ISSN-E: 2617-9563

Laboratory Tests for the Early Detection of Adverse Drug Reaction

By:

Muhanna Musafiq sameer Alanazi

Technician –laboratory (Medical-Laboratory)

Ahmed Khalaf Diri Alanazi

Technician-laboratory (Laboratory and Medical Technology)

Mohammed Munahi Rasheed Alruwaili

Technician-laboratory (Laboratory and Medical Technology)

Bader Mohammed G Alotaibi

Pharmacist (Pharmacy)

Fayez Hamed fayyadh Alanazi

Technician-laboratory (Laboratory and Medical Technology)

Bassam Ghadeer Shanwan Alanazi

Pharmacist (Tapline Hospital)

Reem Mjaweeb Ndian Alrawili

Women's nursing (Dialysis Department)

Majed Jawban Nadyan Alruwaili

Technician-laboratory (Laboratory and Medical Technology)

Abdullah Ibrahim A Alenezi

Technician-laboratory (Laboratory and Medical Technology)

Hameed Manahi R Alrwayli

Pharmacist (Pharmacy)

Abdullah Taher Alanazi

senior specialist –laboratory (Immunology-Laboratory)

KAMAL HULAYYIL JATLI ALANAZI

Technician-Pharmcy

ISSN-E: 2617-9563

Summary

In hospitalised patients, automated laboratory signal-based pharmacovigilance schemes may detect ADRs. The Causality Algorithm of the Spanish Pharmacovigilance System suits this purpose. The software identifies ADRs and helps clinicians manage them.

The laboratory signal "hyponatremia" is more effective than "rhabdomyolysis" since fewer patients must be studied to identify an ADR. Each signal has ADR, with "rhabdomyolysis" at 3.3% and "hyponatremia" at 39.3%. Both attempts to link laboratory value variance to pharmacological causes failed. Automated laboratory signals can reveal clinically ignored adverse medication responses. Healthcare providers must meticulously complete a patient's clinical history to avoid omitting important information that could be relevant later.

Understanding the chance of a medicine causing a specific side effect helps identify it and provide the best patient therapy.

Keywords: **Adverse drug reactions, Drug Reaction**, **Electronic medical records**

Introduction

Adverse drug reactions (ADRs) are defined by the World Health Organisation (WHO) as detrimental, unintended reactions to medications that transpire at dosages typically employed for therapeutic purposes (WHO, 2002; Safety of Medicines, 2002). ADRs are a prevalent contributor to illness, disability, and mortality, and in certain nations, they rank among the ten most significant causes of death (WHO, 2004).

Adverse drug reactions (ADRs) refer to unintended consequences that are plausibly linked to the use of a particular medication. These consequences may manifest spontaneously or unexpectedly as a result of the drug's pharmacological action or manifest in the patient. ADRs are possible in all healthcare settings; however, the majority of the available evidence originates from hospitals due to the elevated dangers associated with hospital treatment. Numerous incidents of this nature transpire in alternative healthcare environments, including patient residences, community clinics, consulting rooms, and nursing homes. Adverse drug reactions (ADRs) are unfavourable consequences linked to the administration of pharmaceutical substances. An estimated fourth-leading cause of mortality in the United States are ADRs. Additionally, it has been estimated that late detection of ADRs can result in adverse health effects and medical expenses exceeding $800 million for a single drug class (rofecoxib-myocardial infarction). 32% of newly approved pharmaceuticals by the US Food and Drug Administration (FDA) experienced post-marketing safety events, such as withdrawals for safety concerns and the addition of boxed warnings, according to a previous review. Succeeding in the detection of ADRs promptly and early can thus substantially mitigate the health hazards associated with them.

Spoonful reports are the prevailing approach utilised for ADR detection within hospital settings. Nonetheless, this system is saddled with a number of drawbacks, most notably the significant underreporting of adverse drug reactions (ADRs). At this time, in order to detect drug safety issues at an early stage, the European Medicines Agency (EMA) and the World Health Organisation (WHO) are considering the addition of specialised pharmacovigilance programmes to supplement spontaneous reports.

