

Risk factors for the development of adverse drug events in hospitalized patients

- P.M.L.A. van den Bemt, A.C.G. Egberts, A.W. Lenderink, J.M. Verzijl, K.A. Simons, W.S.C.J.M. van der Pol and H.G.M. Leufkens

Pharm World Sci 2000;22(2): 62-66.
© 2000 Kluwer Academic Publishers. Printed in the Netherlands.

P.M.L.A. van den Bemt (correspondence): Hospital Pharmacy Midden-Brabant, Tilburg, The Netherlands/Hospital Pharmacy Diagnostisch Centrum SSDZ Delft, The Netherlands (former working place). (Correspondence and reprint requests: Hospital Pharmacy Medisch Centrum Leeuwarden/Hospital 'De Tjongerschans' Heerenveen, Postbus 888, 8901 BR Leeuwarden, The Netherlands)
A.C.G. Egberts: Hospital Pharmacy MiddenBrabant, Tilburg, The Netherlands, and: University of Utrecht, Utrecht Institute for Pharmaceutical Sciences Dept. of Pharmacoepidemiology & Pharmacotherapy.
A.W. Lenderink, J.M. Verzijl and K.A. Simons: Hospital Pharmacy Midden-Brabant, Tilburg, The Netherlands
W.S.C.J.M. van der Pol: Hospital Pharmacy Diagnostisch Centrum SSDZ, Delft, The Netherlands.
H.G.M. Leufkens: University of Utrecht, Utrecht Institute for Pharmaceutical Sciences Dept. of Pharmacoepidemiology & Pharmacotherapy.

Keywords

Adverse drug events
Hospitalized patients
Risk factors
Pharmacoepidemiology

Abstract

Adverse drug events in hospitalized patients lead to increased morbidity, mortality and costs. Early detection of adverse drug events could aid in the prevention of these adverse outcomes. A cost-effective system for the early detection of adverse drug events should focus on high risk patients. A study was set up with the primary aim to identify characteristics that are associated with the development of adverse drug events (ADEs) in hospitalized patients. ADE reports were gathered from physicians and nurses (spontaneous reports) and from patients after intensive ward interviews by hospital pharmacists. All patients admitted to the internal medicine wards of two Dutch hospitals, during a two month period, were included.

The following characteristics were analyzed for their potential relationship to the occurrence of ADEs: age (categorized), gender, number of drugs prescribed during hospital stay, types of drugs used and changes in drug use on admission. Age was found to be inversely associated with the development of ADEs (OR 0.36, CI 0.21-0.61 for age category > 80 years; OR 0.56; CI 0.31-1.02 for age category 75-80 years and OR 0.69; CI 0.42-1.11 for age category 60-74 years). Furthermore, statistically significant associations were found for the number of drugs prescribed per hospitalized patient (for the class of 4-6 drugs per patient OR 2.61, CI 1.32-5.18), for newly prescribed drugs (OR 6.65, CI 2.63-16.81) and for the cessation of drugs on hospital admission (OR 1.50, CI 1.02-2.20). The use of gastrointestinal drugs (OR 2.13, CI 1.32-3.45), central nervous system drugs (OR 1.66, CI 1.07-2.57) and antibiotics (OR 2.44, CI 1.65-3.60) were associated with the development of ADEs, when compared to all other drugs taken by the patients.

In this study, the most important risk factors are the number of drugs used per patient and the starting of a new drug during hospitalization. As most hospitalized patients start new drug therapies while in hospital, this seems an inappropriate focus. However, careful monitoring of patients using more than 7 drugs at a time may be possible in a cost-effective system for the early detection of ADEs.

Accepted February 2000

Introduction

Adverse drug events (ADEs) frequently occur in hospitalized patients. Two recently published studies report rates of 0.7% [1] and 2.4% [2], while a recent meta-

analysis reports an incidence of 10.9% of both serious and nonserious adverse drug events [3]. Classen et al. have shown that these ADEs lead to excess mortality, morbidity and costs [2]. Early detection of ADEs would aid in the prevention of these adverse outcomes. For this purpose, spontaneous reporting is commonly used, but it has the disadvantage of substantial underreporting. Intensive monitoring probably has overcome this problem. It is, however, not a very efficient method for the detection of ADEs. It consumes a lot of time and results in the reporting of a large number of minor ADEs. A system that focuses on certain patients who are at high risk for the development of ADEs is likely to be more efficient in the prevention of ADEs. Therefore, one would like to identify risk factors that lead to adverse drug events, but especially in Europe there is a paucity of studies on risk factors for the development of ADEs in hospitalized patients. Such a study was set up, with the objective to identify risk factors that are related to the development of adverse drug events in hospitalized patients.

