Review Article

Comprehensive Review of Pharmacovigilance in Arthritis Therapy: Safety Monitoring of NSAIDs and DMARDs

Shravani.K.Chavan*, Shahu.K.Deshmukh, Shivani.R.Kashid, Prakash.D.Jadhav, Gayatri.K.Kolekar, Dhanashri.A.Shevale, Vaishnavi.S.Veer, Vaishnavi.S.Salunkhe.

Yashoda Technical Campus, Faculty of Pharmacy, Satara, Maharashtra-India.

***Corresponding author's E-mail:** shravanichavan0704@gmail.com

Received: 08-04-2026; **Revised:** 20-06-2026; **Accepted:** 28-06-2026; **Published online:** 20-07-2026.

ABSTRACT

Arthritis is a persistent inflammatory condition involving the joints that manifests as pain, stiffness, swelling, and limited mobility, substantially diminishing the well-being of those affected. Its treatment typically necessitates extended use of Non-Steroidal Anti-Inflammatory Drugs (NSAIDs) and Disease-Modifying Anti-Rheumatic Drugs (DMARDs). While NSAIDs alleviate pain and inflammation, DMARDs work to decelerate disease advancement and avert joint damage. Notwithstanding their clinical utility, both drug classes carry risks of multiple adverse drug reactions (ADRs), encompassing gastrointestinal irritation, hepatotoxicity, nephrotoxicity, cardiovascular complications, immunosuppression, and blood-related abnormalities. Pharmacovigilance assumes an indispensable role in guaranteeing the safe and rational use of these drugs through systematic identification, evaluation, surveillance, and prevention of ADRs. This review examines the relevance of pharmacovigilance in the context of arthritis treatment, with particular attention to the safety surveillance of NSAIDs and DMARDs. It further underscores the value of ADR reporting mechanisms, patient education, routine laboratory assessments, and the active participation of healthcare providers in mitigating medication-associated hazards. Additionally, obstacles such as ADR underreporting, concurrent multi-drug use, and insufficient awareness are addressed. Robust pharmacovigilance measures have the potential to enhance patient safety, treatment efficacy, and the overall standard of arthritis care.

Keywords: Arthritis, Pharmacovigilance, NSAIDs, DMARDs, Adverse Drug Reactions, Drug Safety, Safety Monitoring.

INTRODUCTION

Arthritis ranks among the most prevalent chronic musculoskeletal conditions globally, affecting millions of individuals and presenting with pain, inflammation, stiffness, diminished mobility, and a compromised quality of life. Its principal subtypes include osteoarthritis, rheumatoid arthritis, psoriatic arthritis, and ankylosing spondylitis. The therapeutic approach primarily aims at suppressing inflammation, alleviating pain, halting joint damage, and restoring physical function through sustained pharmacological treatment. Non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs (NSAIDs) and disease-modifying antirheumatic drugs (DMARDs) constitute the most widely prescribed agents in arthritis management. Nevertheless, prolonged administration of these medications is frequently accompanied by notable adverse drug reactions (ADRs) and significant safety considerations[1,2].

NSAIDs are routinely prescribed for symptomatic management of arthritis owing to their pain-relieving and anti-inflammatory properties. In spite of these benefits, NSAIDs carry risks of gastrointestinal toxicity, renal dysfunction, cardiovascular complications, and hypersensitivity reactions, especially with prolonged administration. In a comparable manner, DMARDs, encompassing both conventional and biologic formulations, fulfil a vital function in retarding disease progression and averting joint destruction in inflammatory arthritis. Nonetheless, these agents may give rise to serious adverse effects including hepatotoxicity, bone marrow suppression, infections, pulmonary complications, and immunological disturbances, necessitating ongoing surveillance throughout the course of therapy[3,4].

Pharmacovigilance encompasses the scientific framework and operational activities directed at the identification, evaluation, comprehension, and prevention of adverse drug effects and other medication-related concerns. Within the realm of arthritis treatment, pharmacovigilance serves a pivotal function in recognizing medication-related hazards, bolstering patient safety, and fostering the rational prescription of NSAIDs and DMARDs. Ongoing safety surveillance via adverse drug reaction reporting mechanisms, post-marketing programs, clinical evaluations, and laboratory testing facilitates timely recognition and handling of drug-induced complications. Sound pharmacovigilance practices additionally equip healthcare professionals to optimize treatment results while curtailing therapy-associated morbidity[5].

Given the rising prevalence of arthritis and the expanding reliance on sustained immunomodulatory regimens, the significance of pharmacovigilance has considerably grown in recent years. Surveillance of the safety profiles of NSAIDs and DMARDs is indispensable for minimizing preventable adverse events and elevating the standard of patient care. Accordingly, this review examines the contribution of pharmacovigilance to arthritis therapy with particular focus on the safety surveillance of NSAIDs and DMARDs, prevalent adverse drug reactions, associated risk factors, and

approaches to strengthening medication safety in arthritis patients.

