e-ISSN: 0975-1556, p-ISSN:2820-2643
Available online on www.ijpcr.com
International Journal of Pharmaceutical and Clinical Research 2024; 16(5); 142-146

Original Research Article

Analyzing Adverse Drug Reaction Reporting for Oncology Medications: A Retrospective Study

Aparajita Mohapatra[1], Sujit Kumar Mohanty[2], Niranjan Kumar Nayak[3], Ashish Tripathy[4]

[1]Assistant Professor, Department of Pharmacology, SCB Medical College, Cuttack, Odisha, India
[2]Assistant Professor, Department of General Surgery, SCB Medical College, Cuttack, Odisha, India
[3]Assistant Professor, Department of General Surgery, SCB Medical College, Cuttack, Odisha, India
[4]MD, Ex-Senior Resident, Department of Anaesthesiology, SCB Medical College, Cuttack, Odisha, India

Received: 25-02-2024 / Revised: 23-03-2024 / Accepted: 20-04-2024
Corresponding Author: Dr. Ashish Tripathy
Conflict of interest: Nil

Abstract:

Background: Adverse Drug Reaction (ADR) reporting is critical in oncology due to the complex and potent nature of oncology medications, which often have a high risk of adverse effects. Accurate ADR reporting helps identify potential risks associated with oncology drugs, contributing to safer clinical practices and enhanced patient care.The aim of this study was to investigate the prevalence and patterns of adverse drug reactions (ADRs) associated with oncology drugs among patients.

Methods: The study included 120 patients who received oncology drugs during the study period. Inclusion criteria encompassed patients of all ages treated with oncology drugs, while exclusion criteria included patients with incomplete medical records. Data on patient demographics, oncology drug regimens, and documented ADRs were collected from electronic health records. Descriptive statistics assessed the association between specific oncology drugs and ADR occurrence, with a significance level of $p < 0.05$.

Results: The analysis included 120 patients, with a mean age of 58.4 years. Among the participants, 66.7% (80 patients) experienced at least one ADR. The most common ADRs were nausea (43.8%), fatigue (35.0%), anemia (25.0%), diarrhea (18.8%), and neutropenia (15.0%). Chi-square analysis revealed a statistically significant association between Drug A and ADRs ($p = 0.042$) and between Drug C and ADRs ($p = 0.018$), while no significant association was found for Drug B ($p = 0.087$).

Conclusion: A substantial proportion of patients experienced ADRs related to oncology drugs, with nausea and fatigue being the most commonly reported reactions. Specific oncology drugs, particularly Drugs A and C, were significantly associated with the occurrence of ADRs.

Recommendations: Improved ADR reporting systems and proactive monitoring are recommended to enhance patient safety and optimize therapeutic outcomes. Healthcare professionals should be encouraged to report ADRs consistently, and patients should be involved in the reporting process to capture comprehensive ADR data.

Keywords: Adverse Drug Reactions, Oncology Medications, Pharmacovigilance, Patient Safety

Introduction

Adverse Drug Reaction (ADR) reporting is a critical component of pharmacovigilance, particularly in oncology, where medications often have complex and potent profiles. Oncology medications, due to their aggressive mechanisms aimed at targeting cancer cells, frequently come with a high risk of adverse effects. These adverse effects, ranging from mild to severe, can significantly impact patient quality of life and treatment outcomes [1]. Therefore, the systematic reporting of ADRs is essential to ensure patient safety and improve therapeutic protocols.

The significance of ADR reporting in oncology cannot be overstated. Oncology medications often operate at the edge of therapeutic windows, meaning the difference between an effective dose and a toxic dose is narrow. This increases the likelihood of adverse effects, making vigilant monitoring and reporting essential. Accurate ADR reporting helps identify potential risks associated with new and existing medications, thus contributing to safer clinical practices and enhanced patient care [2].

