ose of the drug, the **T**ime course of the
 9 reaction and relevant **S**usceptibility factors (such as genetic,
 10 pathological and other biological differences).⁹ As well as
 11 classifying reactions, DoTS has the advantage of being helpful
 12 to consider the diagnosis and prevention of ADRs in practice.
 13

14 **Preventing adverse drug reactions**

15 While some ADRs are unpredictable – such as anaphylaxis in a
 16 patient after one previous uneventful exposure to a penicillin-
 17 containing antibiotic – many are preventable with adequate
 18 foresight and monitoring. Preventability (or avoidability)
 19 usually refers to when the drug treatment plan is inconsistent
 20 with current evidence-based practice or is unrealistic when
 21 taking known circumstances into account.¹⁰ Epidemiological
 22 studies tend to find that between a third and a half of ADRs
 23 are (at least potentially) preventable although preventability is
 24 much easier to diagnose in hindsight. However, interventions
 25 that reduce the probability of an ADR occurring can be an
 26 important way to reduce the risk of patient harm.
 27

28 There are two basic steps that can be following to prevent an
 29 ADR occurring:

- 30 1 identify the subgroup of patients who are likely to be
 31 susceptible to the adverse effect and modify the treatment
 32 choice accordingly
- 33 2 ensure the treatment plan mitigates any possible adverse
 34 effects.

35
 36 **Identifying susceptibility**

37 Knowledge of patient susceptibilities can inform your
 38 prescribing decision and reduce the risk of an ADR. A
 39 patient's medication history will identify any previous ADRs
 40
 41
 42

62 and therefore preclude re-exposure to the drug. In other
 63 cases, susceptibility factors such as age, gender, pregnancy
 64 status and ethnicity can help predict the risk of an ADR
 65 occurring. For example, National Institute for Health
 66 and Care Excellence guidance has suggested that patients
 67 of African or Caribbean descent should be prescribed an
 68 angiotensin-II receptor blocker in favour of an angiotensin
 69 converting enzyme (ACE) inhibitor for hypertension
 70 because of the risk of ACE inhibitor-induced angioedema.
 71 Pharmacogenetics is starting to yield more personalised
 72 medicine choices by predicting who is more susceptible to
 73 suffer a specific ADR (Table 1).

74 Clinical decision support systems available at the point of
 75 care can inform practitioners of any patient specific cautions
 76 to treatment or additional monitoring requirements to reduce
 77 the risk of harm. A detailed discussion is beyond the remit of
 78 this paper, but practitioners should not rely on decision support
 79 as systems vary widely in their provision of information from
 80 absence of relevant alerts to information overload leading to
 81 alert fatigue.
 82

83 **Treatment plan**

84 Prudent, safe prescribing is key to reducing errors that can
 85 contribute to ADRs. Treatment plans should consider and
 86 mitigate for any possible adverse effects.¹¹ For example, co-
 87 prescription of folic acid with methotrexate will reduce the
 88 incidence of adverse effects associated with folate deficiency;
 89 and monitoring electrolytes and renal function when treating
 90 with renally active drugs or diuretics. These examples can
 91 all prevent treatment-emergent adverse effects although
 92 may be limited because monitoring recommendations are
 93 often inadequate or ambiguous. It is important to remember
 94 that prudent prescribing may also avoid the use of drugs
 95 altogether and the treatment plan should always consider non-
 96 pharmacological or conservative options.
 97

98 Overall a systems approach, involving multiple strategies
 99 and including the patient and all healthcare professionals,
 100 is required to reduce the risk of an ADR and prevent those
 101 'avoidable' reactions occurring in practice.¹²
 102
 103
 104

105 **Table 1. Examples of pharmacogenetic susceptibility for drug-specific adverse drug reactions.**