OVERVIEW OF ARTHRITIS

Arthritis constitutes a spectrum of chronic musculoskeletal conditions defined by joint inflammation, pain, swelling, stiffness, and restricted mobility. It is recognized as one of the foremost contributors to disability globally, considerably affecting the well-being of those it afflicts[1,6]. Beyond affecting the joints themselves, arthritis may also implicate adjacent structures including ligaments, tendons, and connective tissues[8].

The condition arises from a complex interplay of contributing factors, including autoimmune processes, degenerative alterations, infections, metabolic disturbances, hereditary susceptibility, and environmental exposures[7,9]. Based on the type and extent of disease, arthritis may culminate in progressive joint deterioration, structural deformity, and enduring functional disability[2].

Arthritis can affect individuals across all age brackets, though its occurrence rises with advancing age. Specific inflammatory forms such as rheumatoid arthritis exhibit a higher incidence in women, attributable to hormonal and immunological differences[10]. The predominant subtypes of arthritis encompass osteoarthritis (OA), rheumatoid arthritis (RA), psoriatic arthritis (PsA), ankylosing spondylitis (AS), and gout[8].

Osteoarthritis represents the most frequently encountered form of arthritis and is primarily linked to the deterioration of articular cartilage and the natural aging process[7]. Rheumatoid arthritis is a long-standing autoimmune inflammatory disorder defined by bilateral joint inflammation and progressive structural joint injury[2,11]. Psoriatic arthritis arises in association with psoriasis and immune dysregulation, whereas ankylosing spondylitis predominantly involves the vertebral column and sacroiliac articulations[12].

The typical clinical features of arthritis comprise joint pain, tenderness, swelling, erythema, morning stiffness, fatigue, and limitation of movement[11]. Persistent inflammation and advancing disease can substantially hinder physical activity and routine daily functioning when left inadequately managed[6].

The treatment of arthritis integrates both pharmacological and non-pharmacological modalities. Among the medications most commonly prescribed are NSAIDs, corticosteroids, analgesics, and DMARDs, particularly in inflammatory arthritis conditions[4]. Given that arthritis therapy frequently demands extended treatment durations, patients face an elevated risk of adverse drug reactions and complications arising from medication use[3,5]. Accordingly, pharmacovigilance and uninterrupted safety surveillance are imperative to uphold safe and efficacious arthritis management[5].

DRUGS USED IN ARTHRITIS THERAPY

The pharmacological treatment of arthritis is directed at diminishing pain and inflammation, preventing joint deterioration, preserving functional capacity, and enhancing the overall quality of life[2,4]. Therapeutic selection is guided by the arthritis subtype and its severity, the individual patient's clinical status, the degree of disease advancement, and any concurrent medical conditions[1]. Drugs used in arthritis therapy mainly include non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs (NSAIDs), corticosteroids, analgesics, and disease-modifying antirheumatic drugs (DMARDs)[14].

NSAIDs are among the most frequently prescribed agents in arthritis owing to their analgesic, antipyretic, and anti-inflammatory attributes[3]. Their principal mechanism involves the inhibition of cyclooxygenase (COX) enzymes with subsequent reduction in prostaglandin biosynthesis[14]. Commonly used NSAIDs include ibuprofen, diclofenac, naproxen, indomethacin, and celecoxib[15]. While NSAIDs provide effective symptomatic control, they do not modify the underlying disease course in inflammatory arthritis[2]. Extended NSAID therapy is linked to gastrointestinal toxicity, renal impairment, cardiovascular complications, and hypersensitivity phenomena[3,16].

Corticosteroids are employed to achieve rapid suppression of inflammation in arthritis, particularly in rheumatoid arthritis and during acute inflammatory exacerbations[4]. Agents such as prednisolone and methylprednisolone attenuate inflammation through suppression of both immune and inflammatory pathways[17]. Despite their considerable efficacy, extended corticosteroid use may induce osteoporosis, hypertension, hyperglycemia, weight gain, adrenal suppression, and heightened vulnerability to infections[18].

Analgesic agents such as paracetamol are routinely utilized for pain control, especially in osteoarthritis and mild arthritis-associated discomfort[19]. These medications offer symptomatic alleviation without substantial anti-inflammatory activity. Opioid analgesics may be employed selectively in severe pain conditions, though their use is generally restricted due to concerns regarding dependence and side effects[20].

DMARDs are regarded as the foundation of treatment for inflammatory arthritis on account of their capacity to decelerate disease progression and forestall joint destruction[4]. Conventional synthetic DMARDs include methotrexate, sulfasalazine, hydroxychloroquine, and leflunomide[4]. Methotrexate is recognized as the preferred first-line DMARD in rheumatoid arthritis owing to its proven efficacy and a reasonably well-characterized safety profile[21]. Nonetheless, DMARD therapy necessitates ongoing surveillance in view of potential adverse consequences including hepatotoxicity, bone marrow suppression, pulmonary toxicity, and immunosuppression[4,22].