Methods

Setting

The study was conducted in the internal medicine wards of two Dutch general hospitals (in Tilburg and Delft).

Study Design

The study was of a follow-up design. The duration of the study was two months. It was conducted from October 1, 1996 to November 30, 1996 in Tilburg and from May 1, 1997 to June 30, 1997 in Delft.

An ADE was defined as any noxious, unintended, and undesired effect of a drug (possibly causally related), which occurs at doses used in humans for prophylaxis, diagnosis, or therapy.

Reports of ADEs were collected from three sources, namely from doctors and nurses (spontaneous reporting) and from patients (intensive ward interview by hospital pharmacists). The use of three sources enabled us to identify adverse drug events with a relatively high degree of sensitivity.

Population and sampling

All patients admitted to the specified wards (including geriatric patients) during the two months period, were included. Exclusion criteria were not applicable to the spontaneous reporting of doctors and nurses, because adverse drug event reporting by doctors and nurses is part of daily care and therefore applies to all patients. For the collection of patient reports, the patients had to be interviewed by the hospital pharmacists. Patients were included in this daily ward interview, when they gave oral informed consent and when they could understand the questions.

Before the study started, the doctors and nurses of the specified wards were given instructions regarding the procedure for reporting adverse drug events. They were asked to report all adverse drug events (both serious and nonserious) on special forms. Data on this report form include gender and date of birth of the patient involved, information about the suspected medicine (name, dose, frequency, route of administration), concomitantly used medication, and other available information considered relevant by the reporter (including diseases, factors possibly related to the event and laboratory findings).

All reporting forms were sent to the hospital pharmacy. The investigator (a hospital pharmacist) then responded to the reporter by giving information or advice concerning the reported adverse drug event.

Patient reports were collected during a daily ward round by the investigator.

The investigator asked the patient whether he/she experienced an adverse drug event. If so, the investigator asked information about the time relationship. Both questions were printed on a special form (different from the doctor/nurse form), which also contained patient characteristics such as age and gender. Adverse drug events were only recorded when the patient could link it to a suspected drug, when the time relationship between drug and adverse drug event was appropriate and when it had occurred during hospital stay. Four investigators (hospital pharmacists) participated in the daily visits in the wards. By using the above mentioned form, the investigators made sure to collect the necessary information in a consistent manner.

Age and gender of the patients admitted to the specified wards were recorded, as well as their length of hospital stay. Adverse drug events were classified according to the WHO (World Health Organization) code, which classifies adverse drug events into system-organ classes and into preferred terms for the ADE [4].

The drugs prescribed to the patients before (by using the records of the community pharmacies of the patients) and during admission (by using the records of the hospital pharmacies) were recorded. The drugs were classified according to the ATC (Anatomical Therapeutic Chemical) code [5]. The changes in drug use on admission to the hospital were also recorded (again by using the records of the community pharmacies of the patients).

The study was approved by the medical ethics committees of the participating hospitals.

Data Analysis

The following variables were analyzed for their potential relationship to the occurrence of ADEs: age, gender, number of drugs prescribed during hospital stay, types of drugs used (both before and during hospital stay; classified according to the ATC code; only the five most frequently prescribed classes of drugs were analyzed for their relationship with the reporting of adverse drug events, because these five classes contained 80% of all prescribed drugs and the other 20% of drugs belonged to 11 classes) and changes in drug use. Changes in drug use were defined as the cessa-

tion of drugs used before hospital admission or the prescription of new drugs on hospital admission or during hospital stay.

The data were analyzed using Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) version 9.0.

Logistic regression analysis was used to determine the relationship between the development of an adverse drug event and age, gender, number of drugs prescribed during hospital stay, classes of drugs used before and during hospital stay (compared to all other drugs the patient used) and changes in drug use on admission. By using multiple logistic regression an adjustment was made for possible confounders (e.g. the relationship between age and the development of an adverse drug event was corrected for gender, length of hospital stay and number of drugs prescribed).

Logistic regression analysis was used to be able to estimate the magnitude of the association between individual risk factors and the probability of developing an ADE. This is a follow-up study and therefore these associations could also have been expressed as risk ratio's instead of odds ratio's by means of simple 2x2 table analysis. However, we also wanted to adjust for several possible confounding variables, i.e. perform a multivariate analysis, so we chose to use logistic regression analysis. This is a convenient and the most commonly used approach in such instances.

