ABSTRACT

Background: Clinically relevant drug–drug interactions (DDIs) must be recognized in a timely manner and managed appropriately to prevent adverse drug reactions or therapeutic failure. Because the evidence for most DDIs is based on case reports or poorly documented clinical information, there is a need for better assessment of their clinical relevance.

Objective: This study evaluates the interdisciplinary agreement between rheumatologists and clinical (hospital) pharmacists in assessing the clinical relevance of DDIs with disease-modifying antirheumatic drugs (DMARDs) and non-DMARD medications.

Methods: Potential DDIs were identified from the medical literature using MEDLINE and EMBASE for the years 1968–2009. The following search terms were used for the key word, title, and abstract sections of the publications: interaction(s), DMARD, disease-modifying antirheumatic drug(s), antirheumatic, rheumatology, rheumatoid arthritis, and the names of the individual DMARDs of interest (abatacept, adalimumab, anakinra, auranofin, aurothioglucose, aurothiomalate, d-penicillamine, etanercept, gold, [hydroxy]-chloroquine, interleukin-1 receptor antagonist, IL1-RA, infliximab, leflunomide, methotrexate, rituximab, and sulfasalazine/sulphasalazine). Reference lists of the retrieved publications were searched for further information on potential DDIs. All pharmacodynamic or pharmacokinetic DDIs between a DMARD and a non-DMARD identified were included in the study, with the exception of evidence regarding DMARD doses higher than used in the treatment of rheumatoid arthritis and interactions with phytotherapeutic or homeopathic preparations. Using a standard information set for each DDI (eg, from product labeling, textbooks, and the medical literature), a group of rheumatologists and a group of clinical pharmacists independently assessed whether the individual drug–DMARD combinations interacted and whether they required immediate intervention. Both groups consisted of 3 members (2 men and 1 woman), aged 40 to 60 years, who had >5 years of clinical experience and were currently involved in clinical practice in large, nonacademic teaching hospitals in the Netherlands.

Results: Forty potential DDIs with DMARDs were retrieved and assessed by the 2 groups. For 30 (75%) of these, rheumatologists and clinical pharmacists agreed about the requirement for immediate intervention. Specifically, 17 drug combinations (43%) were judged to interact and to require immediate intervention, and 13 combinations (33%) were judged either
not to interact or to interact but not to require immediate intervention. For 10 combinations (25%), rheumatologists and clinical pharmacists were not in agreement. Overall, agreement between the groups was good \( (\kappa = 0.80) \) for judging whether the drug combinations were interactions, and agreement was fair \( (\kappa = 0.39) \) for judging whether immediate intervention was required. Prospective analysis of the data showed that rheumatologists tended to recommend immediate intervention more often when the adverse reaction to the DDI involved an increased risk of toxicity of the DMARD. In contrast, clinical pharmacists more often advocated immediate intervention when the adverse reaction involved decreased effectiveness of the DMARD.

**Conclusion:** For a subset of DMARD–drug combinations, rheumatologists and clinical pharmacists differed in their assessments of clinical relevance. *(Clin Ther. 2009;31:1737–1746) © 2009 Excerpta Medica Inc.*
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**INTRODUCTION**

Pharmacotherapy is the mainstay of treatment for rheumatoid arthritis. Because of advanced age and the presence of comorbid conditions in this population, patients may receive multiple medications and hence are at risk for drug–drug interactions (DDIs). To prevent potential adverse drug reactions or therapeutic failure, clinically relevant DDIs must be recognized in a timely manner and managed appropriately.

Although information on potential DDIs is available from reviews, product leaflets, textbooks, and the medical literature, several barriers impede recognition of the clinical importance of a DDI. The evidence for most DDIs is based on case reports or poorly documented clinical information. Drug-interaction compendia are inconsistent in their grading of the relevance of DDIs. Manual recognition of potentially relevant DDIs, in contrast to computer-generated alerts, has been reported to miss many DDIs that are potentially clinically relevant and to result in a large variety of detected DDIs among individual observers. Although computerized drug-interaction alert systems (CISs) may improve sensitivity for the recognition of potentially relevant DDIs, they have a number of important drawbacks. Pharmacists and doctors believe that these systems yield a large number of DDIs with questionable or unclear clinical relevance while failing to detect all relevant DDIs. Furthermore, these systems fail to provide identifiable patient- and medication-related risk factors. These shortcomings allow users to doubt the quality of the system and to ignore DDI alerts. For these reasons, a transparent and reproducible assessment of potential DDIs is essential before drug combinations are entered into a CIS.