Biologic DMARDs are biotechnologically derived agents designed to selectively target distinct inflammatory

mediators implicated in the pathogenesis of arthritis[23]. Frequently employed biologics include tumour necrosis factor (TNF) inhibitors such as infliximab, adalimumab, and etanercept[24]. Additional biologic agents act upon interleukin pathways, B lymphocytes, or T-cell activation mechanisms[23]. Despite their substantial efficacy in managing disease activity, biologics are associated with an elevated risk of serious infections, reactivation of tuberculosis, malignancy, and infusion-associated adverse reactions[25].

Targeted synthetic DMARDs, notably Janus kinase (JAK) inhibitors, constitute a more recently developed class of therapeutic options for rheumatoid arthritis[26]. Agents such as tofacitinib and baricitinib disrupt intracellular inflammatory signaling cascades and assist in controlling disease activity[27]. However, these drugs are likewise associated with adverse effects including infections, thromboembolic episodes, and lipid profile disturbances[28].

Given that arthritis management regularly entails prolonged and combination regimens, meticulous pharmacovigilance and systematic surveillance are essential for the timely detection of adverse reactions and the assurance of safe therapeutic outcomes[5].

PHARMACOVIGILANCE CONCEPTS IN ARTHRITIS THERAPY

Pharmacovigilance is recognized as the scientific discipline and associated activities devoted to the identification, evaluation, comprehension, and prevention of adverse drug effects and other medication-related issues[5]. In arthritis therapy, pharmacovigilance plays a vital role because patients often require prolonged therapy with NSAIDs, corticosteroids, and DMARDs, all of which carry substantial risks of adverse drug reactions and safety-related challenges[3,4].

The foremost goal of pharmacovigilance in arthritis care is to safeguard the safe and effective use of medications by promptly identifying drug-related hazards and reducing harm to patients[29]. Uninterrupted surveillance of arthritis medications carries particular importance since numerous adverse effects may emerge only following extended therapy or after widespread post-market use[30].

The surveillance of adverse drug reactions (ADRs) constitutes one of the fundamental pillars of pharmacovigilance. ADRs arising from arthritis medications may span a wide spectrum, from mild gastrointestinal upset to grave conditions such as hepatotoxicity, cardiovascular complications, bone marrow suppression, severe infections, and hypersensitivity responses[3,22]. Prompt detection and documentation of ADRs contribute meaningfully to improved patient safety and the reinforcement of evidence-based prescribing[31].

Signal detection represents a further core pharmacovigilance function, encompassing the recognition of novel or previously uncharacterized safety concerns linked to specific medications[32]. Such signals arise from spontaneous ADR notifications, institutional patient databases, clinical investigations, electronic medical records, and post-authorization surveillance initiatives[33]. In the management of arthritis, signal detection has been instrumental in uncovering cardiovascular hazards related to selective COX-2 inhibitors and infectious risks connected with biologic DMARDs[16,25].

Risk evaluation and risk mitigation are indispensable elements of pharmacovigilance practice. Risk assessment entails determining the incidence, gravity, causative relationship, and preventability of adverse drug reactions[34]. Drawing from these assessments, risk reduction strategies encompassing dosage adjustments, laboratory surveillance, contraindication advisories, and patient counselling are applied to minimize harm associated with drug use[35].

Post-marketing surveillance holds particular relevance in arthritis treatment, as pre-approval clinical trials are often inadequate for identifying infrequent or delayed adverse effects[30]. Ongoing observation following regulatory approval yields real-world safety information concerning the long-term use of NSAIDs and DMARDs[36]. A number of grave adverse reactions linked to arthritis drugs, including gastrointestinal haemorrhage, reactivation of tuberculosis, and thromboembolic complications, were brought to light through post-marketing surveillance[25,28].

Voluntary ADR reporting systems serve as the cornerstone of pharmacovigilance infrastructure[31]. Healthcare providers, comprising physicians, pharmacists, and nurses, fulfil a critical responsibility in notifying authorities of suspected adverse reactions tied to arthritis drugs[37]. Patient-initiated reporting systems have similarly grown in significance for detecting drug-related complications and bolstering medication safety[38].

Pharmacovigilance repositories such as the WHO international database and national reporting networks are extensively utilized for ongoing drug safety surveillance[5]. These platforms assist regulatory bodies in detecting safety signals, revising prescribing guidance, disseminating safety communications, and enacting regulatory interventions when warranted[39].

In recent times, innovations including electronic health records, artificial intelligence, data analytics, and real-world evidence research have considerably advanced pharmacovigilance practices within arthritis management[40]. These technological tools facilitate more rapid signal identification, enhanced risk forecasting, and refined patient safety surveillance.

Accordingly, the principles and practices of pharmacovigilance are indispensable in arthritis therapy for early adverse effect identification, improvement of treatment outcomes, and assurance of the safe extended use of NSAIDs and DMARDs[5].