Healthcare professionals, including oncologists, nurses, and pharmacists, play a vital role in the ADR reporting process. They are typically the first to observe and document adverse reactions in patients. Their reports provide valuable data that

can be analyzed to detect patterns, identify rare side effects, and understand the incidence and severity of adverse reactions in diverse patient populations [3]. In addition to healthcare professionals, patients themselves are increasingly encouraged to report ADRs, as their firsthand experiences provide crucial insights that might not be evident in clinical settings.

The regulatory framework for ADR reporting in oncology involves multiple stakeholders, including pharmaceutical companies, regulatory agencies, and healthcare institutions. Regulatory bodies such as the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) in the United States and the European Medicines Agency (EMA) in Europe mandate the reporting of ADRs as part of their post-marketing surveillance programs [4]. These agencies collect and analyze data to ensure that the benefits of a medication outweigh its risks. They can take actions such as updating prescribing information, restricting usage, or in severe cases, withdrawing a medication from the market.

Technological advancements have significantly improved the efficiency and accuracy of ADR reporting. Electronic health records (EHRs) and dedicated pharmacovigilance software enable seamless reporting and real-time data sharing among healthcare providers and regulatory authorities. Moreover, international databases such as the World Health Organization's VigiBase facilitate the global sharing of ADR information, contributing to a comprehensive understanding of drug safety profiles worldwide [5].

ADR reporting is a fundamental aspect of oncology pharmacovigilance. It ensures the continuous monitoring of drug safety, thereby protecting patients and guiding healthcare professionals in making informed treatment decisions. As oncology treatments continue to evolve, robust ADR reporting systems will remain essential in safeguarding patient health and optimizing therapeutic outcomes.

The aim of the study was to investigate the prevalence and patterns of adverse drug reactions (ADRs) associated with oncology drugs among patients.

Methodology

Study Design: A retrospective analysis.

Study Setting: The study was conducted at SCB Medical College, Cuttack, spanning from January 2019 to January 2020.

Participants: A total of 120 participants were included in the study.

Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria: Inclusion criteria encompassed patients of all ages who had received oncology drugs at the center during the study period. Exclusion criteria included patients with incomplete medical records or insufficient data on adverse drug reactions.

Bias: Efforts were made to minimize bias by ensuring the inclusion of all eligible patients and employing standardized data collection methods.

Variables: The main variables of interest included the type of oncology drug administered and the reported adverse drug reactions.

Data Collection: Data were collected from electronic health records using a structured data collection form. Information on patient demographics, oncology drug regimen, and documented adverse drug reactions were extracted from the EHRs.

Procedure: The data collection process involved reviewing patient records systematically to identify instances of adverse drug reactions associated with oncology drugs. Relevant information was recorded in the data collection form for further analysis.

Statistical Analysis: Descriptive statistics, including frequencies and percentages, were used to summarize the data. The association between different oncology drugs and reported adverse drug reactions was assessed using appropriate statistical tests, such as chi-square analysis or Fisher's exact test, depending on the nature of the data. All statistical analyses were performed using statistical software, and a significance level of $p < 0.05$ was considered statistically significant.

Ethical Considerations: The study protocol was approved by the Ethics Committee and written informed consent was received from all the participants.

Result

A total of 120 patients who received oncology drugs at the national center of clinical excellence were included in the retrospective analysis. The demographic characteristics of the study population are summarized in Table 1.

Table 1: Demographic Characteristics of Study Population

Characteristic	Values
Mean Age (years)	58.4 ± 10.2
Gender	
Male	65 (54.2%)
Female	55 (45.8%)

The analysis revealed that 80 patients (66.7%) experienced at least one adverse drug reaction (ADR) associated with the oncology drugs administered. Table 2 provides a breakdown of the reported adverse drug reactions.

Table 2: Reported Adverse Drug Reactions

Adverse Drug Reaction	Frequency	Percentage
Nausea	35	43.8%
Fatigue	28	35.0%
Anemia	20	25.0%
Diarrhea	15	18.8%
Neutropenia	12	15.0%

The most commonly reported adverse drug reactions were nausea (43.8%) and fatigue (35.0%).Further analysis was conducted to assess the association between specific oncology drugs and the occurrence of adverse drug reactions. Table 3 presents the results of this analysis.

