

Analysis of Prevalence of Adverse Drug Reactions in Patients Admitted To a Tertiary Care Hospital

Farzana Siddiqui

Associate Professor, Department of Pharmacology,
Government (RVRS) Medical College, Bhilwara, Rajasthan, India.

ABSTRACT

Background: Adverse drug reaction (ADR) is an inevitable consequence of drug therapy, as no pharmacotherapeutic agent is completely safe and more than 50% of approved drugs are associated with some type of adverse effects that are not detected prior to their approval for clinical use. The present study was conducted to analyse the prevalence of Adverse Drug Reactions in Patients Admitted to a Tertiary Care Hospital.

Materials and Methods: This retrospective cross sectional study was conducted in the Department of Pharmacology, Government (RVRS) Medical College, Bhilwara, Rajasthan (India) over a period of 6 months. The sample size included was 540 retrospective inpatient treatment sheets. The treatment records of the diagnosed case of ADR in the register were initially identified and documented in ADR review form. The recorded data was compiled, and data analysis was done.

Results: In this retrospective cross-sectional study a sample of 540 retrospective inpatient treatment sheets were taken. The classes of drugs causing adverse reactions in order of their frequency were NSAIDs (32.43%), drugs acting on CNS (18.91%), Anti-TB drugs (13.51%). Minimum number of effects were due to anticancer drugs (2.70%). A large number of those ADRs were in the form of cutaneous reactions 64.86%. Gastrointestinal disturbances (16.21%) & Hepatobiliary (10.81%) were the second most common ADR. The large proportions of ADRs 62.16% to be mild type while 21.62% of

the reactions are of moderate type and 10.81% severe type of reaction. The large fractions of ADRs fall on Type A (Augmented reactions) category of ADRs.

Conclusion: The present study concluded that drugs causing adverse reactions in order of their frequency were NSAIDs. Minimum number of effects were due to anticancer drugs. A large number of those ADRs were in the form of cutaneous reactions. The large proportions of ADRs to be mild type. The large fractions of ADRs fall on Type A (Augmented reactions) category of ADRs.

Keywords: Drugs, Adverse Drug Reactions, Records.


*Correspondence to:

Dr. Farzana Siddiqui,
Associate Professor,
Department of Pharmacology,
Government (RVRS) Medical College,
Bhilwara, Rajasthan, India.

Article History:

Received: 04-06-2019, **Revised:** 29-06-2019, **Accepted:** 17-07-2019

Access this article online

Website: www.ijmrp.com	Quick Response code 
DOI: 10.21276/ijmrp.2019.5.4.080	

INTRODUCTION

World Health Organization (WHO) defines an adverse drug reaction (ADR) as "one which is noxious and unintended, and which occurs in doses normally used in human for prophylaxis, diagnosis or therapy of disease, or for the modification of physiological functions.¹ Drug-related problems (DRP), including adverse drug reactions (ADRs), constitute a significant health- and quality problem particularly affecting the elderly.² ADRs are as old as medicines. The criteria for serious adverse drug reactions (serious ADRs) have been specified by the WHO and include any untoward medical occurrence at any dose that results in death, life-threatening, requires or prolongs hospitalization, or results in persistent or significant disability or incapacity.³ The overall incidence of serious and fatal ADR among hospitalized patients is

6.7% and 0.32%, respectively.⁴ Sometimes, ADR-related costs, such as hospitalization, surgery and lost productivity, exceed the cost of the medications.⁵

The most commonly reported preventable ADEs were related to inappropriate dosing and choice of: 1) antiplatelet drugs, anticoagulants, diuretics, angiotensin-converting enzyme inhibitors resulting in undesired cardiovascular reactions; 2) combinations of psychoactive agents, antiepileptic drugs causing central nervous system (CNS)-side effects; 3) opioids associated with respiratory depression; 4) anti-infective agents despite history of allergy.⁶ The present study was conducted to analyse the prevalence of Adverse Drug Reactions in Patients Admitted to a Tertiary Care Hospital.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

This retrospective cross-sectional study was conducted in the Department of Pharmacology, Government (RVRS) Medical College, Bhilwara, Rajasthan (India) over a period of 6 months. Before the commencement of the study ethical approval was taken from the Ethical Committee of the institute. The sample size included was 540 retrospective inpatient treatment sheets. Treatment records of individual cases containing clinical diagnosis were considered as sample and samples were collected by systemic random sampling method. From those records, necessary retrospective data was collected. The treatment records of the diagnosed case of ADR in the register were initially identified and documented in ADR review form. The recorded data was compiled, and data analysis was done.