Safety Monitoring of NSAIDs

Non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs (NSAIDs) represent one of the most commonly prescribed drug classes for controlling pain and inflammation in individuals with

arthritis[3,14]. These agents deliver symptomatic relief through suppression of cyclooxygenase (COX) enzymes and a consequent reduction in prostaglandin production[14]. Commonly used NSAIDs in arthritis therapy include ibuprofen, diclofenac, naproxen, indomethacin, and celecoxib[15]. Despite the considerable efficacy of NSAIDs in managing pain and inflammation, their extended use is linked to a range of serious adverse drug reactions, rendering ongoing safety surveillance imperative[3,16].

Gastrointestinal (GI) toxicity stands as one of the most prevalent complications encountered during NSAID treatment[3]. NSAIDs compromise prostaglandin-dependent gastric mucosal defence, predisposing patients to gastritis, peptic ulcer disease, gastrointestinal haemorrhage, and perforation[41]. The likelihood of GI complications is amplified in older patients, those with a prior history of ulceration, recipients of high-dose NSAIDs, individuals concurrently receiving corticosteroids, and patients undergoing extended treatment[42]. Vigilant assessment of gastrointestinal symptoms including abdominal discomfort, dyspepsia, hematemesis, and melena is essential throughout NSAID treatment[43].

Cardiovascular toxicity constitutes another significant safety concern connected with the use of NSAIDs[16]. Specific NSAIDs, most notably selective COX-2 inhibitors, have been linked to elevated risks of myocardial infarction, cerebrovascular events, hypertension, and thromboembolic complications[44]. Sustained NSAID therapy may further aggravate underlying cardiovascular conditions[45]. Routine assessment of blood pressure, cardiovascular manifestations, and clinical history is therefore warranted throughout the course of treatment[46].

NSAIDs may additionally exert notable nephrotoxic effects by diminishing renal perfusion and compromising kidney function[47]. Renal adverse effects encompass acute kidney injury, sodium and fluid retention, hyperkalaemia, and progressive renal insufficiency[48]. Older patients and those with dehydration, elevated blood pressure, diabetes mellitus, or pre-existing renal dysfunction are at particularly elevated risk[49].

Assessment of serum creatinine, blood urea nitrogen, electrolyte concentrations, and urinary output is advised throughout long-term NSAID use[47].

Hepatotoxicity represents an additional clinically significant adverse consequence associated with selected NSAIDs, especially diclofenac[51]. Liver damage may vary from modest elevations of hepatic enzymes to pronounced hepatic dysfunction[51]. Accordingly, periodic hepatic function assessments are recommended for patients on prolonged NSAID regimens[50].

Hypersensitivity responses such as cutaneous rash, urticaria, bronchospasm, angioedema, and anaphylaxis may arise in predisposed patients[52]. NSAID-precipitated asthma is particularly noted in individuals with aspirin hypersensitivity and underlying respiratory conditions[53]. Thorough medical history-taking and ongoing surveillance for allergic manifestations are essential throughout treatment.

Potential drug interactions constitute another significant consideration during NSAID therapy[54]. NSAIDs may interact adversely with anticoagulants, corticosteroids, antihypertensive medications, diuretics, methotrexate, and antiplatelet agents, consequently heightening the risk of haemorrhage, renal toxicity, and compromised therapeutic efficacy[55]. Regular review of the medication list and targeted patient counselling are central to reducing these risks.

Pharmacovigilance activities are vital for the early detection and appropriate handling of NSAID-related adverse effects[5]. Ongoing ADR surveillance, voluntary reporting networks, post-authorization monitoring, and patient education collectively advance the safer utilization of NSAIDs in arthritis care[31]. Healthcare practitioners should advocate for rational prescribing of NSAIDs at the minimum effective dose and promote routine monitoring as means of reducing treatment-associated complications[56].

Safety Monitoring of DMARDs

Disease-modifying antirheumatic drugs (DMARDs) represent the foundational treatment for inflammatory arthritis, most notably rheumatoid arthritis, by virtue of their ability to decelerate disease progression, prevent structural joint damage, and enhance long-term functional capacity[4]. DMARDs are broadly categorized into conventional synthetic agents, biologic drugs, and targeted synthetic formulations[23]. While these agents demonstrate considerable therapeutic effectiveness, they are linked to various potentially grave adverse drug reactions that demand sustained pharmacovigilance and systematic safety monitoring[22].

Methotrexate is established as the first-choice conventional DMARD for rheumatoid arthritis[21]. It exerts its effects through inhibition of folate metabolism and attenuation of inflammatory activity. However, methotrexate treatment may result in hepatotoxicity, bone marrow suppression, mucositis, gastrointestinal disturbances, pulmonary toxicity, and heightened susceptibility to infections[22,57]. Periodic evaluation of complete blood count (CBC), liver function tests (LFTs), renal function parameters, and thoracic assessment is advisable during the course of therapy[58]. Supplementation with folic acid is routinely recommended to attenuate methotrexate-related toxic effects[59].