Results

Nine patients refused to participate in the study and were therefore excluded. The remaining 538 patients were included in the study, of which 149 (27.7%) experienced one or more adverse drug events. Most adverse drug events were reported during the intensive ward visit (85%) and the remaining 15% of the adverse drug events was reported by doctors and nurses. There was a small overlap in ADEs reported by the three sources (11 reports).

Table 1 shows some general characteristics of the study population. A total of 460 patients received newly prescribed drugs on hospital admission or during hospital stay, while 211 patients had one or more of their medications ceased on hospital admission. The five classes of drugs that were most frequently prescribed before and/or during hospital stay were: gastrointestinal drugs (396 patients), central nervous system drugs (376 patients), cardiovascular drugs (312 patients), drugs acting on the blood (294 patients) and antibiotics (183 patients).

The type of adverse drug events, classified by system-organ class, can be found in table 2. Most adverse drug events were gastro-intestinal effects, followed by psychiatric disorders and central & peripheral nervous system disorders and disorders of skin and appendages.

Table 3 shows the association between the development of an adverse drug event and the characteristics age (categorized), gender, number of drugs prescribed during hospital stay (categorized), newly prescribed drug, cessation of drug on hospital admission and class of drugs, as well as their confidence intervals, both without adjustment for possible confounding factors (odds ratio's) and with adjustment for possible confounders (Adjusted odds ratio's).

Age was found to be inversely associated with the

Table 1 General characteristics of the study population (n=538)

determinant	%	mean	st.dev.	range	median
age (years)	–	68.7	16.6	19-97	73
gender					
• male	43.5	–	–	–	–
• female	56.5	–	–	–	–
number of drugs prescribed					
• < 4	21.0	–	–	–	–
• 4-6	27.9	–	–	–	–
• 7-9	23.8	–	–	–	–
• 10 or more	27.3	–	–	–	–
length of hospital stay (days)	–	16.5	19.8	1-160	10

Table 2 Type of adverse drug events, classified by system-organ class (WHO)

system-organ class	number of ADEs (%)
gastro-intestinal system disorders	108 (43.5)
psychiatric disorders	28 (11.3)
skin and appendages disorders	22 (8.9)
central & peripheral nervous system disorders	22 (8.9)
body as a whole - general disorders	20 (8.1)
platelet, bleeding & clotting disorders	9 (3.6)
other ¹	39 (5.7)

¹ consists of 16 other system-organ classes (maximum number of ADE's per class: 4)

development of ADEs. Furthermore, statistically significant associations were found for the number of drugs prescribed per hospitalized patient, for newly prescribed drugs, for the cessation of drugs on hospital admission and for the use of gastrointestinal drugs, central nervous system drugs and antibiotics. Gender and use of drugs acting on the blood and cardiovascular drugs were not statistically significantly associated with the development of ADEs, but after adjustment for possible confounders the use of drugs acting on the blood was statistically significantly associated with ADEs.

Discussion

When the incidence of adverse drug events in this population is compared with the results of the meta-analysis of Lazarou et al. [3], it is rather high: 27.7% versus 10.9% in the meta-analysis. Three reasons can explain this result. First, all possible adverse drug events were included, while Lazarou et al. included probable and definite adverse drug events only. Secondly, most of the reports were obtained by asking the patient for any adverse drug events that he or she had noticed (i.e. intensive monitoring). It has been shown in older studies that this increases the number of reports [6]. This study aimed to collect adverse drug events with a high degree of sensitivity, so three sources of reports were used (doctors, nur-

ses, patients), without applying a formal causality assessment. In this manner, adverse drug events were collected with a high degree of sensitivity, but the method lacks specificity. Because risk factors were studied that can possibly lead to adverse drug events in hospitalized patients, a high degree of sensitivity seemed more important than a high degree of specificity. However, even this method of asking patients for any experienced ADEs still results in some underreporting, because patients are of course unable to recognize e.g. laboratory abnormalities and because they may forget to tell certain ADEs. This may result in selection or recall bias.

Thirdly, the length of hospitalization in this study was relatively long, so there may have been simply more time for ADEs to occur. The length of hospitalization in this study can be explained by the inclusion of geriatric patients. In the Netherlands they often have to wait for admission to a nursing home; time they unjustly spend in a hospital bed.

