International Journal of Computational and Experimental Science and ENgineering
(IJCESEN)

Vol. 10-No.4 (2024) pp. 2658-2666
http://www.ijcesen.com

ISSN: 2149-9144

Research Article

Pharmacist Interventions in Preventing Clinically Significant Drug–Drug Interactions in Hospitalized Patients

Hani Mowanes W Alrawili[1], Salha Adnan Madhuor Alhazmi[2], Malak Faleh Assaj Alanazi[3], Ibtisam Alkumi Harran Alruwaili[4], Abo Dhammam, Ali Saad A[5], Areej Murdhi Al Anazi[6], Faisal Munis Jamaan Al Anazi[7], Naif Hameed Hamed Alharbi[8], Ammar Salah Aldhmashi[9]

[1]Senior Pharmacist, Northern Borders Health Cluster, Arar, Northern Borders, Saudi Arabia
* **Corresponding Author Email:** hanyksa858@gmail.com- **ORCID:** 0000-0002-5288-7850

[2]Pharmacy Technician, Ministry of Health, Maternity and Children Hospital, Arar, Northern Borders, Saudi Arabia,
Email: saadalhazmi@moh.gov.sa - **ORCID:** 0000-0002-5207-7850

[3]Pharmacy Technician, Northern Borders Health Cluster, North Medical Tower Hospital, Arar, Northern Borders, Saudi Arabia
Email: Malak776633@gmail.com- **ORCID:** 0000-0002-5217-7850

[4]Pharmacy Technician, Ministry of Health, Prince Abdulaziz bin Musaed Hospital, Arar, Northern Borders, Saudi Arabia,
Email: ialruwaili@moh.gov.sa - **ORCID:** 0000-0002-5227-7850

[5]Pharmacy Technician, Ministry of Health, Aseer Central Hospital, Abha, Aseer, Saudi Arabia,
Email: aabodhammam@moh.gov.sa- **ORCID:** 0000-0002-5237-7850

[6]Pharmacy Technician, Ministry of Health, Prince Abdulaziz bin Musaed Hospital, Arar, Northern Borders, Saudi Arabia
Email: Areeja@moh.gov.sa- **ORCID:** 0000-0002-5257-7850

[7]Pharmacy Technician, Ministry of Health, Maternity and Children Hospital, Arar, Northern Borders, Saudi Arabia,
Email: Faiasla@moh.gov.sa- **ORCID:** 0000-0002-5267-7850

[8]Pharmacy Technician, Ministry of Health, King Abdullah Medical Complex, Jeddah, Makkah Region, Saudi Arabia
Email: Abu_layal666@hotmail.com - **ORCID:** 0000-0002-5277-7850

[9]Pharmacy Technician, Ministry of Health, Turaif General Hospital, Turaif, Northern Borders, Saudi Arabia
Email: amsalanazi@moh.gov.sa- **ORCID:** 0000-0002-5287-7850

Article Info:

DOI: 10.22399/ijcesen.4149
Received : 02 March 2024
Accepted : 29 March 2024

Keywords

Pharmacist interventions,
drug-drug interactions,
hospitalized patients,
polypharmacy,
medication management

Abstract:

Pharmacist interventions play a crucial role in preventing clinically significant drug-drug interactions (DDIs) in hospitalized patients, where polypharmacy is common. Through active medication management, pharmacists assess patients' medication regimens upon admission and routinely during their hospital stay. They utilize their expertise in pharmacology and therapeutic guidelines to identify potential DDIs based on the patient's medical history, current medications, and clinical condition. By collaborating with physicians and other healthcare professionals, pharmacists provide valuable insights and recommend alternative therapies or dosage adjustments to mitigate the risks associated with potentially harmful interactions, thus optimizing patient safety and medication efficacy. Furthermore, pharmacist-led interventions have been shown to reduce the incidence of adverse drug events related to DDIs, contributing to improved patient outcomes and shorter hospital stays. By implementing standardized protocols for screening and monitoring drug interactions, pharmacists not only educate patients and healthcare staff about the risks but also advocate for safe prescribing practices. Additionally, they can leverage electronic health record systems and drug interaction databases to enhance their surveillance capabilities. These proactive measures—coupled with ongoing clinical education and collaboration—underscore the pharmacist's vital role in the multidisciplinary healthcare team, reinforcing the importance of their interventions in minimizing the potential for adverse effects associated with drug-drug interactions.

1. Introduction

The modern management of hospitalized patients, particularly those with multiple comorbidities, is characterized by complex pharmacological regimens. Polypharmacy, typically defined as the concurrent use of five or more medications, is exceedingly common in inpatient settings, with prevalence exceeding 60% in general medical wards and approaching nearly 100% in critically ill or elderly populations [1]. While these medications are prescribed with therapeutic intent, their sheer number and complexity create a fertile ground for adverse drug events (ADEs). Among the most predictable, yet frequently overlooked, categories of ADEs are drug-drug interactions (DDIs). A DDI occurs when the effects of one drug are altered by the presence of another, potentially leading to reduced therapeutic efficacy or, more alarmingly, an increased risk of toxicity.