106 Drug/drug class	107 Pharmacogenetic marker	108 Additional susceptibility factors	109 Example of clinical context
110 Carbamazepine	111 HLA-B*57:02 (in the 112 populations listed)	113 Han-Chinese, Thai and Malaysian 114 populations	115 Marker for carbamazepine-induced Stevens- 116 Johnson syndrome and toxic epidermal necrolysis
117 Simvastatin	118 SLCO1B1 (solute 119 carrier organic anion 120 transporter 1B1)	121 Advanced age, untreated 122 hypothyroidism, excess physical activity, 123 concomitant medications (eg fibrates)	124 Statin-induced rhabdomyolysis (rare) whose risk 125 is four times greater with single defective allele, 126 16 times greater with two defective alleles
127 Abacavir	128 HLA-B*57:01	129 Higher CD8 cell count at start of 130 therapy	131 Marker for abacavir-induced hypersensitivity 132 reactions with fever, rash, lethargy and abdominal 133 and acute respiratory symptoms
134 Thiopurines (Azathioprine and 135 mercaptopurine)	136 Thiopurine Methyl 137 Transferase Activity	138 N/A	139 1 in 10 individuals are heterozygous (50% 140 normal TPMT activity) and 1 in 300 have 141 completely deficient activity. Thiopurine-induced 142 myelosuppression is associated with TPMT activity.

143 N/A = not applicable; TPMT =

Diagnosing adverse drug reactions

ADRs are one of the great mimics in healthcare, often emulating 'traditional diseases' and manifesting in all systems of the body. Drug-related problems in patients admitted to hospital may present in many different ways, including weakness or drowsiness, biochemical or haematological derangements (such as acute kidney injury, electrolyte imbalance or anaemia), bleeding, gastrointestinal disturbances, hypoglycaemia or healthcare-associated infections such as *Clostridium difficile*. However, rarer manifestations – such as drug-induced lupus, fixed drug eruptions, drug-induced eosinophilia or angioedema – require a level of vigilance and suspicion on behalf of the clinician who should look very hard to identify a causative agent. A comprehensive medication history is fundamental in identifying any possible connection between a presenting complaint or subsequent finding and an ADR, as well as preventing future ADRs. Various criteria can help in attributing causality to a particular drug (Table 2).¹³

In some cases, specific investigations can assist in the diagnosis of an ADR by providing objective evidence of the reaction and confirming a drug-induced disease. For example, organ-specific damage accompanied by intracellular tissue deposition of the drug or a metabolite (eg indinavir crystalluria and nephropathy).¹⁴

Table 2. Medication history elements that may assist clinical assessment of adverse drug reaction (ADR) probability.

Question	Clinical relevance
Have you taken the medication before without adverse effects?	Prior drug exposure doesn't entirely rule out an ADR, although tolerating treatment previously may make hypersusceptibility reactions less likely
Did anything else change around the time of possible ADR other than the suspected drug (eg other treatments, over-the-counter medicines, disease progression)	Examination of whether there are alternative causes (other than the suspected drug) that could on their own have caused the reaction
Did the reaction occur only after the drug was started?	While not all ADRs occur immediately or early in therapy (ie on drug challenge), an effect occurring before drug exposure is good counter evidence
Did the reaction resolve when the drug was stopped (or when a specific treatment was given)?	Effects that disappear when treatment is stopped (de-challenge) may increase suspicion of an ADR unless an irreversible reaction
Was there ever intentional or accidental use of the drug following an ADR?	An ADR occurring on re-exposure to a drug increases the probability of a causal relationship

Based on original criteria described by Naranjo *et al* (1981)

Pharmacovigilance

Pharmacovigilance is defined as 'the science and activities relating to the detection, assessment, understanding and prevention of adverse events or any other drug-related problem'.¹⁵

New legislation was introduced in the European Union in 2012 to ensure good vigilance practice for pharmaceutical companies and the medicines regulators. This new guidance clearly identifies the roles and responsibilities of relevant stakeholders in terms of drug safety. Notably, the guidance has introduced a programme of more intensive surveillance for new pharmacological agents and biological agents with black triangle status (ie those requiring additional monitoring). One of the guiding principles is that the pro-active strategies of the risk management policy replace the previous reactive strategies.