Methods for identifying ADRs must be adapted to local requirements. All hospitalised patients are reviewed as part of active pharmacovigilance activities; however, information regarding adverse drug reactions (ADRs) that are not apparent at the time of admittance or that occur during hospitalisation is lost. Furthermore, the identification of ADRs is not always a simple process, and as part of the effort to enhance patient safety, there are instruments in place to facilitate their early detection.

Due to the increased accessibility of computerised databases containing electronic medical records in recent years, various programmes for the detection of ADRs have become feasible to develop. The

approaches employed by these programmes vary across hospitals as a result of the unique attributes exhibited by each clinical environment. ADR detection systems that utilise laboratory data to generate signals are particularly noteworthy. Multiple studies have established the efficacy of these programmes. Additionally, they can serve as a tool for the early detection of adverse drug reactions (ADRs), thereby decreasing the duration of hospital stays and associated costs. Clinically significant irregular analytical values, including increased levels of liver enzymes (e.g., amylase), creatine phosphokinase (CK), hematologic changes, and hyponatremia, can be detected automatically by the software developed at our medical facility. Using hyponatremia and rhabdomyolysis as case studies, the main goal of this study was to assess how well a laboratory Tests system can identify adverse drug reactions (ADRs). Assessing the efficacy of these laboratory signals, determining the prevalence of identified adverse drug reactions (ADRs), and delineating the attributes of patients in whom an ADR has been detected constituted secondary objectives.

Therapeutic drug monitoring (TDM) is a process that endeavours to establish a reference concentration range for laboratories to consult and physicians to use as a guide. The "therapeutic concentration range" refers to the range in which a specific patient achieves the most favourable response. It is advisable to select this range in consideration of the patient's symptoms and any associated risks. The disadvantage of this strategy is that, in some individuals, the optimum benefit can only be obtained in quantities exceeding the minimum hazardous levels, which increases the risk of adverse side effects.

Although the purpose of clinical trials is typically to evaluate the safety of drugs, they have a number of drawbacks, such as limited sample sizes and brief study durations. Consequently, the utilisation of a spontaneous reporting system (SRS) for post-marketing surveillance is crucial in the identification of adverse drug reactions (ADRs) linked to a specific pharmaceutical compound. An example of a significant SRS is the FDA Adverse Event Reporting System (FAERS), which by the end of 2019 will contain data on various drug-related symptoms reported by 11 million patients. It has been demonstrated that SRSs are the most efficient technique for identifying severe ADRs.

However, systematic underreporting and a lack of information regarding the exposed population are well-known SRS limitations. Previous research has indicated that the SRS receives reports on only about 6% of severe adverse drug reactions (ADRs). This is due to the challenge of discerning whether alterations in the patient's symptoms are drug-induced, despite the limited number of tools available for this purpose. Due to these constraints, the quality of data analysis for detecting ADRs may be diminished. As a result, there is an immediate need for methods that can supplement SRS in the effective detection of ADRs.

In contrast to SRS, administrative claims data and electronic medical records (EMRs) document patient symptoms and medications, irrespective of suspected adverse drug reactions (ADRs). As a result, a number of previous studies have implemented EMRs to identify ADRs. Nevertheless, the scope of patient coverage limited by EMRs is due to the inherent challenge of monitoring patients' symptoms during transfers to alternative facilities. Despite this, administrative claims data have the capability to monitor a patient's symptoms throughout their transfer between hospitals. Furthermore, in comparison to other clinical databases, the provision of information regarding prescription medications and symptoms is notably deficient. Analysing a large-scale administrative claims database thus possesses the capacity to actively illuminate the connection between medications and adverse drug reactions (ADRs).

Objective of the study

- Using hyponatremia and rhabdomyolysis as case studies, we sought to assess the efficacy of laboratory alerts tests as a method for identifying ADRs.
- This research aims to identify techniques for detecting a broad spectrum of ADR signals at an early stage.

Terminologies of the study

Adverse drug reactions: A significantly adverse or disagreeable reaction that arises from an intervention associated with the use of a medicinal product and foreshadows potential danger upon subsequent administration; such an event necessitates preventive measures, targeted treatment, dosage adjustment, or product withdrawal.

Drug Reaction: A drug interaction is a change in the way a drug acts in the body when taken with certain other drugs, foods, or supplements or when taken while you have certain medical conditions.