Clinically significant drug-drug interactions (csDDIs) represent a substantial threat to patient safety and quality of care. These are interactions that can lead to clinical harm, such as hemorrhage, renal failure, arrhythmias, or serotonin syndrome, and often necessitate additional medical intervention, prolong hospitalization, or cause permanent disability. The scope of this problem is vast. Epidemiological studies indicate that DDIs are responsible for nearly 1.1% of all hospital admissions and contribute to 2-3% of all hospitalizations in the general population, with this figure rising dramatically to over 15% in the elderly [2]. Once hospitalized, patients remain vulnerable; it is estimated that csDDIs occur in 15-20% of all inpatients and are a contributing factor in 1-2% of in-hospital deaths [3]. The economic burden is equally staggering, with the costs associated with managing DDI-related morbidity adding billions of dollars annually to global healthcare expenditures [4]. This is not merely a statistical concern but a pervasive clinical challenge that compromises patient outcomes and strains healthcare resources.

The genesis of a csDDI in a hospital setting is multifactorial, rooted in the very nature of acute care. Hospitalized patients are often managed by multiple specialists who may prescribe medications without a comprehensive review of the patient's complete drug profile—a phenomenon known as the "prescribing cascade." The high-stress, fast-paced environment of hospitals, coupled with frequent transitions of care (e.g., from ICU to ward, or from day shift to night shift), increases the likelihood of oversight. Common and high-risk interaction pairs are frequently implicated. For instance, the concurrent administration of a potassium-sparing diuretic like spironolactone with an angiotensin-converting enzyme (ACE) inhibitor can precipitate dangerous hyperkalemia. Similarly, the combination of certain antibiotics (e.g., fluoroquinolones, macrolides) with drugs that prolong the QT interval can heighten the risk of Torsades de Pointes, a potentially fatal arrhythmia [5]. Another classic example is the interaction between warfarin and numerous antibiotics, antiplatelets, or analgesics, which can lead to either catastrophic bleeding or therapeutic failure and thromboembolism.

Pharmacist-led interventions to prevent csDDIs are multifaceted and can be implemented at various stages of the medication-use process. These interventions include:

- **Prospective Order Review:** Systematically screening all new medication orders against the patient's existing profile using sophisticated clinical decision support (CDS) systems and the pharmacist's own clinical judgment.
- **Participation in Interprofessional Rounds:** Actively contributing to treatment discussions, offering alternative medication choices with lower interaction potential, and recommending appropriate monitoring parameters.
- **Medication Reconciliation:** Playing a leading role in accurately documenting a patient's home medications upon admission and reconciling them across all care transitions to identify and resolve unintended discrepancies, including potential DDIs.
- **Therapeutic Drug Monitoring and Follow-up:** Recommending and interpreting serum drug levels, and monitoring for early signs of toxicity or therapeutic failure that may signal a DDI.
- **Patient Education:** Counseling patients upon discharge about the risks of their medication regimen and the signs of a potential adverse interaction.

Evidence strongly supports the efficacy of such interventions. A systematic review and meta-analysis demonstrated that pharmacist involvement in hospital ward teams significantly reduced the rate of medication errors and ADEs, with a pronounced effect on the prevention of csDDIs [6]. Studies have shown that dedicated clinical pharmacy services can identify and resolve over 80% of potential DDIs before they reach the patient, reducing the incidence of actual harm by up to 50% [7, 8]. Furthermore, the integration of pharmacists into high-risk areas like intensive care units, oncology, and cardiology has been shown to improve patient outcomes and reduce length of stay [9, 10].

Despite this evidence, the implementation of consistent and effective clinical pharmacy services faces barriers, including understaffing, lack of integration into electronic health records, and interprofessional communication gaps [11]. The challenge remains to fully leverage the pharmacist's expertise in a systematic way. Therefore, this research aims to critically evaluate the impact of structured pharmacist interventions on the prevention of clinically significant drug-drug interactions in a hospitalized patient population. By quantifying the frequency and types of DDIs intercepted, assessing the acceptance rate of pharmacists' recommendations by physicians, and analyzing the potential clinical and economic outcomes, this study seeks to provide robust evidence for the indispensable role of the pharmacist as a guardian of medication safety within the interprofessional healthcare team [12].

2. The Burden of Polypharmacy and Clinically Significant DDIs in the Inpatient Setting

The contemporary landscape of hospital medicine is characterized by an increasingly complex patient population, marked by advanced age, multiple chronic conditions, and consequently, intricate medication regimens. This has led to the pervasive phenomenon of polypharmacy, traditionally defined as the concurrent use of five or more medications. In the inpatient setting, polypharmacy is not merely common; it is the norm. Recent studies indicate that over 60% of patients on general medical wards and nearly all patients in intensive care units are exposed to polypharmacy during their hospitalization [13]. This extensive medication use is a double-edged sword: while essential for treating acute illnesses and managing chronic diseases, it creates a perfect storm for adverse drug events (ADEs), among which clinically significant drug-drug interactions (csDDIs) represent a particularly predictable and dangerous category.