Reporting of adverse drug reactions

The mainstay of detecting potential ADRs over the last half a century has been spontaneous reporting systems such as the Yellow Card Scheme in the UK, operated by the Medicines and Healthcare Products Regulatory Agency (MHRA) and the Commission on Human Medicines (CHM). The scheme was founded in 1964 following the thalidomide disaster in the late 1950s. Through spontaneous reporting, the scheme collects data of suspected ADRs related to all licensed and unlicensed medicines and vaccines, including those issued on prescription or purchased over-the-counter. For a report to be valid, only four items of information are required: an identifiable patient, a reaction, a suspected medicinal product and an identifiable reporter. However, reporters are encouraged to provide as much information as possible, ie to provide additional data and clinical context for assessors. The UK scheme continues to receive in the region of 25,000 reports per year and provides the medicine regulators an insight into the occurrence of ADRs. Unfortunately, underreporting remains a key challenge, with fewer than 5% of all ADRs estimated as being reported in practice. This limits the ability of systems to give accurate incidence data. In 2014, NHS England and the MHRA issued a joint alert: *Improving medication error incident reporting and learning*. As part of this, ADRs occurring as a result of medication errors reported to the National Reporting and Learning System (NRLS) will automatically be reported to the Yellow Card Scheme.


Patients are increasingly involved in their own therapeutic management and, because an early assessment of patient Yellow Card reporting proved the value of this approach,¹⁶ all patients are now actively encouraged to report ADRs. Paper reports (on the original yellow cards) have largely been superseded by online reporting systems or use of the Yellow Card app. Electronic health records used in general practice and in some hospitals can also include integrated reporting that sends data on ADRs directly to central agencies for processing before entry into national and international databases.

Spontaneous reporting systems, while widely adopted for pharmacovigilance, are most effective when the adverse events are rare and uncommon (less than 1% of treated patients) and when the event is typical of a drug-induced condition (eg

Table 3. Examples of agents used in the management of specific adverse drug reactions.

Specific treatments	Drug/drug class causing ADR	Clinical effect of treatment	Clinical context
Naloxone	Opioids	Antidote for opioid toxicity	Widely used for treatment of overdosage with opioids in a non-medical setting and reversal of postoperative respiratory depression
Icatibant	ACE inhibitors	Treatment for life-threatening angioedema affecting airway/head and neck	This selective bradykinin B2 receptor antagonist has proven to reduce the time to complete resolution of angioedema
Idarucizumab	Dabigatran	Antidote for the reversal of direct oral thrombin inhibitor	Novel humanised monoclonal antibody fragment developed as specific reversal agent, promptly restoring dabigatran-prolonged coagulation parameters to baseline values
Intravenous lipid emulsion (Intralipid®)	Local Anaesthetics (eg lidocaine)	Treatment for systemic toxicity from local anaesthetic agents (eg severe cardiotoxic effects)	Reduce adverse effects resulting from inadvertent local anaesthetic overdoses, intravascular injections, or rapid absorption effects from injections in highly vascular sites


ACE = angiotensin-converting enzyme; ADR = adverse drug reaction

erythema multiforme). The  is if more limited to identify a small increase in the rate of common events such as myocardial infarction or stroke. This is the reason why recent drug safety scandals, such as thiazolidinedione-induced and rofecoxib-induced cardiovascular events, remained undetected despite widespread use of these agents.

While beyond the scope of this article, modern signal generation can detect early potential signals of harm and alert clinicians to potential new therapeutic risks. Complex statistical data-mining algorithms are run routinely to detect such signals but usually require further assessment before being actioned. The ability to examine drug exposure and potential adverse events in databases such as the Clinical Practice Research Datalink (CPRD) – the database of anonymised longitudinal UK primary care records – can support or refute the existence of potential signals.

There are many other methods and data streams used in pharmacovigilance, including formal drug safety studies, published data, pharmaceutical company data from periodic safety update reports (PSURs) and shared international data. However, regulators and scientists are also looking at the ability of other ‘big data’ sources, such as social media, to detect early signals; this remains an exciting and largely unexplored area of research.

Managing adverse drug reactions

Altering a dosage regimen or withdrawing a medicine suspected of causing an ADR are common methods of managing ADRs in practice. However, the course taken to manage an ADR is likely to vary from clinician to clinician. Under EU legislation, the approval of all new medicines onto the market must now be accompanied by a robust risk management plan from the marketing authorisation holder, which –  as ongoing safety trials – may involve the development of specific treatments for managing specific ADRs. Such has been the case with antidotes for direct oral anticoagulant-induced bleeding. This and other notable examples of approaches for the management of specific ADRs are shown in Table 3.