Table 1: Common adverse reactions with different drug group

Drug class	N(%)
Antibiotics	8(21.62%)
Anti TB drugs	5(13.51%)
Anti-cancer drugs	1(2.70%)
Drugs acting on CNS	7(18.91%)
NSAIDs	12(32.43%)
Cardiovascular System	2(5.4%)
Others	2(5.4%)
Total	37(100%)

Table 2: Body Systems involved due to ADRs

Body Systems	N(%)
Skin & appendages	24(64.86%)
Hepatobilliary	4(10.81%)
GIT	6(16.21%)
CNS	2(5.4%)
Others	1(2.7%)
Total	37(100%)

Table 3: Analysis of Adverse Reactions based on the severity

ADR Severity	N(%)
Mild	23(62.16%)
Moderate	10(27.02%)
Severe	4(10.81%)
Total	37(100%)

Table 4: Analysis of Adverse Reactions based on Category

Category	N(%)
Type A (Augmented reactions)	29(78.37%)
Type B (Bizarre reactions)	8(21.62%)
Total	37(100%)

RESULTS

In this retrospective cross-sectional study a sample of 540 retrospective inpatient treatment sheets were taken. The classes of drugs causing adverse reactions in order of their frequency were NSAIDs (32.43%), drugs acting on CNS (18.91%), Anti-TB drugs (13.51%). Minimum number of effects were due to anticancer drugs (2.70%). A large number of those ADRs were in the form of cutaneous reactions 64.86%. Gastrointestinal disturbances (16.21%) & Hepatobiliary (10.81%) were the second most common ADR. The large proportions of ADRs 62.16% to be mild type while 21.62% of the reactions are of moderate type and 10.81% severe type of reaction. The large fractions of ADRs fall on Type A (Augmented reactions) category of ADRs.

DISCUSSION

In this retrospective cross-sectional study, a sample of 540 retrospective inpatient treatment sheets were taken. The classes of drugs causing adverse reactions in order of their frequency were NSAIDs (32.43%), drugs acting on CNS (18.91%), Anti-TB drugs (13.51%). Minimum number of effects were due to anticancer drugs (2.70%). A large number of those ADRs were in the form of cutaneous reactions 64.86%. Gastrointestinal disturbances (16.21%) & Hepatobiliary (10.81%) were the second most common ADR. The large proportions of ADRs 62.16% to be mild type while 21.62% of the reactions are of moderate type and 10.81% severe type of reaction. The large fractions of ADRs fall on Type A (Augmented reactions) category of ADRs.

Pirmohamed et al concluded from a prospective analysis of about 18,820 patients in UK in which about 1225 admissions were related to ADRs giving a prevalence of 6.5%.⁷

In a review they reported that more than 80% of ADRs causing admission or occurring in the hospital are Type A in nature and thus predictable from the known pharmacology of the drug and therefore potentially avoidable. Among serious ADRs majority of the patients lead to hospitalization.⁸

A study conducted by Suh et al, which revealed that the system most badly affected was the dermatological and gastrointestinal system.⁹ The most common ADR involved the skin and appendages in inpatient (63.33%) departments which is similar to the study done by Lei in 2007.¹⁰ Murphy and Frigo developed and implemented an ADR reporting program in Loyola University Medical Center, a 563-bed tertiary care teaching hospital located in the western suburbs of Chicago. This study revealed that the most common adverse reactions were rash; and antibiotics were the most commonly implicated drug class.¹¹

The majority of ADRs observed in admitted patients, and antibiotics were involved in the majority of ADRs, this is due to the reason, that almost all inpatients have received antibiotic therapy either for prophylactic or curative therapy. The results were consistent with previous studies.¹²⁻¹⁴

CONCLUSION

The present study concluded that drugs causing adverse reactions in order of their frequency were NSAIDs. Minimum number of effects were due to anticancer drugs. A large number of those ADRs were in the form of cutaneous reactions. The large proportions of ADRs to be mild type. The large fractions of ADRs fall on Type A (Augmented reactions) category of ADRs.