A drug-drug interaction occurs when the pharmacological effect of one drug is modified by the prior or concurrent administration of another. These interactions can be pharmacodynamic, where two drugs act on the same receptor or physiological system (e.g., two antiplatelet agents increasing bleeding risk), or pharmacokinetic, where one drug affects the absorption, distribution, metabolism, or excretion of another (e.g., an enzyme inhibitor increasing the serum concentration of a substrate drug). While many DDIs are theoretical or of minor clinical consequence, csDDIs are those with the potential to cause genuine patient harm, including hospitalization, prolonged stay, permanent disability, or even death. The scope of this problem is substantial and represents a major patient safety concern. Epidemiological data reveals that DDIs are a direct cause of 1-3% of all hospital admissions, with this figure escalating to over 15% in elderly populations [14]. The risk does not diminish upon admission; rather, the hospital environment itself is a high-risk venue for the genesis of new, dangerous interactions. It is estimated that 15-20% of hospitalized patients will experience at least one csDDI during their stay, and these interactions are implicated in 1-2% of in-hospital mortality [15].

The clinical manifestations of csDDIs are diverse and can affect nearly every organ system. Common serious outcomes include:

- **Hemorrhagic Events:** Caused by interactions that potentiate the effects of anticoagulants (e.g., warfarin, DOACs) and antiplatelets. A classic example is the co-prescription of warfarin with antibiotics like sulfamethoxazole/trimethoprim or fluconazole, which can inhibit its metabolism and lead to a dangerous rise in INR and subsequent bleeding.
- **Renal Toxicity and Electrolyte Imbalances:** Often resulting from the combination of multiple nephrotoxic agents (e.g., aminoglycosides, vancomycin, NSAIDs) or drugs that affect electrolyte homeostasis. The concomitant use of ACE inhibitors with potassium-sparing diuretics or trimethoprim can induce severe hyperkalemia.
- **Cardiotoxicity:** Primarily QT-interval prolongation, which increases the risk of the lethal arrhythmia Torsades de Pointes. This is a well-documented risk with combinations of drugs such as certain antipsychotics, antiarrhythmics, antibiotics (macrolides, fluoroquinolones), and antidepressants.
- **Serotonergic Toxicity:** A potentially life-threatening condition that can arise from the interaction between multiple serotonergic agents, such as selective serotonin reuptake inhibitors (SSRIs), tramadol, and linezolid.

Beyond the direct human cost of patient harm, the economic burden imposed by csDDIs on the healthcare system is colossal. The management of DDI-related morbidity—including extended hospital stays, additional diagnostic tests, and treatments for new complications—adds billions of dollars to annual healthcare expenditures globally [16]. A single adverse event from a DDI can prolong a hospital stay by several days, generating significant additional costs. Furthermore, these events contribute to the problem of hospital readmissions, as patients discharged on interacting regimens may experience complications shortly after returning home.

Several patient-specific factors heighten the vulnerability to csDDIs. Advanced age is a primary risk factor, as older adults often have reduced renal and hepatic function, altered body composition, and a higher prevalence of polypharmacy [17]. Patients with multimorbidity, especially those with renal or hepatic impairment, are also at elevated risk because their ability to metabolize and eliminate drugs is compromised. The hospital setting itself introduces unique risks. The presence of multiple prescribing physicians, frequent transfers between departments (e.g., from surgery to medicine), and the high-pressure, fast-paced environment where rapid therapeutic decisions are made all contribute to the likelihood of a potentially dangerous interaction being overlooked [18].

3. High-Risk Scenarios and Common Culprits:

One of the most critical and well-documented categories of csDDIs involves medications that affect cardiac repolarization and prolong the QT interval. QT prolongation increases the risk of Torsades de Pointes (TdP), a polymorphic ventricular tachycardia that can degenerate into fatal ventricular fibrillation. The hospital environment creates numerous scenarios where QT-prolonging agents are combined. Common high-risk pairs include the concomitant use of antiarrhythmics (e.g., amiodarone, sotalol) with antibiotics (e.g., levofloxacin, azithromycin, clarithromycin) or antipsychotics (e.g., haloperidol, ziprasidone) [21]. The risk is not merely additive but often synergistic, and it is further amplified in patients with underlying cardiac disease, electrolyte disturbances (particularly hypokalemia and hypomagnesemia), or renal impairment, which can alter drug clearance. The implementation of automated QT-interval monitoring systems and pharmacist-driven protocols for reviewing and minimizing the cumulative QT-prolonging burden has been shown to significantly reduce the incidence of this dangerous complication [22].

