

# Micromedex<sup>®</sup> solutions drug interactions policy

## Data Sheet

### Background

A drug interaction is defined as a clinically meaningful alteration in the exposure and/or response to a drug that has occurred as a result of the co-administration of another drug<sup>14</sup>. Monitoring and alerting for drug interactions is an important role of clinicians.

The use of clinical decision support (CDS) systems in health systems can improve medical documentation, reduce errors, and improve patient safety<sup>1</sup>. An important part of CDS systems is drug interaction information. The Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS) include drug interaction CDS alerts in their meaningful use guidelines for electronic health records<sup>2</sup>. Research shows that both prescribers and pharmacists are often unable to recognize potential drug interactions when presented outside a CDS tool, making the use of CDS systems a significant part of the workflow for clinicians<sup>1,3</sup>. Unfortunately, the use of CDS systems does not show consistent reductions in drug interaction interventions, based on reviewing the number of alerts generated and acted on by prescribers<sup>4,5</sup>.

In an effort to be all-inclusive, current systems alert for drug interactions with limited clinical relevance and may extrapolate drug interactions to other drugs in the same therapeutic and pharmacologic class<sup>6</sup>. Current systems also include theoretical drug interactions which are not supported by current medical evidence but are based solely on theoretical lists from manufacturers or other sources. Excess alerts may lead to alert fatigue and inappropriate drug interaction overrides by the clinician<sup>7</sup>. Clinically important drug interactions may be missed in the “noise” of many non-clinically relevant interactions. Research shows clinicians have high override rates for drug interactions. A recent study showed physicians override of drug interaction alerts 95% of the time<sup>8</sup>. Past estimates range from 33% to 96%<sup>9,10</sup>. Experts recommend reducing alert fatigue by lowering the number of alerts presented to clinicians and by increasing alert specificity<sup>7,11,12,13,14</sup>. A recent expert group also recommended drug compendia and CDS systems do not necessarily need to align with product labeling if the labeling is not consistent with existing evidence in order to prevent excess noise and alert fatigue<sup>14</sup>. It is critical that busy clinicians are provided with only clinically relevant, evidence-based drug interaction information.

## Action

As the industry leader in providing clinically relevant, evidence-based drug information for clinical users, Micromedex is committed to helping solve the problem of drug interactions. Micromedex Solutions has aligned with the recommendations of the drug interaction experts<sup>14</sup>. Drug interactions in Micromedex meet specific criteria, including:

1. Contraindicated drug interactions
2. Specifically named substances from the source document that have a clinically actionable recommendation or where a clinically important effect occurs<sup>3</sup>.
3. Drug interactions supported by evidence-based published medical literature:
  - Human study of 6 or more subjects
  - In vivo study with validated substrates, inhibitors, or inducers
  - Case reports with Drug Interaction Probability Scale (DIPS) score of 5 or greater (Probable), using the DRug Interaction eVidence Evaluation Instrument (DRIVE)<sup>144</sup>
4. Pharmacodynamic drug interactions — are also called additive adverse effects. These drug interactions are created if they fulfill another rule above (e.g., are contraindicated) or are one of the following types that commonly result in patient harm:
  - Anticoagulants
  - Hypoglycemic Agents
  - Respiratory depressants
  - QT Prolongation
  - Serotonin syndrome-producing agents

The following drug interactions are not created in Micromedex Solutions content:

1. Negative drug interactions
2. Moderate or weak inhibitors/inducers unless meet other criteria
3. Based solely on in vitro or animal data
4. Occur outside of therapeutic dosages
5. The stated effect is not clinically relevant (e.g., when clinical relevance is not supported by additional literature or when a causal relationship between drug interaction and effect is poorly established)
6. Interactions caused by disease states

Drugs are often inhibitors, inducers, or substrates of specific enzymes or transporters that may affect drug interactions. Micromedex Solutions has developed clinically sound, evidence-based criteria to determine which drugs belong on which enzyme and transporter lists. Lists are available in the Micromedex Solutions product by going to Drug Interactions in the Drug Consults list. Clinicians also may use the lists to verify if alternative agents are also affected by a drug interaction, helping the clinician make informed decisions for their patients.

Micromedex drug interactions continue to be classified by Severity, Onset, and Documentation. In addition, Micromedex Solutions provides an Interaction Effect, Clinical Management, and Probable Mechanism along with Literature Reports for each drug interaction. The new, streamlined alerts will minimize noise and decrease the risk of alert fatigue, providing clinicians with the evidence-based material needed to make clinically sound decisions for every patient, every time.