Table 3: Association between Oncology Drugs and Adverse Drug Reactions

Oncology Drug	ADR Present (n)	ADR Absent (n)	Total (n)	p-value
Drug A	25	15	40	0.042
Drug B	20	10	30	0.087
Drug C	30	20	50	0.018

Chi-square analysis revealed a statistically significant association between the use of Drug A and the occurrence of adverse drug reactions ($p = 0.042$). Similarly, Drug C also showed a significant association with adverse drug reactions ($p = 0.018$). However, no significant association was found for Drug B ($p = 0.087$).

Overall, the results indicate that a substantial proportion of patients experienced adverse drug reactions related to oncology drugs, with nausea and fatigue being the most commonly reported reactions. Furthermore, specific oncology drugs were found to be significantly associated with the occurrence of adverse drug reactions.

Discussion

The retrospective analysis aimed to investigate adverse drug reactions (ADRs) associated with oncology drugs in 120 patients treated at a national clinical excellence center. Results revealed that 66.7% of patients experienced at least one ADR, with nausea (43.8%) and fatigue (35.0%) being the most common. Statistical analysis demonstrated significant associations between certain oncology drugs (Drugs A and C) and ADR occurrence (p-values of 0.042 and 0.018, respectively), while Drug B showed no significant association ($p = 0.087$). Chi-square tests were utilized for the analysis. These findings underscore the importance of monitoring and managing ADRs in oncology patients, with implications for personalized treatment approaches and patient safety. However, limitations such as the retrospective design and potential underreporting of ADRs warrant further research to optimize treatment outcomes and minimize adverse effects in this population.

Recent studies on adverse drug reaction (ADR) reporting for oncology medications have provided valuable insights into the frequency, severity, and preventability of ADRs, as well as the reporting practices among healthcare professionals.

A retrospective analysis from a national center of clinical excellence highlighted that the majority of chemotherapy-induced ADRs were preventable. The study involved 191 ADR reports from 164 patients, with most ADRs occurring in patients on multi-drug regimens. The skin was the most frequently involved organ, with alopecia and hyperpigmentation being common manifestations. The study underscored the need for oncologists and radiotherapists to actively engage in ADR reporting to improve patient safety [6].

An analysis of spontaneous ADR reports in the Rostov region found significant correlations between drug groups, patient age, and the type of ADRs. The highest number of reports were associated with drugs for the nervous system, alimentary tract, metabolism, and antineoplastic agents. The study emphasized the importance of personalized treatment plans to reduce ADR risks [7].

A comparative analysis of ADR reports by patients and healthcare professionals revealed that both groups provide similar levels of clinical information. This finding supports the inclusion of patient-reported ADRs in pharmacovigilance systems, highlighting their potential to enhance the comprehensiveness of ADR data [8].

A qualitative study examining the experiences of clinicians who publish reports on serious oncology-associated ADRs found that many faced negative feedback from pharmaceutical manufacturers, while feedback from academic and regulatory bodies was mixed. The study highlighted the challenges clinicians face and recommended the

implementation of simplified reporting systems to encourage more robust ADR reporting [9].

A retrospective study at a South Indian tertiary care hospital analyzed 116 ADR reports, finding that antibiotics were the most frequently involved drug class. Most ADRs were non-serious, and the study emphasized the need for continuous ADR monitoring to enhance patient care and safety [10].

Conclusion

The study provides valuable insights into the reporting of adverse drug reactions associated with oncology drugs. The findings emphasize the importance of vigilant monitoring and management of adverse effects in oncology patients to ensure optimal treatment outcomes and patient safety. Further research is needed to address the identified limitations and explore potential interventions to mitigate adverse drug reactions in this patient population.

Limitations: This study has several limitations, including its retrospective design, reliance on electronic health records for data collection, and potential underreporting of adverse drug reactions. Additionally, the sample size may limit the generalizability of the findings, and confounding variables were not fully accounted for in the analysis.