Electronic medical records: Electronic health records (EHRs), which are compiled, managed, and accessed by authorised personnel and clinicians within a single health care organisation, possess the capability to offer significant advantages to clinic practices, health care organisations, and physicians.

Literature Review

Laboratory Tests for the Early Detection of Adverse Drug Reaction

Only drugs that are deemed secure and effective for sale in the United States have received approval from the Food and Drug Administration (FDA). In other words, the benefits of the medication must outweigh any known risks. However, prescription and over-the-counter (OTC) drugs also have adverse effects. (FDA) reactions, which are also known as side effects, are unintended consequences that may be associated with a pharmaceutical product. The severity of side effects can vary, spanning from minor inconveniences such as a congested nose to critical circumstances like myocardial infarction, and in certain instances, even fatal outcomes. The severity of side effects can be influenced by factors such as age, concurrent medication use, dietary supplements, vitamin intake, drug dosage, and route of administration. Adverse effects manifest more rapidly and strongly when administered intravenously (IM) or intravenously (IV) compared to the oral route. Numerous laboratory tests have been conducted to determine the effects of a drug on the body. Elevated levels of liver enzymes, including alkaline phosphatase (ALP), alanine transaminase (ALT), and aspartate aminotransferase (AST), are observed in drug-induced liver failure. Laboratory tests show elevated levels of lipase and amylase in kidney failure patients. Laboratory tests identify substances with a high cholesterol level, including prednisone, anabolic steroids, beta-adrenaline, and prednisone, at concentrations exceeding 200 mg/dL. Medications such as statins, corticosteroids, and beta-adrenergic blockers cause an increase in blood glucose levels beyond what is considered normal. Analytical methods may also incorporate laboratory procedures, as these have been utilised in scientific laboratories to aid in the separation and identification of substances (e.g., high performance liquid chromatography, spectrophotometry) (Hameed., 2023)

Utility of a Laboratory Alert System for Detecting Adverse Drug Reactions in Hospitalised Patients: Hyponatremia and Rhabdomyolysis

Analysis of the laboratory signal "hyponatremia" yields a more effective result than analysis of the signal "rhabdomyolysis" due to the reduced number of cases that must be examined in order to identify an ADR. ADR is identified as prevalent for each of the signals, with "rhabdomyolysis" accounting for 3.3% and "hyponatremia" for 39.3%. It has been impossible to establish a correlation between the extent of the change in the laboratory value and the likelihood that it was caused by drugs in either instance. By analysing adverse drug reactions with the aid of automated laboratory signals, information that might be overlooked during clinical evaluation can be gleaned. In order to accomplish this accurately, healthcare practitioners must complete a patient's clinical history with meticulousness, ensuring that no pertinent information is omitted that could prove useful in the future. Understanding the likelihood that a drug

will induce a specific adverse effect facilitates its identification, thereby enabling the administration of the most effective treatment for the patient. Sustained pharmacovigilance is crucial in order to gather additional data regarding adverse drug reactions, including those that occur less frequently and may remain largely unidentified (Valdés, 2022).

Adverse Drug Reactions: Types and Treatment Options

Drug hypersensitivity arises from the interaction between the human immune system and a pharmacologic agent. Such adverse drug reactions represent a negligible portion of the total. IgE-mediated drug hypersensitivity reactions comprise a distinct category of adverse drug reactions. The classification system developed by Gell and Coombs, which is a universally recognised conceptual framework for comprehending intricate immune reactions, can be employed to discuss immune-mediated drug reactions in general. Conversely, certain reactions encompass supplementary mechanisms that remain obscured and difficult to categorise. Age, gender of the female individual, concurrent medical conditions, and prior hypersensitivity to analogous medications have been identified as risk factors for drug hypersensitivity reactions. A clinical diagnosis of drug hypersensitivity is established using the data at hand. While laboratory testing can offer utility, epidermis testing is considered the most precise method. The therapeutic approach primarily consists of symptomatic treatment, patient education, and the cessation of the problematic medication. It is advisable to exercise caution when prescribing cephalosporins to patients who have a penicillin allergy and should abstain from carbapenems. By administering pretreatment with prednisone, diphenhydramine, ephedrine, or a histamine H_3-receptor antagonist, it is possible to restrict reactions to radiocontrast media (Riedl, 2003).