Though it is generally stated that the incidence of adverse drug events increases with increasing age, there is still much debate about age as an independent risk factor for adverse drug events in literature [7-15]. Factors such as the number of drugs used per patient, the number of clinical diagnoses and the length of hospital stay are considered to be responsible for the increase in adverse drug reactions with increasing age. Carbonin et al. showed that age was not an independent risk factor for adverse drug events in hospitalized patients [16]. In a recent study of Moore et al. patients with an adverse drug event during hospital stay were not older than those without an adverse drug event [17]. In this study an inverse relationship was found between age and adverse drug events. Patients older than 80 years of age were significantly less likely to have adverse drug events than younger patients. This may be due to underreporting by both healthcare professionals and patients, which has been stated to increase with increasing age [10]. A study of reporting rates of adverse drug events to the Committee on Safety of Medicines showed that reporting rates were highest in the fifth and sixth decades and declined thereafter [18]. In this study, the decline in ADEs with increasing age may have been partly due to problems of com-

Table 3 Association of the development of adverse drug events with the characteristics age, gender, number of drugs prescribed, newly prescribed drug, cessation of drug on hospital admission and type of drug

characteristic	Odds Ratio (95% C.I. ^{b)})	Adjusted Odds Ratio ^{a)} (95% C.I. ^{b)})
age		
• < 60 years	1 (ref. ^{c)})	1 (ref. ^{c)})
• 60-74 years	0.69 (0.42 - 1.11)	0.70 (0.43 - 1.14)
• 75-80 years	0.56 (0.31 - 1.02)	0.54 (0.30 - 0.99)
• > 80 years	0.36 (0.21 - 0.61)	0.34 (0.20 - 0.59)
gender	1.20 (0.82 - 1.76)	1.30 (0.89-1.92)
number of drugs prescribed		
• < 4	1 (ref. ^{c)})	1 (ref. ^{c)})
• 4-6	2.61 (1.32 - 5.18)	4.00 (1.91 - 8.39)
• 7-9	3.50 (1.76 - 6.96)	5.55 (2.62 - 11.76)
• 10 or more	5.01 (2.58 - 9.76)	8.50 (4.03 - 18.19)
newly prescribed drug	6.65 (2.63 - 16.81)	8.17 (3.16 - 21.13)
cessation of drug on hospital admission	1.50 (1.02 - 2.20)	1.84 (1.23 - 2.76)
drug ^{d)}		
• gastrointestinal drugs	2.13 (1.32 - 3.45)	2.38 (1.44 - 3.91)
• central nervous system drugs	1.66 (1.07 - 2.57)	1.88 (1.19 - 2.95)
• cardiovascular drugs	0.70 (0.48 - 1.03)	1.02 (0.65 - 1.60)
• drugs acting on the blood	1.33 (0.91 - 1.95)	1.73 (1.14 - 2.62)
• antibiotics	2.44 (1.65 - 3.60)	2.71 (1.81 - 4.06)

^{a)} Adjusted for possible confounding factors (age, gender, number of drugs prescribed, length of hospital stay)

^{b)} C.I. = Confidence Interval

^{c)} ref. = reference category

^{d)} For each drug class the reference category was the total of all other drug classes

prehension and hearing in communicating verbal ADE reports.

Adverse drug events were reported in slightly more women than men in this study, although this difference did not reach statistical significance. In general, adverse drug events are stated to occur more often in women than in men [7 9 17 19].

This study showed two risk factors that were strongly associated with the reporting of adverse drug events. The first of these, the number of drugs used per patient during hospitalization, is a well known risk factor from literature [7-15]. The second one has not been described before, but seems very logical from a pharmacological point of view. The starting of newly prescribed drugs during hospitalization was strongly associated with the reporting of adverse drug events. This can be explained by the pharmacological actions of newly started drugs: most adverse drug events will occur shortly after starting a drug. Thereafter, either tolerance for the adverse drug event develops or the patient discontinues the medication.

The cessation of a drug on hospital admission was also found to be associated with the reporting of adverse drug events. In this case, there may very well have been a causal relationship. The drug may have been stopped because it was thought to be the cause of an adverse reaction.

This study showed that patients who used gastrointestinal drugs, central nervous system drugs and antibiotics were more likely to report an adverse drug

event. After adjustment for age and gender this was also found for drugs acting on the blood. It is worth noting, however, that the association between ADEs and the five most prescribed classes of drugs (as compared to all other classes of drugs the patients used) was determined. The fact that these classes are prescribed so often may be related to the occurrence of ADEs.