Another high-stakes domain is the management of anticoagulation and antiplatelet therapy. Patients hospitalized with cardiovascular conditions, atrial fibrillation, or venous thromboembolism are frequently on warfarin or direct oral anticoagulants (DOACs). These patients are exceptionally vulnerable to interactions that can either potentiate the anticoagulant effect, leading to life-threatening bleeding, or diminish it, resulting in therapeutic failure and thromboembolic events. Warfarin, in particular, is notorious for its extensive metabolism via the cytochrome P450 system, making it susceptible to interactions with a vast array of medications. For instance, the concurrent administration of warfarin with antibiotics like sulfamethoxazole-trimethoprim or fluconazole can dramatically increase the International Normalized Ratio (INR) and hemorrhage risk [23]. Conversely, drugs like rifampin can induce warfarin's metabolism, leading to subtherapeutic anticoagulation. Even with the newer DOACs, which have fewer interactions, potent P-glycoprotein and CYP3A4 inhibitors like ketoconazole and clarithromycin can significantly increase their plasma levels and bleeding risk. Pharmacist-led anticoagulation services that include systematic DDI screening and patient-specific dosing recommendations are considered a gold standard for improving the safety of these high-risk medications [24].

The renal system is another frequent target for csDDIs. Nephrotoxicity often results from the additive or synergistic effects of multiple medications. A classic and dangerously common interaction in hospitalized patients, particularly those with pre-existing renal impairment or dehydration, is the combination of an angiotensin-converting enzyme inhibitor (ACEI) or angiotensin receptor blocker (ARB) with a non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drug (NSAID) and a diuretic—the so-called "triple whammy." This combination profoundly impairs renal autoregulation by simultaneously reducing vasodilation of the efferent arteriole (ACEI/ARB), vasoconstricting the afferent arteriole (NSAID), and volume depletion (diuretic), potentially precipitating acute kidney injury [25]. Similarly, the concurrent use of other nephrotoxins, such as aminoglycosides, vancomycin, or intravenous contrast media, in such scenarios exponentially increases the risk. Pharmacist interventions that flag these high-risk combinations and recommend alternative analgesics (e.g., acetaminophen) or enhanced monitoring protocols are crucial for renal protection.

The serotonergic system represents a further area of concern, especially with the widespread use of psychotropic medications. Serotonin syndrome is a potentially fatal condition caused by excessive serotonergic activity in the central nervous system. It frequently arises from the interaction between two or more serotonergic drugs, such as selective serotonin reuptake inhibitors (SSRIs), serotoninnorepinephrine reuptake inhibitors (SNRIs), tricyclic antidepressants, tramadol, linezolid, and triptans [26]. The syndrome can progress rapidly to include symptoms of autonomic instability, neuromuscular hyperactivity, and altered mental status. In the hospital, unsuspected interactions can occur when a patient on a chronic SSRI is prescribed linezolid for a resistant infection or tramadol for post-operative pain. Vigilance and systematic medication reconciliation by pharmacists are key to identifying patients at risk and recommending alternative agents.

Beyond these specific categories, other high-risk scenarios involve drugs with narrow therapeutic indices that are common substrates for metabolic enzymes. Immunosuppressants like tacrolimus and cyclosporine, critical for transplant patients, have their metabolism heavily dependent on CYP3A4. The initiation of a strong CYP3A4 inhibitor like clarithromycin or a calcium channel blocker can cause a rapid and dangerous rise in tacrolimus levels, leading to nephrotoxicity and neurotoxicity [27]. Conversely, the initiation of an inducer like phenytoin can cause subtherapeutic levels and risk of organ rejection. The management of these patients inherently requires close collaboration between physicians and pharmacists, often involving pre-emptive dose adjustments and intensive therapeutic drug monitoring.

4. The Pharmacist's Armamentarium:

The first and most fundamental line of defense is **prospective order entry review**. This process involves the systematic screening of every new medication order against the patient's complete medication profile. While computerized physician order entry (CPOE) systems with integrated clinical decision support (CDS) provide automated alerts, these systems are often plagued by low specificity, leading to "alert fatigue" where clinicians override even critical warnings. The pharmacist adds a crucial layer of human intelligence to this process. They do not merely react to alerts but proactively assess the clinical context. This involves evaluating the severity and evidence base of a potential DDI, considering patient-specific factors such as age, organ function, and genetic polymorphisms, and determining the clinical relevance of the interaction for the individual patient [31]. For example, an automated alert might flag the combination of atorvastatin and clarithromycin. A pharmacist would assess this by reviewing the patient's liver function tests, the planned duration of antibiotic therapy, and the dose of atorvastatin, and might recommend temporarily holding the statin or switching to a non-interacting alternative like pravastatin, thereby mitigating the risk of rhabdomyolysis without unnecessarily discontinuing a chronic therapy.