Sulfasalazine is an additional widely prescribed DMARD that exerts both anti-inflammatory and immunomodulatory effects[60]. Side effects linked to sulfasalazine include gastrointestinal intolerance, headache, skin rash, hepatotoxicity, leukopenia, and reversible reduction in sperm count[61]. Individuals on sulfasalazine therapy require scheduled monitoring of CBC and hepatic function tests to enable early detection of hematological and liver-related abnormalities[62].

Hydroxychloroquine is commonly prescribed for mild rheumatoid arthritis and systemic autoimmune disorders given its comparatively favourable tolerability profile[63]. Nonetheless, long-term administration may predispose patients to retinal toxicity, visual impairment, and cardiomyopathy[64]. Baseline ophthalmologic assessment prior to commencement of therapy and periodic retinal surveillance are essential to avert irreversible visual deterioration[65].

Leflunomide acts by blocking pyrimidine biosynthesis and thereby suppressing inflammatory immune activity[66]. Principal adverse effects encompass hepatotoxicity, elevated blood pressure, gastrointestinal disturbances, infections, and teratogenic potential[67]. Scheduled hepatic function tests and blood pressure assessments are essential throughout the treatment period[68]. Leflunomide is contraindicated during pregnancy on account of its teratogenic properties[67].

Biologic DMARDs are designed to selectively engage distinct inflammatory mediators that drive arthritis pathogenesis[23]. Common biologics include tumour necrosis factor (TNF) inhibitors such as infliximab, adalimumab, and etanercept[24]. Other biologic agents target interleukins, B cells, or T-cell activation pathways[23]. While biologic DMARDs substantially enhance disease control, they elevate the risk of serious infections, tuberculosis reactivation, infusion-related adverse reactions, malignancy, and opportunistic infections[25,69]. Evaluation for tuberculosis, hepatitis B, and other chronic infections is recommended prior to initiating biologic agents[70].

Targeted synthetic DMARDs including Janus kinase (JAK) inhibitors such as tofacitinib and baricitinib act by disrupting intracellular inflammatory signal transduction[26]. These drugs may induce serious infections, reactivation of herpes zoster, thromboembolic events, lipid profile alterations, and hematological disturbances[28,71]. Surveillance of CBC, lipid levels, hepatic enzyme concentrations, and infection status is advisable throughout treatment[72]

Uninterrupted pharmacovigilance is imperative during DMARD therapy since a considerable proportion of adverse reactions may manifest only following extended use or in the setting of immunosuppression[22]. Timely recognition through laboratory testing, patient education, voluntary ADR reporting, and periodic clinical review contributes to enhanced therapeutic safety and improved treatment outcomes[5]. Healthcare providers bear a central responsibility in monitoring for adverse effects, informing patients about warning signs, and fostering the rational utilization of DMARDs[31].

Adverse Drug Reactions (ADRs) in Arthritis Therapy

Adverse drug reactions (ADRs) are defined as noxious, undesired, or unintentional responses that arise upon the administration of drugs at standard therapeutic dosages[29]. Arthritis patients are especially susceptible to ADRs given that their treatment routinely requires sustained use of multiple agents including NSAIDs, corticosteroids, and DMARDs[3,4]. The persistent nature of arthritis and the commonplace co-administration of multiple drugs considerably amplify the risk of medication-related complications[31].

ADRs arising from arthritis treatment may range in severity from mild gastrointestinal discomfort to serious organ toxicity, potentially fatal infections, cardiovascular events, and immunological adverse effects[16,25]. Accordingly, early detection and systematic surveillance of ADRs constitute indispensable elements of pharmacovigilance in the management of arthritis[5].

NSAIDs are one of the leading contributors to ADRs encountered in arthritis treatment[3]. Gastrointestinal side effects, including gastritis, peptic ulcer disease, gastrointestinal haemorrhage, nausea, and abdominal pain, are among the most commonly documented reactions[41]. NSAIDs are additionally linked to renal dysfunction, elevated blood pressure, fluid retention, hepatotoxicity, and cardiovascular complications including myocardial infarction and cerebrovascular events[45,47]. Hypersensitivity manifestations such as cutaneous rash, urticaria, bronchospasm, and aspirin-exacerbated respiratory disease may similarly develop in predisposed patients[52].

Corticosteroids generate adverse effects that are governed by both dose intensity and duration of administration[17]. Extended corticosteroid treatment may culminate in osteoporosis, weight gain, hyperglycemia, adrenal insufficiency, hypertension, cataract formation, and enhanced vulnerability to infections[18]. Sustained corticosteroid therapy is further associated with psychiatric disturbances and metabolic derangements[73].

Adverse reactions attributable to DMARDs carry particular clinical significance given that these drugs suppress both immune function and inflammatory signaling[4]. Methotrexate frequently gives rise to hepatotoxicity, bone marrow suppression, mucositis, pulmonary fibrosis, nausea, and an elevated risk of infection[22,57]. Sulfasalazine may produce gastrointestinal intolerance, dermatological reactions, hepatotoxicity, and blood cell abnormalities[61]. Hydroxychloroquine is linked to retinal damage and visual deterioration in the context of prolonged administration[64]. Leflunomide may induce hepatotoxicity, elevated blood pressure, diarrhoea, and teratogenic consequences[67].

