ADVERSE DRUG REACTION REPORTS IN MALAYSIA: COMPARISON OF CAUSALITY ASSESSMENTS
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Causality assessment of reported adverse drug reactions (ADR) is an important component of pharmacovigilance as they contribute to better evaluation of the risk-benefit profile of drugs. The main objective of the present study was to evaluate the agreement of causality assessments of ADR between the spontaneous ADR reporters, the expert panel and the Naranjo algorithm. We retrospectively reviewed ADR reports received by the Malaysian Adverse Drug Reactions Advisory Committee (MADRAC) between January to June 2003. Causality assessments were categorized as Certain, Probable, Possible, Unlikely and Unclassifiable. A total of 384 reports were included. Spontaneous reporters assessed 30.4% as Certain, 46.1% as Probable, 21.9% as Possible and 1.6% as Unlikely. MADRAC panel assessed 21.9%, 13.0%, 64.6% and 0.5% as Certain, Probable, Possible and Unlikely, respectively. Using the algorithm, 16.4%, 83.1% and 0.5% were categorized as Probable, Possible and Unlikely, respectively. No reports achieved the Certain/Definite category using the algorithm. The total percentage of agreement between spontaneous reporters, MADRAC and Naranjo’s algorithm in causality assessment was 15.1%. Among the three groups, no agreement was found in the Certain and Unlikely categories. Spontaneous reporters attributed a higher level of causality compared to MADRAC and Naranjo’s algorithm. The difference in aims and methods in causality assessment among the three methods of assessment could be the main reason of disagreement.
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INTRODUCTION

Causality assessment of ADR is an important component of pharmacovigilance as they contribute to better evaluation of the risk-benefit profile of drugs. Assessment methods based on clinical judgments may be subjective and imprecise (Karch et al. 1976; Blanc et al. 1979). As a result, several algorithms have been developed to identify the important aspects of an ADR and to integrate them into an objective rating. Comparisons between these algorithms have been made (Busto, Naranjo...
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and Sellers 1982; Michel and Knodel 1986). Although they were found to be comparatively reliable, Naranjo’s algorithm is less complex and less time consuming. The advantages of decisional algorithm scale over clinical judgment are its consistency and objectivity. With the use of published algorithms, the agreement between observers improved considerably compared to when the same observers used their unaided judgment or global introspection (Hutchinson and Lane 1986).

In Malaysia, ADR reports are submitted by the reporter (e.g. doctor, pharmacist) using a standardized report form to the MADRAC. MADRAC is established under the Drug Control Authority (DCA) of Malaysia to monitor the safety profiles of drugs registered in Malaysia. The committee comprises of 12 members including physicians, clinical pharmacologists and pharmacists. The number of reports received by MADRAC has been increasing steadily over the last few years. In fact, MADRAC received more than 2000 ADR reports in 2005 (Ministry of Health Malaysia 2005).

Information available from each report includes a brief description of the ADR, the extent and outcome of the reaction, and causality classification. Classification of causality or drug reaction relationship is also provided by the reporter based on his/her own assessment. This is classified as Certain, Probable, Possible, Unlikely and Unclassifiable.

For each ADR report submitted to MADRAC, a causality assessment is made based on consensus agreement by the committee members during their bimonthly meetings. The method used is based on the WHO-Uppsala Monitoring Centre (WHO-UMC) guidelines on causality assessment (WHO-UMC 2005). This is classified as Certain, Probable, Possible, Unlikely and Unclassifiable. This final causality classification is available in MADRAC’s database.

The present study is carried out to compare the results of causality assessment of ADRs made by spontaneous reporters, an expert panel (MADRAC) and using a published decisional algorithm.
METHODS

All ADR report forms received by MADRAC from January to June 2003 were retrospectively reviewed. Reports were excluded if important information like the name of the suspected agent or causality assessment was missing. They were also excluded if the causality assessment was categorised as Unclassifiable. Only reports available at the time of study were analysed.

One of the authors (HSL), determined causality assessment using the Naranjo’s algorithm (Naranjo et al. 1981) based on information provided in the ADR report form. Criteria used in the Naranjo’s algorithm are shown in Table 1. This algorithm was chosen because its four levels of causality assessment coincide with the causality categories in the ADR report form. This algorithm has been widely used (Dalton-Bunnow and Halvachs 1993; Dormann et al. 2000) and is the recommended algorithm for reporting ADR in the Annals of Pharmacotherapy.

Reporter’s assessment was obtained from each ADR report form whereas MADRAC’s causality assessment was obtained from MADRAC’s database. MADRAC committee members formulate their assessment based on the information in the report forms and their clinical judgement. Criteria used to guide them in making the final causality assessment are shown in Table 1. Causality assessments obtained from the ADR forms (reporters), MADRAC database and the algorithm were categorized into Certain or Definite, Probable, Possible, Unlikely, and Unclassifiable.