Methodology

Effects of Adverse Drug Reactions on the Body

An extensive array of organ systems may be affected by ADRs, which range in intensity from moderate to severe. Instances of mild reactions, such as a modest increase in liver enzymes or a skin rash, cease to occur once the causing drug is discontinued. Severe reactions, including skin blistering reactions like Stevens-Johnson syndrome or toxic epidermal necrolysis, and fulminant liver failure, have the potential to result in catastrophic outcomes. Epilepsy is treated with carbamazepine and phenytoin, gout with allopurinol, and HIV with nevirapine and abacavir; these medications induce hypersensitivity on the skin. Infections with Gram-positive bacteria are treated with flucloxacillin, co-amoxiclav, nevirapine, and minocycline, all of which induce hepatotoxicity in the gastrointestinal tract. The use of 5-aminosalicylic acid to treat inflammatory bowel disease results in renal nephrotoxicity. An anticoagulant such as warfarin may induce haemorrhage within the cardiovascular system (Ferner, 2019).

It has been identified that platinum-based drugs have severe adverse effects in cancer patients, which they should avoid. Oxaliplatin, cisplatin, and carboplatin are the three platinum-based drugs utilised for the treatment of cancer on a global scale. Additionally. Four platinum-based medications have received regulatory approval in their respective countries: lobaplatin in China, heptaplatin in Korea, miriplatin, and nedaplatin in Japan. Patients undergoing treatment with the three platinum medications may experience over forty distinct adverse effects, which can be classified approximately into seven groups: gastrointestinal toxicity, nephrotoxicity, ototoxicity, neurotoxicity, and cardiotoxicity; haematological and hepatotoxicity. As a result of adverse effects, platinum medication dosages may need to be decreased by 25 to 100 percent for some patients. Patients may also be required to undergo hearing tests, biochemical analyses, and vigilant surveillance of their kidney and liver functions, depending on the specific medication.

Observation of Renal Performance

Acute kidney injury (AKI) is characterised by impaired renal function, which is manifested by decreased urine output and elevated levels of serum creatinine. Reproductive ischemia-reperfusion in clinical settings, such as renal transplantation for patients with end-stage renal disease (ESRD), induces an upsurge in antibody production and immune activation. This, in turn, worsens the outcomes of graft failure and renal graft loss. Oxygen free radicals are produced during the reperfusion phase, which results in lipid peroxidation and tissue injury. Apoptosis and lipid membrane peroxidation are both capable of inducing cellular demise via oxidative damage to proteins and DNA. Antioxidant enzymes such as superoxide dismutase (SOD), catalase (CAT), and glutathione peroxidase (GPx) may be inhibited in response to Ischemia-Reperfusion Injury (IR); therefore, a decrease in these enzymes indicates a drug adverse effect. In the case of end-stage renal disease, ghrelin levels increase by 2.8-fold, and transient renal injury causes aldosterone levels to rise in renal tissue, urine, and plasma (Zwart, 2021).

Antiviral agents (cidofovir, adefovir, and tenofovir), bisphosphonate pamidronate, and antiparasitic drugs (sulfadiazine) all induce crystal nephropathy, and the formation of crystals results in renal failure. Consequently, adverse drug reactions of these substances on the kidney can be identified through the surveillance of its enzyme levels.

Observation of Liver Performance

It is widely acknowledged that chronic hepatitis can lead to the progressive development of cirrhosis. It is critical to develop precise treatment strategies that specifically target liver disease and inflammation. Currently, the prevailing clinical approach for assessing liver function involves the quantification of alanine aminotransferase (ALT) and aspartate aminotransferase (AST) levels. In the process of

rendering diagnoses, physicians frequently cite elevated ALT and AST levels as indicators of hepatic injury. Serum ALT and AST levels may, however, be normal or marginally elevated in a subset of patients with progressive hepatitis. We can detect substances that may cause liver damage in this manner. As per the labelling authorised by the US Food and Drug Administration (FDA) for statins, liver function tests are recommended to be performed twice a year thereafter, six and twelve weeks following the initiation of treatment or dosage increase, and once every six to twelve weeks thereafter. Consider acute liver failure (ALF), cholestasis, hepatitis, and an increase in transaminases as the four hepatic syndromes (Lee, 2020).