Biologic and targeted synthetic DMARDs carry risks of serious infections, tuberculosis reactivation, opportunistic infections, malignancies, infusion-associated reactions, and thromboembolic events[25,28]. TNF inhibitors have been associated with a heightened susceptibility to bacterial and fungal infections as a result of their immunosuppressive activity[69]. JAK inhibitors may predispose patients to herpes zoster infection, thrombotic events, and dyslipidemias[71].

ADRs occurring in arthritis treatment may be categorized as predictable (type A) and unpredictable (type B) reactions[29]. Predictable reactions are contingent on dose and arise from the established pharmacological mechanism of the drug, as illustrated by NSAID-induced gastric ulceration or

corticosteroid-induced hyperglycemia[16]. Unpredictable reactions are infrequent and comprise allergic or idiosyncratic phenomena such as anaphylaxis and severe hypersensitivity responses[53].

A number of factors heighten the risk of ADRs in arthritis patients, including advanced age, concurrent use of multiple medications, prolonged treatment, comorbid conditions, renal or hepatic impairment, and unsupervised use of over-the-counter NSAIDs[49,74]. Older patients are particularly at risk due to age-related changes in drug metabolism and the co-existence of multiple medical conditions[75].

Pharmacovigilance assumes a vital role in the identification, documentation, and prevention of ADRs arising from arthritis treatment[5]. Voluntary ADR notification mechanisms, periodic laboratory assessments, patient education, and ongoing clinical surveillance collectively serve to reduce the disease burden attributed to arthritis medications[31]. Healthcare providers should inform patients about early indicators of toxicity and advocate for prompt reporting of adverse effects in order to enhance the safety of treatment[37].

RISK FACTORS FOR ADVERSE DRUG REACTIONS (ADRS)

Numerous determinants elevate the risk of adverse drug reactions in arthritis patients undergoing prolonged treatment[74]. Older patients demonstrate heightened susceptibility to ADRs as a consequence of modified drug pharmacokinetics, diminished renal and hepatic function, and the concurrent presence of multiple medical conditions[75]. The co-administration of multiple agents constitutes another primary risk determinant, as simultaneous use of NSAIDs, corticosteroids, DMARDs, and additional medications augments the probability of drug-drug interactions and toxic effects[54].

Extended therapy and elevated dosing regimens substantially amplify the risk of gastrointestinal, hepatic, renal, cardiovascular, and hematological complications[3,22]. Individuals with pre-existing hepatic disease, renal dysfunction, hypertension, diabetes mellitus, or cardiovascular conditions face a higher likelihood of experiencing severe ADRs[45,47]. Unsupervised use of non-prescription NSAIDs and suboptimal medication adherence may further predispose patients to unfavourable outcomes[56].

Hereditary predisposition, alcohol intake, cigarette smoking, and insufficient laboratory surveillance additionally contribute to the probability of ADRs throughout the course of arthritis treatment[68]. Consequently, thorough patient evaluation and uninterrupted pharmacovigilance are indispensable for reducing treatment-associated complications[5].

CHALLENGES IN PHARMACOVIGILANCE OF ARTHRITIS DRUGS

Pharmacovigilance of arthritis medications confronts numerous obstacles attributable to the chronic and multifaceted nature of arthritis management. Among the foremost difficulties is the underreporting of adverse drug reactions by both healthcare providers and patients[31]. Numerous ADRs go unrecognized as mild or delayed reactions are frequently overlooked or inadequately recorded.

The concurrent use of multiple drugs in arthritis patients renders it challenging to pinpoint the specific agent responsible for a given adverse reaction[74]. Sustained administration of NSAIDs and DMARDs may generate delayed toxic effects that are not readily apparent through standard clinical monitoring[22]. Surveillance of biologic DMARDs is especially demanding given their association with serious infections, reactivation of latent tuberculosis, and infrequent but significant immunological complications[25,70].

Insufficient familiarity with pharmacovigilance programs, suboptimal patient education, restricted access to ADR reporting platforms, and inadequate laboratory monitoring collectively undermine the efficacy of safety surveillance[5]. Furthermore, the substantial expense of biologic treatments and requisite monitoring procedures may hinder comprehensive safety evaluation in certain patient populations[69].

Accordingly, reinforcing ADR reporting mechanisms, raising awareness, and championing active pharmacovigilance are fundamental to improving the safety of arthritis therapy[31].

STRATEGIES TO IMPROVE DRUG SAFETY

Enhancing medication safety in arthritis management necessitates robust pharmacovigilance practices and sustained patient surveillance[5]. Routine laboratory assessments including liver function tests, renal function tests, complete blood count, and ophthalmologic evaluations facilitate the early identification of drug-induced toxicity[22,64]. Administering the minimum effective dosage and refraining from unnecessary polypharmacy can substantially lower the risk of adverse drug reactions[3,54].