The Working Group on Pharmacotherapy and Drug Information, responsible for the maintenance of the CIS of the Royal Dutch Association for the Advancement of Pharmacy, developed a structured assessment for potential DDIs in an effort to reach a transparent and reproducible assessment procedure. The assessment is based on the evaluation of 4 core parameters of DDIs: the quality of the evidence on the specific DDI; the severity of the adverse reaction to the DDI; patient, medication, or disease characteristics that increase the risk of adverse reactions to the drug combination; and the incidence of adverse reactions when the combination is given. These 4 core parameters are equally weighted in a multidisciplinary assessment. On the basis of this assessment, drug combinations are selected for incorporation into the CIS.

Although the perception of sensitivity and specificity of the alerts generated by the CIS may improve with the use of a structured assessment procedure, differences may exist in the assessment of clinical relevance between medical and pharmacologic specialties. When these differences are not considered, the sensitivity and specificity of the CIS alerts may be perceived as suboptimal. A search of the literature did not identify any studies on the difference between medical specialty groups in the assessment of the clinical relevance of DDIs in rheumatology. We therefore performed a study to compare and contrast the assessments of rheumatologists and clinical (hospital) pharmacists regarding the clinical relevance of DDIs with various disease-modifying antirheumatic drugs (DMARDs) and other medications.

**METHODS**

**Selection of Potential Drug–Drug Interactions**

Using product leaflets and textbooks, we identified potential DDIs with drugs used as DMARDs. We also searched the medical literature using MEDLINE for the years 1968–2009, with the
following search terms for the key word, title, and abstract sections of the publications: interaction(s), DMARD, disease-modifying antirheumatic drug(s), antirheumatic, rheumatology, rheumatoid arthritis, and the names of the individual DMARDs of interest (abatacept, adalimumab, anakinra, auranofin, aurothioglucose, aurothiomalate, D-penicillamine, etanercept, gold, [hydroxy]chloroquine, interleukin-1 receptor antagonist, IL1-RA, infliximab, leflunomide, methotrexate, rituximab, and sulfasalazine/sulphasalazine). Reference lists of the retrieved publications were searched for further information on potential DDIs.

All potential DDIs with DMARDs were included except for the following. First, we excluded combinations of 2 DMARDs, DMARDs with systemic corticosteroids, and DMARDs with NSAIDs because, in most cases, these medications are combined by rheumatologists intentionally to improve clinical response. Although we are well aware of the (relative) contraindications for the combination of NSAIDs with methotrexate, anti–tumor necrosis factor-α antagonists with rituximab, or drugs with overlapping toxicity profiles (eg, hepatotoxicity), these combinations were not assessed in this study. Second, we excluded combinations when the evidence for potential DDIs was based on dose levels far higher than those used in the treatment of rheumatoid arthritis (eg, methotrexate or azathioprine at doses used in oncology, or chloroquine as an antimalarial agent). Third, we excluded combinations of DMARDs with food supplements or phytotherapeutic or homeopathic preparations. Finally, we excluded pharmaceutical DDIs (eg, incompatibilities in pharmaceutical containers with solutions for parenteral administration).

Assessment of Potential Drug–Drug Interactions

Standard Information Package for Each Interaction

For every potential DDI, a standard data set was prepared containing comprehensive information on the 4 core parameters of the DDI, as described earlier.16 These included the following: (1) the quality level of the evidence on the drug combination, categorized from 0 to 416; (2) a description of the adverse reaction from the combination, including the severity and the mechanism of the DDI; (3) characteristics of the patient (eg, age, sex, disease (eg, renal and hepatic function), or medication (eg, dose, route of administration) when the risk of an adverse reaction from the potential DDI is dependent on these characteristics; and (4) the incidence of the adverse reaction when the combination is administered, according to the literature. The quality level of evidence for DDIs was defined as follows16: category 0 indicated pharmacodynamic animal studies, in vitro studies with limited predictive value for the human in vivo situation, or “data on file”; category 1 indicated incomplete case reports (no rechallenge or dechallenge; presence of factors other than a DDI that explain the adverse reaction); category 2 indicated well-documented case reports or retrospective analyses of case series; category 3 indicated controlled interaction studies with surrogate end points; and category 4 indicated controlled interaction studies with clinically relevant end points. The standard data set also contained the main publications on the DDI. These publications could either support or deny the existence of the DDI. All of the information in the standard data set was provided electronically as well as on paper.