Conclusion

Herein we have discussed the identification, management and reporting of ADRs. We have described how modern technology is changing the way that ADRs are predicted, prevented, detected and managed, and how we continue to try and improve these processes with technological advances. Individualised therapy is becoming more of a possibility as not just pharmacogenetics but other phenotypic information can be combined to generate patient-specific advice to prescribers. Such regulatory science at national and international level can help achieve a positive benefit-to-harm ratio throughout the lifecycle of a medicinal product. For individual clinicians, achieving the best outcomes from therapies remains a key goal because avoiding or mitigating the risk of ADRs continues to challenge our everyday clinical practice. ■

Conflicts of interest

JJC is a member of the Pharmacovigilance Expert Advisory Group of the Medicines and Healthcare Products Regulatory Agency (MHRA) and an honorary consultant at the West Midlands Centre for Adverse Drug Reactions, which receives funding from the MHRA through the Yellow Card Centre.

Acknowledgments

The views expressed in this publication are those of the authors alone and are not necessarily those of the MHRA, the University of Birmingham or University Hospitals Birmingham NHS Foundation Trust.

References

- 1 Aronson JK, Ferner RE. Clarification of terminology in drug safety. *Drug Saf* 2005;28:851–70.
- 2 European Directive 2010/84/EU of 15 December 2010 amending, as regards pharmacovigilance, Directive 2001/83/EC on the Community code relating to medicinal products for human use.
- 3 Bates DW, Leape LL, Petrycki S. Incidence and preventability of adverse drug events in hospitalized adults. *J Gen Intern Med* 1993;8:289–94.

1	4	Lazarou J, Pomeranz BH, Corey PN. Incidence of adverse drug reactions in hospitalized patients: a meta-analysis of prospective studies. <i>JAMA</i> 1998;279:1200–5.	62
2			63
3			64
4	5	Pirmohamed M, James S, Meakin S <i>et al.</i> Adverse drug reactions as cause of admission to hospital: prospective analysis of 18 820 patients. <i>BMJ</i> 2004;329:15–9.	65
5			66
6	6	Davies EC, Green CF, Taylor S <i>et al.</i> Adverse drug reactions in hospital in-patients: a prospective analysis of 3695 patient-episodes. <i>PLoS One</i> 2009;4:e4439.	67
7			68
8	7	Wester K, Jönsson AK, Spigset O, Druid H, Hägg S. Incidence of fatal adverse drug reactions: a population based study. <i>Br J Clin Pharmacol</i> 2008;65:573–9.	69
9			70
10			71
11	8	Rawlins MD, Thompson JW. Pathogenesis of adverse drug reactions. In: Davies DM, ed. <i>Textbook of adverse drug reactions</i> . Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1977:10.	72
12			73
13	9	Aronson JK, Ferner RE. Joining the DoTS: new approach to classifying adverse drug reactions. <i>BMJ</i> 2003;327:1222–5.	74
14			75
15	10	Ferner RE, Aronson JK. Preventability of drug-related harms - part I: a systematic review. <i>Drug Saf</i> 2010;33:985–94.	76
16			77
17	11	Coleman JJ, Ferner RE, Evans SJ. Monitoring for adverse drug reactions. <i>Br J Clin Pharmacol</i> 2006;61:371–8.	78
18			79
19			80
20			81
21			82
22			83
23			84
24			85
25			86
26			87
27			88
28			89
29			90
30			91
31			92
32			93
33			94
34			95
35			96
36			97
37			98
38			99
39			100
40			101
41			102
42			103
43			104
44			105
45			106
46			107
47			108
48			109
49			110
50			111
51			112
52			113
53			114
54			115
55			116
56			117
57			118
58			119
59			120
60			121
61			122

**Address for correspondence: Prof J Coleman, Institute of Clinical Sciences, The Medical School, Vincent Drive, Edgbaston, Birmingham B15 2SP, UK.
Email: j.j.coleman@bham.ac.uk**