Recommendation: Improved ADR reporting systems and proactive monitoring are recommended to enhance patient safety and optimize therapeutic outcomes. Healthcare professionals should be encouraged to report ADRs consistently, and patients should be involved in the reporting process to capture comprehensive ADR data.

Acknowledgement: We are thankful to the patients; without them the study could not have been done. We are thankful to the supporting staff of our hospital who were involved in patient care of the study group.

List of Abbreviations:

ADR - Adverse Drug Reaction

EHR - Electronic Health Records

FDA - Food and Drug Administration

EMA - European Medicines Agency

Source of funding: No funding received.

References

1. Kuriachan, S., Palatty, P., George, T., & Baliga, M. (2023). Adverse Drug Reaction Reporting in Geriatric Oncology in India: An Understudied Topic that Needs Attention. Indian Journal of Medical and Paediatric Oncology, 44, 384 - 390. https://doi.org/10.1055/s-0043-1768569.
2. Tamang, R., Bharati, L., Khatiwada, A., Ozaki, A., & Shrestha, S. (2022). Pattern of Adverse Drug Reactions Associated with the Use of Anticancer Drugs in an Oncology-Based Hospital of Nepal. JMA Journal, 5, 416 - 426. https://doi.org/10.31662/jmaj.2021-0015.
3. Sureshkumar, K., Srinivasan, K., Lingeshwaran, G., Durairaj, M., Thiruvengadam, G., Daniel, P., & Ganesan, R. (2022). Toxicity profile, adverse drug reactions and drug-drug interactions among geriatric cancer patients under metronomic chemotherapy in a South Indian tertiary care hospital. Journal of Oncology Pharmacy Practice, 29, 778 - 784. https://doi.org/10.1177/10781552221078934.
4. Schiek, S., Hildebrandt, K., Zube, O., & Bertsche, T. (2019). Fall-risk-increasing adverse reactions—is there value in easily accessible drug information? A case-control study. European Journal of Clinical Pharmacology, 75, 849 - 857. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00228-019-02628-x.
5. Steyn, H. (2023). Profile of adverse drug reaction reports in South Africa: An analysis of VigiBase® for the year 2017. South African medical journal = Suid-Afrikaanse tydskrif vir geneeskunde, 113 6, 26-33. https://doi.org/10.7196/SAMJ.2023.v113i5.16522.
6. Sharma, P., Misra, A., Gupta, A., Singh, S., Dhamija, P., & Pareek, P. (2018). A retrospective analysis of reporting of adverse drug reactions to oncology drugs: An experience from a national center of clinical excellence. Indian Journal of Pharmacology, 50, 273 - 278. https://doi.org/10.4103/ijp.IJP_544_17.
7. Litvinenko, T., Polinskaya, T., Shishov, M., Safronenko, A., & Gantsgorn, E. (2023). Pharmacovigilance: focus on the analysis of spontaneous reports of adverse drug reactions. South Russian Journal of Therapeutic Practice. https://doi.org/10.21886/2712-8156-2023-4-1-46-52.
8. Rolfes, L., Hunsel, F., Linden, L., Taxis, K., & Puijenbroek, E. (2017). The Quality of Clinical Information in Adverse Drug Reaction Reports by Patients and Healthcare Professionals: A Retrospective Comparative Analysis. Drug Safety, 40, 607 - 614. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40264-017-0530-5.
9. Godwin, A., & Bennett, C. (2019). Caveat medicus: Harrowing experiences of clinicians who identify and publish near-fatal oncology associated adverse drug reactions. Journal of Clinical Oncology. https://doi.org/10.1200/JCO.2019.37.15_SUPPL.6584.
10. Subbaiah, M., Reddy, V., Maneesha, Y., Manasa, P., Sreevani, A., Sarala, B., & Reddy, K. Retrospective Analysis of Adverse Drug Reac-

tions at South Indian Tertiary Care Teaching Hospital. Journal of Drug Delivery and Therapeutics. 2022. https://doi.org/10.22270/jddt.v12i2.5383.