A substantial body of case reports and case series have presented persuasive evidence regarding the hepatic harm inflicted by specific medications. A multitude of these medications have been associated with clinical manifestations of hepatic impairment. A few instances include amoxicillin-clavulanate, BS phenotype, halothane, isoniazid, and chlorpromazine. Early DILI research consistently identified chlorpromazine and halothane as potential hepatotoxicants. Hence, deleterious drug reactions associated with these substances can be identified through the surveillance of hepatic enzymes.

Blood Glucose Level Monitoring

Numerous medications, such as corticosteroids, can increase blood glucose levels. Critically ill patients frequently exhibit hyperglycemia due to a variety of mechanisms, including increased gluconeogenesis and glycogenolysis induced by insulin resistance and elevated levels of the corresponding hormones. An assortment of methodologies are currently being employed to quantify glucose, encompassing more intricate techniques such as infrared spectroscopy and mass spectrometry. Nevertheless, enzymatic techniques underpin the vast majority of routine analytical methods employed in point of care testing (POCT) devices, central laboratory analyzers, hospital and ambulatory clinic settings, and homecare glucose metres designed for patient self-testing. A laboratory test is conducted during the patient's fasting period to measure blood glucose levels. Prediabetes is diagnosed if the blood glucose level is between 100 and 125 mg/dL; hypoglycemia is diagnosed if it falls below 70 mg/dL; and diabetes is diagnosed if it exceeds 126 mg/dL (Mathew, 2020).

Thus, hyperglycemia-causing pharmaceuticals can be identified as adverse drug reactions through the measurement of blood glucose levels.

Methodologies Analytical in Metallomics for Medication Investigations

The preponderance of trace elements found in biological systems are bound to biomolecules. In order to regulate physiological processes and reactions within cells and organs, metal-binding substances serve as biological catalysts. Metalloenzymes, which catalyse biological reactions and are metalloproteins, are involved in a number of crucial biological processes. Metal-binding biomolecules are also implicated in

degeneration processes. For instance, minute quantities of Fe, Cu, and Zn contribute to the formation of neurotoxic amyloid fibrils, which promote the progression of Alzheimer's disease. The detection of platinum (Pt) in antitumor drugs is possible through the use of analytical methods. Adsorptive stripping voltammetry (ASV), neutron activation analysis (NAA), absorption and emission atomic spectroscopy, and inductively coupled plasma mass spectrometry (ICP-MS) are examples of such analytical methods. Due to their high sensitivity, they appear to be the most effective elemental techniques (Esteban, 2010).

Method of Analytical Drug Monitoring

Monitoring therapeutic drugs requires costly, microvolume, ultrafast, and sophisticated apparatus such as liquid chromatography, high-resolution TOF mass spectrometry, and LC/MS/M in small volumes. By employing liquid chromatography high resolution TOF mass spectrometry (LC-HRMS), which precisely measures the mass to charge ratio of the target analyte, atenolol was identified. Additional analytical techniques that have been implemented in the laboratory include spectrophotometry and fluorometry, both of which exhibit a sensitivity level of µg/ml. The utilisation of thin layer chromatography lies in its capacity to identify and quantify drugs. It is more time-consuming and less sensitive, GLS with HPLC: This method is exceptionally precise, sensitive, and particular. However, over time, column degradation occurs, necessitating extraction. HPLC is more preferred than GLC. Radioimmunoassay (RIA): This sensitive and accurate method requires radio nucleotides (Zhang, 2018).

Laboratory Evaluation

Laboratory testing aims to assess biochemical or immunologic markers that validate the activation of a specific immunopathological pathway in order to provide an explanation for the adverse drug effect that is suspected. The laboratory assessment is determined by the pathologic mechanism that is suspected. In order to validate suspected Type I hypersensitivity reactions, antigen-specific IgE detection is necessary. A valuable diagnostic procedure for these patients is skin testing. Skin testing protocols for penicillin are standardised, while those for local anaesthetics and muscle relaxants are comprehensively described. When testing substances with a high molecular weight protein content, such as insulin, vaccines, streptokinase, monoclonal or polyclonal antibodies, and latex, it may also provide useful information. In the appropriate clinical setting, positive skin testing to such reagents confirms the presence of antigen-specific IgE and supports the diagnosis of a Type I hypersensitivity reaction. The utility of negative skin testing is limited to penicillin skin testing, where the test's specificity has already been sufficiently established (Brahma, 2013). When other pharmacological agents are present, the absence of specific IgE cannot be effectively ruled out by a negative skin test. For a restricted selection of drugs, in vitro IgE testing is offered via radioallergosorbent assays, which have a longer history of sensitivity compared to skin testing in determining specific IgE levels. Furthermore, the lack of clarity