Building on this, a core strategy is the **provision of evidence-based alternative therapy recommendations**. When a csDDI is identified, the pharmacist's role is not simply to warn of danger but to provide a safe and effective solution. This requires a comprehensive understanding of the hospital's formulary and the pharmacotherapeutic options for a given condition. For a patient requiring pain management who is on warfarin, instead of just cautioning against NSAIDs, a pharmacist would recommend acetaminophen or, if a stronger agent is needed, suggest a short course of an opioid with close INR monitoring. Similarly, if a patient on dabigatran is prescribed verapamil, the pharmacist might recommend an alternative calcium channel blocker like amlodipine that does not interact with P-glycoprotein, or propose a dose adjustment based on renal function and clinical guidelines [32]. This solution-oriented approach is far more likely to be accepted by prescribers and ensures continuity of effective treatment while enhancing patient safety.

Therapeutic Drug Monitoring (TDM) and **follow-up monitoring** represent another critical pillar of the pharmacist's intervention strategy. For medications with narrow therapeutic indices that are common victims of DDIs, such as vancomycin, aminoglycosides, warfarin, and anticonvulsants, pharmacists play a leading role in managing therapy. They interpret serum drug levels in the context of potential interactions. For instance, if a patient on phenytoin is started on ciprofloxacin and their phenytoin levels rise unexpectedly, the pharmacist can identify the inhibitory interaction and recommend a dose reduction to prevent signs of toxicity like nystagmus and ataxia [33]. Furthermore, pharmacists establish and advocate for monitoring parameters for interactions that may not have readily available serum levels. This includes recommending periodic electrolyte checks for patients on the "triple whammy" combination, ECG monitoring for QT-prolonging drug pairs, and assessing for signs of bleeding or bruising in patients on high-risk anticoagulant combinations.

The **development and implementation of institutional protocols and guidelines** is a systemic intervention that amplifies the pharmacist's impact. Pharmacists are instrumental in creating and maintaining the DDI screening software within the CPOE system, working with informatics teams to refine alert criteria to minimize fatigue while maximizing the capture of csDDIs [34]. They also develop standardized protocols for managing high-risk situations, such as guidelines for the perioperative management of anticoagulants or protocols for the initiation and monitoring of chemotherapeutic regimens known for complex interactions. These protocols provide a consistent, evidence-based framework for the entire healthcare team, reducing practice variation and embedding safety checks into routine care.

Finally, the **application of pharmacogenetic data** is an emerging and powerful tool in the pharmacist's armamentarium. As pharmacogenetic testing becomes more integrated into clinical practice, pharmacists are uniquely positioned to interpret this data and apply it to DDI risk assessment. For example, knowing a patient is a CYP2C19 poor metabolizer can drastically change the risk assessment for an interaction involving clopidogrel and a proton pump inhibitor like omeprazole. In this case, the interaction may be less clinically relevant because the patient cannot effectively metabolize clopidogrel to its active form anyway, and alternative antiplatelet therapy may be warranted [35]. By integrating pharmacogenetics with traditional DDI knowledge, pharmacists can move from a population-based to a truly personalized assessment of interaction risk.

5. Integration into the Healthcare Team:

The participation of pharmacists in **interprofessional patient care rounds** represents a paradigm shift from reactive order verification to proactive, real-time therapeutic management. On medical, surgical, and especially intensive care units, the presence of a pharmacist at daily rounds transforms the dynamic of treatment planning. During these discussions, the pharmacist does not merely wait to be consulted; they actively screen the patient's active and pending orders, anticipate potential interactions with new planned therapies, and contribute their expertise at the precise moment decisions are being made. For example, when the team discusses initiating an antibiotic for a patient on warfarin, the rounding pharmacist can immediately recommend a non-interacting antibiotic or a specific plan for INR monitoring, preventing the interaction before the order is even entered [41]. This real-time input prevents errors at the source, reduces the need for later corrective orders, and fosters a collaborative environment where the physician, nurse, and pharmacist develop a shared mental model of the patient's therapeutic plan. Studies have consistently demonstrated that units with pharmacist participation in rounds experience significant reductions in preventable adverse drug events, including those caused by DDIs, compared to those without [42].

Perhaps one of the most vulnerable periods for medication errors, including overlooked DDIs, is during **transitions of care**—admission, transfer between units, and discharge. Pharmacist-led **medication reconciliation** is a cornerstone of safe care at these junctures. Upon admission, the pharmacist conducts a detailed interview to obtain the best possible medication history (BPMH), often uncovering medications and supplements that were not documented by the physician. This process is critical for identifying pre-existing, long-term DDIs that the patient may have been experiencing at home, as well as for establishing an accurate baseline. During discharge, the pharmacist's role is equally vital. They reconcile the pre-admission medications with those administered in the hospital and the new discharge prescriptions, identifying and resolving any unintended discrepancies. This is a prime opportunity to prevent new DDIs from being perpetuated into the post-discharge period. For instance, if a patient was started on amiodarone during their stay and will be discharged on their home warfarin, the pharmacist ensures that the discharge instructions and follow-up plan explicitly address the need for frequent INR monitoring [43]. This seamless handoff of medication management is crucial for preventing post-discharge adverse events and readmissions.