All data were entered and analysed using Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) version 10.0.1. The agreements between the algorithm, expert panel (MADRAC) and spontaneous reporters were evaluated using kappa (κ) statistical test. The κ value ranged from −1 (perfect disagreement) to +1 (perfect agreement).
Table 1: Guide to causality assessment used in Naranjo’s algorithm and MADRAC.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Probability scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Naranjo’s algorithm</td>
<td>Previous report of the same reaction</td>
<td>A score ranging from +2 to –1 is given for each criteria. The probability scale is based on the total score; ≤ 0 Doubtful, 1 to 4 Possible, 5 to 8 Probable, ≥ 9 Definite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Temporal relationship</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dechallenge (i.e., drug withdrawal or use of antagonist)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rechallenge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alternative etiologies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Placebo rechallenge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Blood concentration of the drug</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dose-severity relationship</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Previous exposure (similar reaction or similar drug)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Event confirmed by objective evidence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MADRAC</th>
<th>Plausible time, not related to underlying condition/concurrent disease or other drugs or chemicals, related pharmacologically, positive challenge, positive rechallenge</th>
<th>C1 Certain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reasonable time, unlikely to be related to concurrent disease, other drugs, positive dechallenge, no rechallenge</td>
<td>C2 Probable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reasonable time, may be due to concurrent disease, other drugs, no information on dechallenge</td>
<td>C3 Possible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Improbable temporal relationship. Other confounding factors such as drugs, chemical, underlying disease</td>
<td>C4 Unlikely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Insufficient information</td>
<td>C5 Unclassifiable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

A total sample size of 495 ADR reports was reviewed. Reports were excluded from the study for various reasons like no drug name (n = 6), reporters did not report his/her causality assessment (n = 63), causality assessment reported as Unclassifiable (n = 16), reports about drug abuse or overdose (n = 5), and one report about therapeutic failure. We also excluded reports where MADRAC did not specify the causality
assessments (n = 9) or classified them as Unclassifiable (n = 4). Five reports were found to be duplicates of previous reports and two reports which were registered in the MADRAC database were not available at the time of review. The total number excluded was 111 and the final sample size was 384. The majority of those reports came from doctors (n = 308; 80.2%). There were 48 (12.5%) pharmacists who contributed to the ADR reports.

The reported ADRs included a large spectrum of clinical manifestations, which are summarized based on WHO Adverse Reaction Terminology (WHOART) system-organ class (Fig. 1). The total number of manifestations was 494; 87 cases affected more than one organ system. The most common organ-system affected was the skin (47.4%). This was followed by central and peripheral nervous system (10.3%), gastrointestinal system (9.3%), vision and ocular system (7.5%), and cardiovascular system (7.3%).

![Fig. 1: Distribution of ADR based on system-organ classification.](image-url)
ADR causalities of Certain and Probable were most frequently reported by spontaneous reporters compared to the other two methods. Out of 384 reports, spontaneous reporters assessed the causal relationship of drugs and ADRs as 30.4% Certain, 46.1% Probable, 21.9% Possible and 1.6% Unlikely (Fig. 2). Although they used the same category scale like the MADRAC expert panel, spontaneous reporters were not provided with any guideline to assess causality. Instead, we assumed that they rely on their clinical judgments and experiences to make their assessments. Dukes (1984) listed three factors that may influence a physician’s assessment of an ADR. They are (i) physician’s lack of experience in causality assessment and thus, may overlook other causal factors, (ii) physician’s clinical knowledge of the patient and (iii) physician’s knowledge of previous similar cases. Our finding is consistent with Miremont et al. (1994), who also found that physicians tend to assess ADRs with very high level of causality. They argued that in clinical practice, physicians need to have definite judgment because they have to decide whether or not to discontinue the suspected drug causing the ADRs. As a result, spontaneous reporters often assess a very high or very low level of causality between the drugs and suspected ADRs. In general, our findings showed that spontaneous reporters tend to report ADRs with higher level of causality. It may seem that ADRs with a higher causality assessment favor spontaneous reporting compared to those with lower causality categories.

![Fig. 2: Causality assessments of ADR.](image-url)
The most frequent causality assessment by the MADRAC panel was *Possible* (64.6%). MADRAC expert panel categorized 21.9% as *Certain*, 13.0% as *Probable*, 64.6% as *Possible* and 0.5% as *Unlikely*. Macedo et al. (2003) has shown that *Probable* and *Possible* were the most common (68%) causality assessment of ADR by global introspection, which is the same method as the WHO-UMC system. Similarly, the most frequent causality categories in ADRs cases reported by WHO-UMC were also *Possible* and *Probable* (WHO-UMC 2005). Using the WHO-UMC approach, positive rechallenge is one of the criteria for *Certain* but it does not always need to be present in order for the event to be assessed as *Certain*. Therefore, the causality assessment for *Certain* was less strict and ADRs reports assessed as *Certain* were more common in MADRAC results compared to using the Naranjo’s algorithm.