Educating and counselling patients are essential measures to enhance medication compliance and promote the timely reporting of adverse reactions[37]. Healthcare practitioners should routinely examine patients' medication records and remain vigilant for potential drug interactions[55]. The application of digital ADR reporting platforms and proactive post-marketing surveillance programs can facilitate the early detection of emerging safety signals[33].

The involvement of clinical pharmacists, personalization of therapeutic regimens, and regular risk evaluation further support the delivery of safer arthritis care[5]. Accordingly, an integrated, multidisciplinary pharmacovigilance strategy is essential for reducing therapy-related complications and enhancing patient outcomes.

CONCLUSION

Arthritis is a chronic musculoskeletal condition that commonly demands extended pharmacological treatment with NSAIDs, corticosteroids, and DMARDs to manage pain,

inflammation, and disease advancement. While these treatment regimens confer substantial clinical advantages, they are often accompanied by adverse drug reactions spanning from mild gastrointestinal disturbances to grave hepatic, renal, cardiovascular, hematological, and immunological complications.

Pharmacovigilance fulfils a critical function in guaranteeing the safe and rational use of arthritis drugs by facilitating early detection, systematic evaluation, reporting, and prevention of adverse drug reactions. Uninterrupted safety surveillance through laboratory testing, clinical assessment, ADR reporting frameworks, and patient counselling serves to diminish medication-related morbidity and advance treatment outcomes.

Consistent surveillance of NSAIDs and DMARDs is indispensable given that prolonged therapeutic regimens and concurrent polypharmacy heighten the probability of toxicity and treatment-related complications. Healthcare professionals, notably physicians and pharmacists, bear a significant responsibility in recognizing adverse effects, instructing patients, and advocating evidence-based prescribing practices.

Consequently, reinforcing pharmacovigilance infrastructure, advancing awareness of ADR reporting obligations, and implementing sound risk management strategies are imperative for bolstering patient safety and maximizing the outcomes of arthritis therapy.

Source of Support: The author(s) received no financial support for the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article

Conflict of Interest: The author(s) declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