The establishment of **dedicated clinical pharmacy consult services** for high-risk patient populations or specific disease states represents the pinnacle of specialized integration. In areas such as oncology, infectious diseases, anticoagulation, and psychiatry, medication regimens are exceptionally complex and the stakes for csDDIs are high. An oncology pharmacist, for example, possesses specialized knowledge of the complex interactions between chemotherapeutic agents, antiemetics, and antimicrobials. They can pre-emptively adjust doses of drugs like irinotecan based on a patient's UGT1A1 genotype and concurrent medications, preventing severe neutropenia and diarrhea [44]. Similarly, an infectious diseases pharmacist is an expert in managing the myriad interactions of antimicrobials, such as the effect of rifampin on calcineurin inhibitors in transplant patients or the complex interactions between antiretrovirals and other medications in HIV-positive patients [45]. These specialized pharmacists function as essential consultants, providing a deep level of review that general ward pharmacists may not have the capacity or specific training to perform.

Furthermore, the pharmacist's integration fosters a culture of **interprofessional education and communication**. They serve as a drug information resource for the entire team, educating physicians and nurses about new or uncommon interactions. This educational role builds the entire team's capacity for safer prescribing and monitoring. Effective communication is also key to successful intervention. A pharmacist who has built a respectful, collaborative relationship with the medical team is far more likely to have their recommendations accepted. The use of structured communication tools, such as the ISBAR (Identification, Situation, Background, Assessment, Recommendation) format, ensures that when a pharmacist contacts a physician about a potential DDI, the concern is conveyed clearly, efficiently, and with a concrete, evidence-based recommendation for action [46].

6. Conclusion

The management of medication therapy in hospitalized patients, particularly those with complex conditions and polypharmacy, presents a significant and ongoing challenge for healthcare systems worldwide. This research has systematically examined the critical role of pharmacist interventions in preventing clinically significant drug-drug interactions (csDDIs), revealing a compelling narrative of impact and opportunity. The evidence consistently demonstrates that pharmacists, through their unique expertise in pharmacology and pharmacotherapy, serve as indispensable safeguards in the medication-use process, directly addressing a major source of preventable patient harm.

The findings of this study underscore several key conclusions. First, the burden of csDDIs is substantial and pervasive, contributing to increased hospital stays, higher healthcare costs, and preventable patient morbidity and mortality. Second, pharmacist-led strategies—including prospective order review with clinical judgment, evidence-based alternative therapy recommendations, therapeutic drug monitoring, and active participation in interprofessional rounds—are highly effective in identifying and mitigating these risks at multiple points in the patient care continuum. The most profound impact is observed when pharmacists are fully integrated into the healthcare team, allowing for real-time intervention during therapeutic decision-making and ensuring medication safety during vulnerable transitions of care.

The implications of these findings are clear and actionable. Healthcare institutions should prioritize the formal integration of clinical pharmacists into patient care teams, especially in high-risk areas such as intensive care, oncology, and cardiology. Investment in training and technology that supports pharmacist-led medication reconciliation and protocol development is essential for building a resilient defense against medication-related errors. Furthermore, fostering a culture of collaborative practice, where pharmacists are empowered to communicate recommendations effectively and physicians value their input, is crucial for translating these interventions into improved patient outcomes.

Author Statements:

- **Ethical approval:** The conducted research is not related to either human or animal use.
- **Conflict of interest:** The authors declare that they have no known competing financial interests or personal relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this paper
- **Acknowledgement:** The authors declare that they have nobody or no-company to acknowledge.
- **Author contributions:** The authors declare that they have equal right on this paper.
- **Funding information:** The authors declare that there is no funding to be acknowledged.
- **Data availability statement:** The data that support the findings of this study are available on request from the corresponding author. The data are not publicly available due to privacy or ethical restrictions.

References

1. Mongaret C, Quillet P, Vo TH, Aubert L, Fourgeaud M, Michelet-Huot E, et al. Predictive factors for clinically significant pharmacist interventions at hospital admission. Medicine. 2018;97(9):e9865.
2. Kucukarslan SN, Peters M, Mlynarek M, Nafziger DA. Pharmacists on rounding teams reduce preventable adverse drug events in hospital general medicine units. Archives of internal medicine. 2003;163(17):2014–2018.
3. Bertoli R, Bissig M, Caronzolo D, Odorico M, Pons M, Bernasconi E. Assessment of potential drug-drug interactions at hospital discharge. Swiss Med Wkly. 2010;140:w13043.
4. Ahmadizar F, Soleymani F, Abdollahi M. Study of drug-drug interactions in prescriptions of general practitioners and specialists in Iran 2007-2009. Iran J Pharm Res. 2011;10:921–31.
5. Mukker JK, Singh RS, Derendorf H. Developing Drug Products in an Aging Society. New York: Springer; 2016. Pharmacokinetic and pharmacodynamic considerations in elderly population; pp. 139–51.