Expert Assessment

On the basis of the standard data set for each potential DDI, 3 rheumatologists and 3 clinical pharmacists were asked to assess the DDI individually. The rheumatologists and clinical pharmacists were selected on the basis of >5 years of clinical experience and current involvement in clinical practice. The rheumatologists and clinical pharmacists (2 men and 1 woman in both groups; aged 40–60 years) all worked in large, nonacademic teaching hospitals in the Netherlands.

The following 2 questions, which required a “yes” or “no” response, were used to assess the potential DDIs: (1) “On the basis of the information provided about the DDI, would you conclude that this combination of drugs will interact?” and (2) “When you judge this combination to interact, is any immediate intervention required?” Immediate intervention was defined as any action required at the moment the combination is recognized to prevent medication-related problems such as adverse drug reactions or suboptimal efficacy, as judged by the individual rheumatologist or clinical pharmacist on the basis of the evidence presented. Potential immediate interventions included the following: adjusted monitoring of therapy effectiveness or tolerability in the near future, adjusted provision of patient education about potential symptoms indicating adverse effects, appointments for therapeutic drug monitoring, dose adjustments, or prescription of an alternative drug.
Data Analysis

For both specialty groups (rheumatologists and clinical pharmacists), the data from the individual assessments were pooled separately. Outcomes per group were based on the opinion of the majority. On the basis of these assessments, the potential DDIs were divided into 3 groups: (1) drug combinations judged by both specialty groups as DDIs that require immediate intervention; (2) combinations judged by both specialty groups as either not interacting and therefore not requiring immediate intervention, or interacting but not requiring immediate intervention; and (3) combinations for which the rheumatologists and clinical pharmacists disagreed whether the combination interacted or whether immediate intervention was required.

The adverse reaction of each individual drug combination was prospectively grouped into 1 of 5 categories: (1) increased toxicity of the DMARD or (2) the non-DMARD, (3) decreased effectiveness of the DMARD or (4) the non-DMARD, or (5) other. When the adverse reaction of the DDI involved increased toxicity associated with both the DMARD and the non-DMARD individually, this toxicity was categorized as “increased toxicity of the DMARD.”

Statistical Analysis

Assessments of the DDIs per specialty group were presented using 2 × 2 tables. To assess the interobserver variability, Cohen’s κ was calculated. The κ values of <0.20, 0.21 to 0.40, 0.41 to 0.60, 0.61 to 0.80, and 0.81 to 1.00 were classified as poor, fair, moderate, good, or very good agreement, respectively, between the specialty groups. Differences in assessments of clinical relevance between the specialty groups per adverse-reaction category were analyzed using the nonparametric McNemar test in SPSS 13.0 (SPSS Inc., Chicago, Illinois). P < 0.05 was considered significant.

RESULTS

Selection of Potential Drug–Drug Interactions

Forty potentially interacting drug combinations with DMARDs were identified within the selection criteria. The highest level of evidence found for the potential DDIs was level 3 in 57%, level 2 in 5%, level 1 in 18%, and level 0 in 20%. Level-4 evidence was not found for any of the drug combinations. No evidence for DDIs with biologic agents was found.
both groups either not to interact or to interact but not to require immediate intervention.\textsuperscript{46–58} Table IV outlines the 10 drug combinations (25\%) for which the rheumatologists and clinical pharmacists disagreed.\textsuperscript{59–70}

Table V shows the expert opinions about the need for immediate intervention according to the adverse-reaction category. Rheumatologists, compared with clinical pharmacists, tended to recommend immediate intervention more often for drug combinations with an increased risk of toxicity of the DMARD. Rheumatologists and clinical pharmacists tended to differ in their assessments of individual drug combinations when the adverse reaction involved decreased effectiveness of the DMARD; specifically, clinical pharmacists were more likely to judge the combination as requiring immediate intervention.