Finally, the overlap in the three sources (doctors, nurses, patients) could have influenced the results. However, this overlap was very small (11 reports) compared to the total number of ADEs, so the influence is probably not substantial.

Conclusion

Adverse drug events in hospitalized patients lead to excess morbidity, mortality and costs [2 3 17]. Therefore, measures to prevent these adverse drug events are likely to have a positive influence on patient care, both directly (less morbidity and mortality due to adverse drug events) and indirectly (cost savings). By focusing a system for the detection of ADEs on patients with risk factors the early detection and prevention of ADEs may be possible in a cost-effective manner. In this study, the most important risk factors are number of drugs used per patient and the starting of a new drug during hospitalization. As most hospitalized patients start new drug therapies while in hospital, this seems an inappropriate focus. However, careful monitoring of patients using more than 7

drugs at a time may be possible in a cost-effective system for the early detection of ADEs. Future studies should look into the effect of interventions, aiming at reducing the number of drugs used per patient, on the frequency of adverse drug events in hospitalized patients.

Acknowledgement

We wish to thank the participating community pharmacists, doctors, nurses and patients for their contribution to this study.

References

- 1 Leape LL, Brennan TA, Laird N, Lawthers AG, Localio AR, Barnes BA, et al. The nature of adverse events in hospitalized patients. Results of the Harvard Medical Practice Study II. *N Engl J Med* 1991;324:377-84.
- 2 Classen DC, Pestotnik SL, Scott Evans R, Lloyd JF, Burke JP. Adverse drug events in hospitalized patients. *JAMA* 1997;277:301-6.
- 3 Lazarou J, Pomeranz BH, Corey PN. Incidence of adverse drug events in hospitalized patients. A meta-analysis of prospective studies. *JAMA* 1998;279:1200-05.
- 4 Anonymous. International monitoring of adverse reactions to drugs. Adverse reaction terminology. Uppsala: WHO Collaborating Centre for International Drug Monitoring, 1995.
- 5 Anonymous. Anatomical Therapeutic Chemical (ATC) classification index. Oslo: WHO Collaborating Centre for Drug Statistics Methodology, 1994.
- 6 Mitchell AS, Henry DA, Sanson-Fisher R, O'Connell DL. Patients as a direct source of information on adverse drug events. *BMJ* 1988;297:891-3.
- 7 Hoigné R, Lawson DH, Weber E. Risk factors for adverse drug events - epidemiological approaches. *Eur J Clin Pharmacol* 1990;39:321-5.
- 8 Brawn LA, Castleden CM. Adverse drug events - an overview of special considerations in the management of the elderly patient. *Drug Safety* 1990;5:421-35.
- 9 Denham MJ. Adverse drug events. *Br Med Bull* 1990;46:53-62.
- 10 Lamy PP. Adverse drug effects. *Clin Geriatr Med* 1990;6:293-307.
- 11 Gurwitz JH, Avorn J. The ambiguous relation between aging and adverse drug events. *Ann Intern Med* 1991;114:956-66.
- 12 Lindley CM, Tully MP, Paramsothy V, Tallis RC. Inappropriate medication is a major cause of adverse drug events in elderly patients. *Age and Ageing* 1992;21:294-300.
- 13 Atkin PA, Shenfield GM. Medication-related adverse reactions and the elderly: a literature review. *Adverse Drug React Toxicol Rev* 1995;14:175-91.
- 14 Holland EG, Degruy FV. Drug-induced disorders. *Am Family Physician* 1997;56:178-88.
- 15 D'Arcy PF. Adverse drug events in hospital and in the community. *Adverse Drug React Toxicol Rev* 1997;16:95-101.
- 16 Carbonin P, Pahor M, Bernabei R, Sgadari A. Is age an independent risk factor of adverse drug events in hospitalized medical patients? *J Am Geriatr Soc* 1991;39:1093-99.
- 17 Moore N, Lecointre D, Noblet C, Mabile M. Frequency and cost of serious adverse drug events in a department of general medicine. *Br J Clin Pharmacol* 1998;45:301-8.
- 18 Mann RD, Rawlins MD, Fletcher P, Wood SM. Age and the spontaneous reporting of adverse reactions in the United Kingdom. *Pharmacoepidemiology and Drug Safety* 1992;1:19-23.
- 19 Kando JC, Yonkers KA, Cole JO. Gender as a risk factor for adverse events to medications. *Drugs* 1995;50:1-6.