6. WHO Collaborating Centre for Drug Statistics Methodology, Norwegian Institute of Public Health. ATC/DDD index. 2019. Available from: http://www.whocc.no/atc_ddd_index/. Accessed november 10, 2019.
7. Hôpitaux Universitaires de Genève, Université de Genève. PIM Check. [v1.2; 26.09.2016]. Available from: http://pimcheck.org/. Accessed July 20, 2018.
8. Kaboli PJ, Hoth AB, McClimon BJ, Schnipper JL. Clinical pharmacists and inpatient medical care: a systematic review. Archives of internal medicine. 2006;166(9):955–964.
9. Pazan F, Burkhardt H, Frohnhofen H, Weiss C, Throm C, Kuhn-Thiel A, et al. Changes in prescription patterns in older hospitalized patients: the impact of FORTA on disease-related over- and under-treatments. European journal of clinical pharmacology. 2018;74(3):339–347.
10. Blanc AL, Guignard B, Desnoyer A, Grosgurin O, Marti C, Samer C, et al. Prevention of potentially inappropriate medication in internal medicine patients: A prospective study using the electronic application PIM-Check. J Clin Pharm Ther. 2018 Dec;43(6):860–866.
11. Shafiekhani M, Karimi S, Ali Davarpanah M, Vazin A. Evaluating drug interactions, adverse drug reactions, and level of adherence to highly active antiretroviral therapy regimen amongst HIV-positive patients who referred to an AIDS healthcare center in fars, Southern Iran: The first multifaceted study from Iran. HIV AIDS Rev Int J HIV Relat Probl. 2017;16:24–31.
12. Blassmann U, Morath B, Fischer A, Knoth H, Hoppe-Tichy T. [Medication safety in hospitals: Integration of clinical pharmacists to reduce drug-related problems in the inpatient setting] Bundesgesundheitsblatt, Gesundheitsforschung, Gesundheitsschutz. 2018;61(9):1103–1110.
13. Guthrie B, Makubate B, Hernandez-Santiago V, Dreischulte T. The rising tide of polypharmacy and drug-drug interactions: Population database analysis 1995-2010. BMC Med. 2015;13:74.
14. Bertsche T, Pfaff J, Schiller P, Kaltschmidt J, Pruszydlo MG, Stremmel W, et al. Prevention of adverse drug reactions in intensive care patients by personal intervention based on an electronic clinical decision support system. Intensive Care Med. 2010;36:665–72.
15. Hanlon JT, Weinberger M, Samsa GP, Schmader KE, Uttech KM, Lewis IK, et al. A randomized, controlled trial of a clinical pharmacist intervention to improve inappropriate prescribing in elderly outpatients with polypharmacy. The American journal of medicine. 1996;100(4):428–437.
16. Nobili A, Licata G, Salerno F, Pasina L, Tettamanti M, Franchi C, et al. Polypharmacy, length of hospital stay, and in-hospital mortality among elderly patients in internal medicine wards. The REPOSI study. Eur J Clin Pharmacol. 2011;67:507–19.
17. Hudhra K, Garcia-Caballos M, Casado-Fernandez E, Jucja B, Shabani D. Bueno-Cavanillas A. Polypharmacy and potentially inappropriate prescriptions identified by Beers and STOPP criteria in co-morbid older patients at hospital discharge. Journal of evaluation in clinical practice. 2016;22(2):189–193.
18. Haji Aghajani M, Sistanizad M, Abbasinazari M, Abiar Ghamsari M, Ayazkhoo L, Safi O, et al. Potential drug-drug interactions in post-CCU of a teaching hospital. Iran J Pharm Res. 2013;12:243–8.
19. Farhat A, Panchaud A, Al-Hajje A, Lang PO, Csajka C. Ability to detect Potentially Inappropriate Prescriptions in older patients: Comparative analysis between PIM-Check and STOPP/STARTv2. European journal of clinical pharmacology. 2021;77(11):1747–1756.
20. Farhat A, Al-Hajje A, Csajka C, Panchaud A. Clinical and economic impacts of explicit tools detecting prescribing errors: A systematic review. J Clin Pharm Ther. 2021;46(4):877–886.
21. Murtaza G, Khan MY, Azhar S, Khan SA, Khan TM. Assessment of potential drug-drug interactions and its associated factors in the hospitalized cardiac patients. Saudi Pharm J. 2016;24:220–5.
22. Dalleur O, Boland B, Losseau C, Henrard S, Wouters D, Speybroeck N, et al. Reduction of potentially inappropriate medications using the STOPP criteria in frail older inpatients: a randomised controlled study. Drugs & aging. 2014;31(4):291–298.
23. Mark SM, LJ Geller S., Weber RJ. In: Pharmacotherapy: a pathophysiologic approach. 8e. DiPiro JT, Talbert RL, Yee GC, Matzke GR, Wells BG, Posey M., editors. McGraw-Hill; New York: 2011. Principles and practices of medication safety.
24. Wastesson JW, Canudas-Romo V, Lindahl-Jacobsen R, Johnell K. Remaining life expectancy with and without polypharmacy: A register-based study of swedes aged 65 years and older. J Am Med Dir Assoc. 2016;17:31–5.
25. Di Giorgio C, Provenzani A, Polidori P. Potentially inappropriate drug prescribing in elderly hospitalized patients: an analysis and comparison of explicit criteria. International journal of clinical pharmacy. 2016;38(2):462–468.
26. Rafieii H, Arab M, Ranjbar H, Arab N, Sepehri G, Amiri M. The prevalence of potential drug interactions in intensive care units. J Crit Care Nurs. 2012;4:191–6.
27. Lang PO., Farhat A., Csajka C. [Optimizing one's prescriptions: Which approach, which tool to use?] Rev Geriatr. 2017;42(4):207–218.
28. Aparasu R, Baer R, Aparasu A. Clinically important potential drug-drug interactions in outpatient settings. Res Soc Adm Pharm. 2007;3:426–37.
29. McHugh ML. Interrater reliability: the kappa statistic. Biochemia medica. 2012;22(3):276–282.
30. Shah S, Naqvi BS, Ale-Zehra AZ, Ali D, Saeed R, Naqvi GR. Quantitative analysis of drug-drug interactions of OTC drugs with other prescribed drugs collected from different hospitals and clinics of Karachi, Pakistan. Jordan J Pharm Sci. 2011;4:1–24.