REFERENCES

1. Geneva: World Health Organization; 2002. World Health Organization. Safety of medicines - A guide to detecting and reporting adverse drug reactions - Why health professionals need to take actions. Available at: <http://apps.who.int/medicinedocs/en/d/Jh2992e/6.html>.
2. Rydberg DM, Holm L, Engqvist I, Fryckstedt J, Lindh JD, Stiller CO, et al. Adverse drug reactions in a tertiary care emergency medicine ward-prevalence, preventability and reporting. *PloS one*. 2016 Sep 13;11(9):e0162948.
3. Edwards IR, Aronson JK. Adverse drug reactions: Definitions, diagnosis, and management. *Lancet* 2000;356:1255-9.
4. Lazarou J, Pomeranz BH, Corey PN. Incidence of adverse drug reactions in hospitalized patients: a meta-analysis of prospective studies. *JAMA* 1998;279:1200-5.
5. World Health Organization. Fact sheet No293. Medicines: safety of medicines – adverse drug reactions. Geneva: World Health Organization; 2008.
6. Kanjanarat P, Winterstein AG, Johns TE, Hatton RC, Gonzalez-Rothi R, Segal R. Nature of preventable adverse drug events in hospitals: a literature review. *Am J Health Syst Pharm*. 2003;60(17):1750-9. Epub 2003/09/25. PMID:14503111.
7. Pirmohamed M, James S, Meakin S, Green C, Scott AK, Walley TJ, et al. Adverse drug reactions as cause of admissions to hospital: prospective analysis of 18820 patients. *BMJ*. 2004;329(7456):15-9.
8. Lazarou J, Pomeranz BH, Corey PN. Incidence of adverse drug reactions in hospitalized patients: a metaanalysis of prospective studies. *JAMA*. 1998 Apr 15;279(15):1200-5.
9. Suh DC, Woodall BS, Shin SK, Hermes-De Santis ER. Clinical and economic impact of adverse drug reactions in hospitalized patients. *Ann Pharmacother*. 2000;34(12):1373-9.
10. Lei HS, Rahman AFAR, Haq AHSM. Adverse Drug Reaction Reports in Malaysia: Comparison of Causality Assessment. *Malaysian Journal of Pharmaceutical Sciences*. 2007; 5:7-17.
11. Murphy BM, Frigo LC. Development, implementation, and results of a successful multidisciplinary adverse drug reaction reporting program in a university teaching hospital. *Hosp Pharm*. 1993;28(12):1199-204.
12. Vijayakumar TM, Dhanaraju MD. Description of adverse drug reactions in a multi-specialty teaching hospital. *Int J Integr Med*. 2013;1:1-6.
13. Kiran R, Divya S, Prathiba N, Bhanu P. Monitoring and analysis of drug reactions in a private tertiary care teaching hospital. *Asian J Pharm Clin Res*. 2015;8:335-7.
14. Marcia GAdeAL, Sandra MBP, Jose GD, Valeria GM, Maria CSP. Adverse drug reaction monitoring: support for Pharmacovigilance at a tertiary care hospital in northern Brazil. *BMC Pharmacol Toxicol*. 2013;14:5.

Source of Support: Nil. **Conflict of Interest:** None Declared.

Copyright: © the author(s) and publisher. IJMRP is an official publication of Ibn Sina Academy of Medieval Medicine & Sciences, registered in 2001 under Indian Trusts Act, 1882.

This is an open access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution Non-commercial License, which permits unrestricted non-commercial use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

Cite this article as: Farzana Siddiqui. Analysis of Prevalence of Adverse Drug Reactions in Patients Admitted To a Tertiary Care Hospital. *Int J Med Res Prof*. 2019 July; 5(4): 319-21. DOI:10.21276/ijmrp.2019.5.4.080