After excluding the drug combinations that did not interact and did not require immediate intervention according to both specialty groups, 27 of the 40 combinations remained. Both groups achieved a sensitivity of 81\% for these combinations (ie, both groups identified 22 of 27 combinations as requiring immediate intervention). Specificity for both groups was 19\% (ie, for 5 of

---

**Table II.** Drug combinations with disease-modifying antirheumatic drugs (DMARDs) assessed by both specialty groups as drug–drug interactions requiring immediate intervention.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DMARD</th>
<th>Combining Agent</th>
<th>Level of Evidence*</th>
<th>Adverse Reaction</th>
<th>Ref</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Azathioprine</td>
<td>Allopurinol</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>↑Azathioprine toxicity</td>
<td>20, 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Doxorubicin</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>↑Hepatotoxicity</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Warfarin</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>↓Anticoagulant activity</td>
<td>23, 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chloroquine</td>
<td>Praziquantel</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>↓AUC praziquantel by 65%</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Drugs that increase the QT interval</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>↑Cardiac arrhythmia</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-penicillamine</td>
<td>Digoxin</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>↓AUC digoxin by 40%–64%</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Iron salts</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>↓AUC D-penicillamine by 35%–60%</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hydroxychloroquine</td>
<td>Cardiac glycosides</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>↑C\textsubscript{max} digoxin by 4-fold</td>
<td>28, 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leflunomide</td>
<td>Activated charcoal/resins</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>↓Plasma t\textsubscript{1/2} of A77 1726 by 10-fold</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Warfarin</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>↑Anticoagulant activity</td>
<td>31, 32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methotrexate</td>
<td>Acitretin/retinoids</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>↑Hepatotoxicity due to ↑AUC MTX</td>
<td>33–35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cotrimoxazole/trimethoprim</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>↑Bone marrow depression</td>
<td>36–39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Isoniazid</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>↑Hepatotoxicity</td>
<td>40, 41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Probenecid</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>↑C\textsubscript{24h} MTX by 3- to 4-fold</td>
<td>42, 43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sulfasalazine</td>
<td>Digoxin</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>↓AUC digoxin by 50%</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Isoniazid</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>↑Hepatotoxicity</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Talinolol</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>↓AUC talinolol by 90%</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ref = references; ↑ = increase or increased risk; ↓ = decrease or decreased risk; A77 1726 = active metabolite of leflunomide; MTX = methotrexate.

*Category 0 = pharmacodynamic animal studies, in vitro studies with limited predictive value for the human in vivo situation, or “data on file”; category 1 = incomplete case reports (no rechallenge or dechallenge; presence of factors other than a drug–drug interaction that explain the adverse reaction); category 2 = well-documented case reports or retrospective analyses of case series; category 3 = controlled interaction studies with surrogate end points; category 4 = controlled interaction studies with clinically relevant end points.
nations had information on the existence of a potential DDI. 71 When translating these results to the population with rheumatoid arthritis, one may also expect underreporting of potentially clinically relevant DDIs with DMARDs. Guidelines for research on potential DDIs for newly registered drugs72 may expand our knowledge of potential DDIs. However, drugs that have been marketed for several years may lack this information. This is reflected by the relatively high proportion (43%) of combinations in our study with evidence quality categorized as grade 0 to 2 and the lack of grade-4 evidence for any of the combinations.

In our study, immediate intervention was broadly defined as any action taken to prevent medication-related problems (eg, adverse drug reactions or suboptimal efficacy) or to avoid the interaction. Differences in judgment between the specialty groups may be due to differing perceptions about the degree to which the DDI can be controlled (eg, the likelihood of preventing the adverse reaction). For example, when the drug