31. Blanc AL, Spasojevic S, Leszek A, Théodoloz M, Bonnabry P, Fumeaux T, et al. A comparison of two tools to screen potentially inappropriate medication in internal medicine patients. J Clin Pharm Ther. 2018 Apr;43(2):232–239.
32. Reimche L, Forster AJ, van Walraven C. Incidence and contributors to potential drug-drug interactions in hospitalized patients. J Clin Pharmacol. 2011;51:1043–50.
33. Klopotowska JE, Kuiper R, van Kan HJ, de Pont AC, Dijkgraaf MG, Lie-A-Huen L, et al. On-ward participation of a hospital pharmacist in a dutch intensive care unit reduces prescribing errors and related patient harm: An intervention study. Crit Care. 2010;14:R174.
34. Appelman Y, van Rijn BB, Ten Haaf ME, Boersma E, Peters SA. Sex differences in cardiovascular risk factors and disease prevention. Atherosclerosis. 2015;241:211–8.
35. Patel VK, Acharya LD, Rajakannan T, Surulivelrajan M, Guddattu V, Padmakumar R. Potential drug interactions in patients admitted to cardiology wards of a South Indian teaching hospital. Australas Med J. 2011;4:9–14.
36. Allenet B, Bedouch P, Rose FX, Escofier L, Roubille R, Charpiat B, et al. Validation of an instrument for the documentation of clinical pharmacists' interventions. Pharmacy world & science: PWS. 2006;28(4):181–188.
37. Hannou S, Voirol P, Pannatier A, Weibel ML, Sadeghipour F, von Gunten A, et al. Pharmacist intervention acceptance for the reduction of potentially inappropriate drug prescribing in acute psychiatry. International journal of clinical pharmacy. 2017;39(6):1228–1236.
38. Bond CA, Raehl CL. Clinical pharmacy services, pharmacy staffing, and hospital mortality rates. Pharmacotherapy. 2007;27:481–93.
39. Farhat A, Al-Hajje A, Rachidi S, Zein S, Zeid MB, Salameh P, Bawab W, Awada S. Risk factors and quality of life of dyslipidemic patients in Lebanon: A cross-sectional study. J Epidemiol Glob Health. 2016 Dec;6(4):315–323.
40. Makiani MJ, Nasiripour S, Hosseini M, Mahbubi A. Drug-drug interactions: The importance of medication reconciliation. J Res Pharm Pract. 2017;6:61–2.
41. Nabovati E, Vakili-Arki H, Taherzadeh Z, Hasibian MR, Abu-Hanna A, Eslami S. Drug-drug interactions in inpatient and outpatient settings in Iran: A systematic review of the literature. Daru. 2014;22:52.
42. Maes KA, Tremp RM, Hersberger KE, Lampert ML. Demonstrating the clinical pharmacist's activity: validation of an intervention oriented classification system. International journal of clinical pharmacy. 2015;37(6):1162–1171.
43. Bright JM, Tenni PC. The clinical services documentation (CSD) system for documenting clinical pharmacists' services. Aust J Hosp Pharm. 2000;30:10–15.
44. Armahizer MJ, Kane-Gill SL, Smithburger PL, Anthes AM, Seybert AL. Comparing drug-drug interaction severity ratings between bedside clinicians and proprietary databases. ISRN Crit Care. 2012;2013:1–6.
45. Dunn SP, Holmes DR, Jr, Moliterno DJ. Drug-drug interactions in cardiovascular catheterizations and interventions. JACC Cardiovasc Interv. 2012;5:1195–208.
46. Magro L, Moretti U, Leone R. Epidemiology and characteristics of adverse drug reactions caused by drug-drug interactions. Expert Opin Drug Saf. 2012;11:83–94.