surrounding the immunogenic determinants of numerous pharmaceuticals diminishes the predictive value of in vitro tests (Patton, 2018).

Obtaining laboratory tests that quantify mast cell activation within four hours of the initiation of the suspected allergic reaction could prove to be beneficial. Serum tryptase levels peak one hour after anaphylaxis and remain elevated for two to four hours; this is in contrast to serum histamine levels, which reach their maximum five minutes and then revert to baseline within thirty minutes. Although histamine, tryptase, and beta-tryptase levels have been utilised to confirm acute IgE-mediated reactions, adverse results do not necessarily rule out the possibility of acute allergic reactions. Drug-induced type II cytotoxic reactions manifest as neutrophilia, thrombocytopenia, or hemolytic anaemia, as determined by a complete blood count. A positive direct and/or indirect Coombs' test, which detects the presence of complement and/or drug-bound molecules on the red cell membrane, can be utilised to confirm hemolytic anaemia (Al-Worafi, 2020).

An increase in nonspecific inflammatory biomarkers, including erythrocyte sedimentation rate and C-reactive protein, may be observed in Type III immune complex reactions to a substance. Additional laboratory tests that measure complement levels (CH50, C3, C4) or circulating immune complexes may be performed, if they are accessible. Positive tests aid in the validation of the clinical diagnosis, while negative tests do not rule out the possibility of an immune complex disease. Medication-induced systemic vasculities may be discernible through the utilisation of autoantibody assays, including antinuclear antibody or anti-histone antibody.

Immune reactions of type IV typically manifest as allergic contact dermatitis that is induced by topical medications. Patch testing for particular pharmacological agents, is a suitable diagnostic procedure in such circumstances. The presence of pruritic vesicular rash, erythema, and induration that appear forty-eight hours after the application of the patch provide further evidence in favour of diagnosing a Type IV immune reaction (Alomar, 2014).

Diagnosis

Clinical expertise is frequently employed in the diagnosis of drug hypersensitivity due to the inherent challenge of conducting definitive, confirmatory drug-specific testing. After the diagnosis has been confirmed, the medical record should contain the appropriate documentation that identifies the substance responsible for the adverse effect and its nature. In most cases, re-exposure to a substance induces immune-mediated hypersensitivities that present a more severe and predictable health hazard. Antibody-dependent drug reactions are typically milder and less replicable. If there is no viable alternative and the potential consequences of not treating the underlying discomfort outweigh the risks associated with continuing the drug, then it may be acceptable to continue using the offending substance. It is critical

that the patient be closely monitored by an experienced physician in these circumstances. When discontinuing a medication, an inventory of alternative medications for future use should be provided to the patient (Coleman, 2016).

Therapy and Management

If feasible, the most critical and efficacious therapeutic approach for managing drug hypersensitivity reactions is to cease administration of the offending medication. When possible, alternative medications with unrelated chemical structures should be used in place of the originals. Vigilant monitoring of the clinical ramifications associated with medication cessation or substitution is imperative. Symptom resolution for the majority of patients occurs within a two-week period, contingent upon an accurate diagnosis of drug hypersensitivities (Ferner, 2016).

Supplementary treatment for drug hypersensitivity reactions consists primarily of symptomatic and supportive measures. Corticosteroids administered systemically may hasten recovery in severe instances of drug hypersensitivity. Oral antihistamines and topical corticosteroids may alleviate dermatological symptoms. Toxic epidermal necrolysis and Stevens-Johnson syndrome provoke severe drug reactions that necessitate further intensive treatment (Schatz, 2015).