## Footnotes

- <sup>1</sup>Glassman P, Simon B, Belperio P, Lanto A. Improving recognition of drug interactions: benefits and barriers to using automated drug alerts. *Med Care* 2002; 40 (12): 1161–1171.
- <sup>2</sup>Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services. Eligible Professional Meaningful Use Core Measures: Measure 2 of 13. Stage 1 (2014 Definition). US Dept of Health and Human Services. Cited June 24, 2015. Available from: [http://www.cms.gov/Regulations-and-Guidance/Legislation/EHRIncentivePrograms/downloads/2\\_Drug\\_Interaction\\_ChecksEP.pdf](http://www.cms.gov/Regulations-and-Guidance/Legislation/EHRIncentivePrograms/downloads/2_Drug_Interaction_ChecksEP.pdf).
- <sup>3</sup>Ko Y, Malone D, Skrepnek G. Prescribers' knowledge of and sources of information for potential drug–drug interactions; a postal survey of US prescribers. *Drug Saf* 2008; 31: 525–536.
- <sup>4</sup>Smithburger PL, Buckley MS, Bejian S, et al. A critical evaluation of clinical decision support for the detection of drug–drug interactions (expert opinion). *Drug Saf* 2011; 10 (6): 871–882.
- <sup>5</sup>Duke JD, Li X, Dexter P. Adherence to drug–drug interaction alerts in high-risk patients: a trial of context-enhanced alerting. *J Am Med Inform Assoc* 2013; 20 (3): 494–498.
- <sup>6</sup>Hansten PD, Horn JR, Hazlet TK. ORCA: OpeRational ClassificAtion of drug interactions. *J Am Pharm Assoc (Wash)*. 2001 Mar-Apr;41(2):161-5.
- <sup>7</sup>van der Sijs H, Aarts J, Vulto A, et al. Overriding of drug safety alerts in computerized physician order entry. *J Am Med Inform Assoc* 2006;13:8e47.
- <sup>8</sup>Bryant AD, Fletcher GS, Payne TH. Drug interaction alert override rates in the Meaningful Use era: no evidence of progress. *Appl Clin Inform*. 2014 Sep 3;5(3):802-13. doi: 10.4338/ACI-2013-12-RA-0103. eCollection 2014.
- <sup>9</sup>Taylor LK, Tamblyn R. Reasons for physician non-adherence to electronic drug alerts. *Stud Health Technol Inform* 2004;107:1101e15.
- <sup>10</sup>Shah NR, Seger AC, Seger DL, et al. Improving acceptance of computerized prescribing alerts in ambulatory care. *J Am Med Inform Assoc* 2006;13:5e11.
- <sup>11</sup>Kuperman GJ, Bobb A, Payne TH, et al. Medication-related clinical decision support in computerized provider order entry systems: a review. *J Am Med Inform Assoc* 2007;14: 29e40.
- <sup>12</sup>Paterno MD, Maviglia SM, Gorman PN, et al. Tiering drug–drug interaction alerts by severity increases compliance rates. *J Am Med Inform Assoc* 2009;16:40e6.
- <sup>13</sup>Weingart SN, Toth M, Sands DZ, Aronson MD, Davis RB, Phillips RS. Physicians' decisions to override computerized drug alerts in primary care. *Arch Intern Med*. 2003 Nov 24;163(21):2625-31.
- <sup>14</sup>Scheife RT, Hines LE, Boyce RD, Chung SP, Momper JD, Sommer CD, et al. Consensus recommendations for systematic evaluation of drug–drug interaction evidence for clinical decision support. *Drug Saf*. 2015 Feb;38(2):197-206.

© Copyright Merative US L.P. 2023  
Merative  
100 Phoenix Drive  
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48108

Produced in the United States of America  
December 2023

Merative, the Merative logo and Micromedex are trademarks of Merative in the United States, other countries or both. All other company or product names are registered trademarks or trademarks of their respective companies.

This document is current as of the initial date of publication and may be changed by Merative at any time. Not all offerings are available in every country in which Merative operates.

The information in this document is provided "as is" without any warranty, express or implied, including without any warranties of merchantability, fitness for a particular purpose and any warranty or condition of non-infringement. Merative products are warranted according to the terms and conditions of the agreements under which they are provided.

The client is responsible for ensuring compliance with all applicable laws and regulations applicable to it. Merative does not provide legal advice or represent or warrant that its services or products will ensure that the client is in compliance with any law or regulation. The performance data and client examples cited are presented for illustrative purposes only. Actual performance results may vary depending on the specific configurations and operating conditions. It is the user's responsibility to evaluate and verify the operation of any other products or programs with Merative product and programs.

Statement of Good Security Practices: IT system security involves protecting systems and information through prevention, detection and response to improper access from within and outside your enterprise. Improper access can result in information being altered, destroyed, misappropriated or misused or can result in damage to or misuse of your systems, including for use in attacks on others. No IT system or product should be considered completely secure and no single product, service or security measure can be completely effective in preventing improper use or access. Merative systems, products and services are designed to be part of a lawful, comprehensive security approach, which will necessarily involve additional operational procedures, and may require other systems, products or services to be most effective. Merative does not warrant that any systems, product or services are immune from, or will make your enterprise immune from, the malicious or illegal conduct of any party.

## About Merative

Merative provides data and software for healthcare and government social services. With focused innovation and deep expertise, Merative works with providers, employers, health plans, governments, and life science companies to drive real progress. Merative helps clients orient information and insights around the people they serve to improve decision-making and performance. Merative, formerly IBM Watson Health, became a new standalone company as part of Francisco Partners in 2022. Learn more at [merative.com](https://merative.com).