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DMARD</th>
<th>Combining Agent</th>
<th>Level of Evidence</th>
<th>Adverse Reaction</th>
<th>Ref</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aurothiomalate</td>
<td>ACE inhibitors</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Nitritoid reactions</td>
<td>46, 47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Azathioprine</td>
<td>Lamivudine</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>↑ Pancreatitis</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mycophenolate mofetil</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>↑ Hematologic toxicity</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ACE inhibitors</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>↑ Neutropenia and ↑ anemia</td>
<td>50, 51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chloroquine</td>
<td>Codeine</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>↓ Analgesic effectiveness of codeine</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Metronidazole</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Acute dystonia</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Neuromuscular blocking agents</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>↑ Neuromuscular blockade</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mefloquine</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>↑ QT-interval prolongation, ↑ convulsions, ↑ mefloquine plasma concentrations</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-penicillamine</td>
<td>Clozapine</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>↑ Agranulocytosis</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oral contraceptives</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>↑ Macromastia</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tricyclic antidepressants</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>↑ Myasthenia gravis</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gold salts</td>
<td>Chelating agents</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Changes in gold distribution and elimination</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methotrexate</td>
<td>Theophylline</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>↓ Theophylline clearance</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ref = references; ACE = angiotensin-converting enzyme; ↑ = increase or increased risk; ↓ = decrease or decreased risk.
*The drug combinations were judged either not to interact or to interact but not to require immediate intervention.
†For explanation of categories, see Table II.
### Table IV. Drug combinations with disease-modifying antirheumatic drugs (DMARDs) for which rheumatologists and clinical pharmacists disagreed about whether the combination interacted or whether immediate intervention was required.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DMARD</th>
<th>Combining Agent</th>
<th>Level of Evidence*</th>
<th>Adverse Reaction</th>
<th>Immediate Intervention?</th>
<th>Ref</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Azathioprine</td>
<td>Cotrimoxazole</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>↑ Neutropenia/thrombocytopenia</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chloroquine</td>
<td>Cimetidine</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>↓ Elimination of chloroquine</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Magnesium trisilicate/kaolin</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>↓ AUC chloroquine</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-penicillamine</td>
<td>Antacids</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>↓ AUC D-penicillamine by 30%-40%</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L-dopa</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>↑ AUC L-dopa by 50%</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leflunomide</td>
<td>Itraconazole</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>↑ Hepatotoxicity</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rifampicin</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>↑ C&lt;sub&gt;max&lt;/sub&gt; A77 1726 by 40%</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methotrexate</td>
<td>Penicillins</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>↑ MTX toxicity</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sulfasalazine</td>
<td>Ampicillin/ rifampicin</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>↓ AUC sulfapyridine by 60%-65%</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Iron salts</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>↓ C&lt;sub&gt;3h&lt;/sub&gt; sulfasalazine</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ref = references; ↑ = increase or increased risk; ↓ = decrease or decreased risk; A77 1726 = active metabolite of leflunomide; MTX = methotrexate.

*For explanation of categories, see Table II.

### Table V. Assessments of the need for immediate intervention according to adverse-reaction category for drug combinations with disease-modifying antirheumatic drugs (DMARDs) by the 2 specialty groups.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adverse-Reaction Category</th>
<th>No. of Combinations in Category</th>
<th>Requiring Immediate Intervention</th>
<th>P*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increased toxicity of DMARD</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decreased effectiveness of DMARD</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased toxicity of non-DMARD</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decreased effectiveness of non-DMARD</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Differences in assessments between the specialty groups per adverse-reaction category were analyzed using the nonparametric McNemar test.
Combination shows an interaction based on decreased absorption from the gastrointestinal tract due to complexation (e.g., chloroquine/magnesium trisilicate, D-penicillamine/antacids, D-penicillamine/iron salts, D-penicillamine/digoxin, or sulfasalazine/iron salts), the DDI can be controlled by adjusting the dosing times of the medications. Clinical pharmacists judged that all of these DDIs would have required immediate intervention, whereas rheumatologists considered immediate intervention to be required for only 2 of these interactions. These results highlight the differences in points of view between the specialty groups and the need for a multidisciplinary approach when assessing the relevance of a drug combination.

Our study has some limitations that should be addressed. First, the differences in results between the specialty groups may be specific to the field of rheumatology or the particular setting (i.e., hospital). To our knowledge, no studies on this subject have been published in other fields of medicine that have evaluated DDIs. Second, no effort was made to reach consensus between the groups, so the results presented indicate the maximum contrast between the groups. Third, the rheumatologists and clinical pharmacists were not blinded to the objective of the study, and this may have been a source of bias. Despite these limitations, our study provides valuable information about differences in the assessment of the clinical relevance of DDIs between 2 specialties involved in the care of patients with rheumatoid arthritis.

CONCLUSIONS
Rheumatologists and clinical pharmacists differed in their assessments of clinical relevance for 10 out of 40 DMARD–drug combinations. To prevent drug-related problems, it may be necessary to eradicate discordant interdisciplinary attitudes and institute multidisciplinary judgment of the relevance of DDIs.
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