Conclusion

Automated laboratory signal-based pharmacovigilance programmes may be an effective means of detecting ADRs in hospitalised patients. For this objective, the Causality Algorithm of the Spanish Pharmacovigilance System is appropriate. The utilised application enables the identification of ADRs and, if necessary, assists clinicians with the targeted management of the ADR.

Analysis of the laboratory signal "hyponatremia" yields a more effective result than analysis of the signal "rhabdomyolysis" due to the reduced number of cases that must be examined in order to identify an ADR. ADR is identified as prevalent for each of the signals, with "rhabdomyolysis" accounting for 3.3% and "hyponatremia" for 39.3%. It has been unsuccessful in both instances to establish a correlation between the extent of the laboratory value variation and the likelihood that it was induced by pharmaceutical substances.

By analysing adverse drug reactions with the aid of automated laboratory signals, information that might be overlooked during clinical evaluation can be gleaned. In order to accomplish this accurately, healthcare practitioners must complete a patient's clinical history with meticulousness, ensuring that no pertinent information is omitted that could prove useful in the future.

Understanding the likelihood that a drug will induce a specific adverse effect facilitates its identification, thereby enabling the administration of the most effective treatment for the patient.

References

- Alomar, M. J. (2014). Factors affecting the development of adverse drug reactions. *Saudi pharmaceutical journal*, *22*(2), 83-94.
- Al-Worafi, Y. M. (2020). Adverse drug reactions. In *Drug safety in developing countries* (pp. 39-57). Academic Press.
- Brahma, D. K., Wahlang, J. B., Marak, M. D., & Sangma, M. C. (2013). Adverse drug reactions in the elderly. *Journal of pharmacology and pharmacotherapeutics*, *4*(2), 91-94.
- Coleman, J. J., & Pontefract, S. K. (2016). Adverse drug reactions. *Clinical Medicine*, *16*(5), 481.
- Esteban-Fernández, D., Moreno-Gordaliza, E., Cañas, B., Palacios, M. A., & Gómez-Gómez, M. M. (2010). Analytical methodologies for metallomics studies of antitumor Pt-containing drugs. *Metallomics*, *2*(1), 19-38.
- Ferner, R. E. (2016). Adverse drug reactions. *Medicine*, *44*(7), 416-421.
- Ferner, R., & Aronson, J. (2019). Susceptibility to adverse drug reactions. *British journal of clinical pharmacology*, *85*(10), 2205-2212.
- Hameed Manahi, R. A. (2023). Laboratory Tests for the Early Detection of Adverse Drug Reaction. *Saudi J Med Pharm Sci*, *9*(12), 835-838.
- Lee, S., Kim, S. S., Roh, Y. H., Choi, J. Y., Park, M. S., & Kim, M. J. (2020). Diagnostic performance of CT/MRI liver imaging reporting and data system v2017 for hepatocellular carcinoma: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Liver International*, *40*(6), 1488-1497.
- Mathew, T. K., & Tadi, P. (2020). Blood glucose monitoring.
- Patton, K., & Borshoff, D. C. (2018). Adverse drug reactions. *Anaesthesia*, *73*, 76-84.
- Riedl, M. A., & Casillas, A. M. (2003). Adverse drug reactions: types and treatment options. *American family physician*, *68*(9), 1781-1791.
- Schatz, S., & Weber, R. J. (2015). Adverse drug reactions. *Pharmacy Practice*, *1*(1).
- Valdés-Garicano, M., Mejía-Abril, G., Campodónico, D., Parra-Garcés, R., & Abad-Santos, F. (2022). Utility of a Laboratory Alert System for Detecting Adverse Drug Reactions in Hospitalised Patients: Hyponatremia and Rhabdomyolysis. *Frontiers in Pharmacology*, *13*, 937045.
- Zhang, Y., & Zhang, R. (2018). Recent advances in analytical methods for the therapeutic drug monitoring of immunosuppressive drugs. *Drug testing and analysis*, *10*(1), 81-94.

- Zwart, T. C., Moes, D. J. A., van der Boog, P. J., van Erp, N. P., de Fijter, J. W., Guchelaar, H. J., ... & Ter Heine, R. (2021). Model-informed precision dosing of everolimus: external validation in adult renal transplant recipients. *Clinical Pharmacokinetics*, *60*, 191-203.