Causality assessment using Naranjo’s algorithm have shown that the most common category is *Possible* (83.1%). Our results showed (Fig. 2) that 16.4% of ADRs was *Probable*, 83.1% was *Possible*, and 0.5% was *Unlikely*. None of the ADRs reports was assessed as *Certain* using this method. The results are consistent with other studies using Naranjo’s algorithm, which reported about 50% were classified as *Possible* and less than 10% as *Definite* (Dalton-Bunnow and Halvachs 1993; Dormann et al. 2000). Using the same algorithm, Michel and Knodel (1986) also reports that the majority (n = 27; 96%) of ADR assessments were categorized as *Probable* and *Possible* and only (n = 1; 3.6%) as *Certain*. Another study showed that out of 98 cases, only 13.3% were able to achieve a score of 4 or greater on the Naranjo’s scale (Berry et al. 1988). However, when the use of this algorithm is applied at bedside, 62% of ADRs detected were categorized as *Definite* and less than 1% as *Possible* (Classen et al. 1991). This increase in *Definite* category has been attributed to more complete information that is available at the time of assessment.

The agreement of causality assessment by Naranjo’s algorithm, expert panel and spontaneous reporters using the same ADRs reports was compared. Total agreement of ADRs causality was achieved in 15.1% (58 of 384 reports). The agreement on causality assessment was 14.8% in *Possible* cases and 0.3% in *Probable* cases. No agreement was found among the three assessors in causality categories of *Certain* and *Unlikely*. Kappa value could only be analyzed for comparison between the MADRAC
panel and spontaneous reporters for which values for all categories were available. A positive but poor agreement was obtained (Table 2).

Table 2: The percentage agreement of causality assessment between Naranjo’s algorithm, MADRAC expert panel and spontaneous reporters.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Between assessors</th>
<th>Certain</th>
<th>Probable</th>
<th>Possible</th>
<th>Unlikely</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>( \kappa )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N &amp; EP &amp; SR</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N &amp; EP</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>59.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>60.7</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N &amp; SR</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EP &amp; SR</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>0.057</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N denotes Naranjo’s algorithm; EP denotes expert panel; SR denotes spontaneous reporter

A study on comparison of causality assessment of ADRs from published decisional algorithms and expert panel using global introspection shows that full agreement was not found in any level of causality assessment. However, the highest concordance was on Probable, which is about 61% (Macedo et al. 2003). Miremont et al. (1994) has shown that complete agreement between a French algorithm and physicians’ opinion occurred only in 6% of cases.

The percentage agreement of causality assessment was highest between Naranjo’s algorithm and MADRAC panel. Unlike spontaneous reporters who assess the causality during the clinical practice or with more complete information, the causality assessment of Naranjo’s algorithm and MADRAC panel use similar source of information i.e. the reporting forms. In addition, MADRAC panel also use their clinical judgment (eg. previous experience) to make their assessments. The aims of causality assessment and the components for causality assessment are similar between MADRAC panel and Naranjo’s algorithm. Causality assessment of MADRAC panel and Naranjo’s algorithm aims to classify ADR reports according to the strength of the association between a drug and ADR. On the other hand, the aim of spontaneous reporters in assessing the ADRs is to make a definite decision whether or not to discontinue the suspected drugs. Therefore, it is reasonable that the percentage of agreement between Naranjo’s algorithm and MADRAC panel is relatively higher compared to the agreement between Naranjo’s
algorithm and spontaneous reporters, or between the MADRAC panel and spontaneous reporters.

Spontaneous reporters, particularly the physicians were able to access directly to the whole range of information and clinical evidence of patients who suffered from the ADRs. There is probably some loss of information because all relevant information and clinical evidence needed for causality assessment may not be transmitted in the ADR report forms. Therefore, loss and lack of data that are needed for causality assessment by the MADRAC panel and Naranjo’s algorithm could contribute to the low percentage of agreements between the assessors in the present study, with higher level of causality in spontaneous reporters but lower level of causality in MADRAC panel and Naranjo’s algorithm.

The results of causality assessment of ADRs depend on the quality and state of information used for evaluation. Incomplete information in reporting forms was a limiting factor in causality assessment using established guidelines (i.e. MADRAC panel and Naranjo’s algorithm). Therefore, the familiarity and understanding of health professional with the components in ADR reporting forms could directly affect the quality of data used for causality assessment in the present study.

CONCLUSION

ADR voluntary reporting to MADRAC may favor reporters, who will usually attribute a higher level causality to an adverse drug event. The difference in aims and methods in causality assessment among the three groups of assessors could be the reasons of disagreements. Variability among spontaneous reporters in making causality assessment may also contribute to such disagreement.
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