REFERENCES

1. Firestein GS, Budd RC, Gabriel SE, McInnes IB, O'Dell JR. *Kelley's Textbook of Rheumatology*. 10th ed. Philadelphia: Elsevier; 2017.
2. Smolen JS, Aletaha D, McInnes IB. Rheumatoid arthritis. The Lancet. 2016;388(10055):2023-38.
3. Wolfe MM, Lichtenstein DR, Singh G. Gastrointestinal toxicity of nonsteroidal antiinflammatory drugs. New England Journal of Medicine. 1999;340(24):1888-99.
4. Singh JA, Saag KG, Bridges SL Jr, Akl EA, Bannuru RR, Sullivan MC, Vaysbrot E, McNaughton C, Osani M, Shmerling RH, Curtis JR. 2015 American College of Rheumatology guideline for the treatment of rheumatoid arthritis. *Arthritis Care & Research*. 2016;68(1):1-25.
5. World Health Organization. The importance of pharmacovigilance: safety monitoring of medicinal products. Geneva: WHO; 2002.
6. Cross M, Smith E, Hoy D, Nolte S, Ackerman I, Fransen M, Bridgett L, Williams S, Guillemin F, Hill CL, Laslett LL, Jones G, Cicuttini F, Osborne R, Vos T, Buchbinder R, Woolf A, March L. The global burden of hip and knee osteoarthritis: estimates from the global burden of disease 2010 study. *Annals of the Rheumatic Diseases*. 2014;73(7):1323-30.
7. Hunter DJ, Bierma-Zeinstra S. Osteoarthritis. The Lancet. 2019;393(10182):1745-59.
8. Kumar V, Abbas AK, Aster JC. *Robbins and Cotran Pathologic Basis of Disease*. 10th ed. Philadelphia: Elsevier; 2020.
9. Scott DL, Wolfe F, Huizinga TW. Rheumatoid arthritis. The Lancet. 2010;376(9746):1094-108.
10. Alamanos Y, Drosos AA. Epidemiology of adult rheumatoid arthritis. Autoimmunity Reviews. 2005;4(3):130-6.
11. McInnes IB, Schett G. The pathogenesis of rheumatoid arthritis. New England Journal of Medicine. 2011;365(23):2205-19.
12. Taurog JD, Chhabra A, Colbert RA. Ankylosing spondylitis and axial spondyloarthritis. New England Journal of Medicine. 2016;374(26):2563-74.
13. Katzung BG, Trevor AJ. *Basic and Clinical Pharmacology*. 15th ed. New York: McGraw Hill; 2021.
14. Vane JR, Botting RM. Mechanism of action of anti-inflammatory drugs. International Journal of Tissue Reactions. 1998;20(1):3-15.
15. Rang HP, Ritter JM, Flower RJ, Henderson G. *Rang and Dale's Pharmacology*. 9th ed. Elsevier; 2020.
16. Grosser T, Smyth E, FitzGerald GA. Anti-inflammatory, antipyretic, and analgesic agents. In: Brunton LL, Hilal-Dandan R, Knollmann BC, editors. *Goodman & Gilman's The Pharmacological Basis of Therapeutics*. 13th ed. New York: McGraw Hill; 2018.
17. Barnes PJ. Anti-inflammatory actions of glucocorticoids: molecular mechanisms. Clinical Science. 1998;94(6):557-72.
18. Schäcke H, Döcke WD, Asadullah K. Mechanisms involved in the side effects of glucocorticoids. Pharmacology & Therapeutics. 2002;96(1):23-43.
19. Towheed TE, Maxwell L, Judd MG, Catton M, Hochberg MC, Wells G. Acetaminophen for osteoarthritis. Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews. 2006;(1):CD004257.
20. da Costa BR, Nüesch E, Kasteler R, Husni E, Welch V, Rutjes AWS, Jüni P. Oral or transdermal opioids for osteoarthritis of the knee or hip. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews*. 2014;(9):CD003115.
21. Weinblatt ME. Methotrexate in rheumatoid arthritis: a quarter century of development. Transactions of the American Clinical and Climatological Association. 2013;124:16-25.
22. Visser K, van der Heijde D. Risk and management of liver toxicity during methotrexate treatment in rheumatoid arthritis. Clinical and Experimental Rheumatology. 2009;27(6):1017-25.
23. Smolen JS, Landewé RBM, Bijlsma JWJ, Burmester GR, Dougados M, Kerschbaumer A, McInnes IB, Sepriano A, van Vollenhoven RF, de Wit M, Aletaha D, Aringer M, Askling J, Balsa A, Boers M, den Broeder AA, Buch MH, Buttgereit F, Caporali R, Cardiel MH, De Cock D, Codreanu C, Cutolo M, Edwards CJ, van Eijk-Hustings Y, Emery P, Finckh A, Gossec L, Gottenberg JE, Hetland ML, Huizinga TWJ, Koloumas M, Li Z, Mariette X, Müller-Ladner U, Mysler EF, da Silva JAP, Poór G, Pope JE, Rubbert-Roth A, Ruyssen-Witrand A, Saag KG, Strangfeld A, Takeuchi T, Voshaar M, Westhovens R, van der Heijde D. EULAR recommendations for the management of rheumatoid arthritis. *Annals of the Rheumatic Diseases*. 2020;79(6):685-99.
24. Feldmann M, Maini RN. Anti-TNF therapy of rheumatoid arthritis: what have we learned? Annual Review of Immunology. 2001;19:163-96.
25. Dixon WG, Symmons DP, Lunt M, Watson KD, Hyrich KL; BSRBR Control Centre Consortium. Serious infection following anti-TNF therapy in patients with rheumatoid arthritis. Arthritis & Rheumatism. 2006;54(8):2368-76.
26. O'Shea JJ, Kontzias A, Yamaoka K, Tanaka Y, Laurence A. Janus kinase inhibitors in autoimmune diseases. Annals of the Rheumatic Diseases. 2013;72(Suppl 2):ii111-5.
27. Schwartz DM, Kanno Y, Villarino A, Ward M, Gadina M, O'Shea JJ. JAK inhibition as a therapeutic strategy for immune and inflammatory diseases. Nature Reviews Drug Discovery. 2017;17(1):78.

28. Yates M, Mootoo A, Adas M, Bechman K, Rampes S, Patel V, Qureshi S, Hong Y, Wahba A, Sarwar U, Galloway J, Sattui SE. Venous thromboembolism risk with JAK inhibitors. *Rheumatology*. 2021;60(SI2):ii95-102.
29. Edwards IR, Aronson JK. Adverse drug reactions: definitions, diagnosis, and management. The Lancet. 2000;356(9237):1255-59.
30. Waller PC, Evans SJ. A model for the future conduct of pharmacovigilance. Pharmacoepidemiology and Drug Safety. 2003;12(1):17-29.
31. Hazell L, Shakir SA. Under-reporting of adverse drug reactions. Drug Safety. 2006;29(5):385-96.
32. Hauben M, Aronson JK. Defining 'signal' and its subtypes in pharmacovigilance based on a systematic review of previous definitions. Drug Safety. 2009;32(2):99-110.
33. Bate A, Evans SJ. Quantitative signal detection using spontaneous ADR reporting. Pharmacoepidemiology and Drug Safety. 2009;18(6):427-36.
34. Meyboom RH, Egberts AC, Edwards IR, Hekster YA, de Koning FH, Gribnau FW. Principles of signal detection in pharmacovigilance. Drug Safety. 1997;16(6):355-65.
35. Lindquist M. VigiBase, the WHO global ICSR database system. Drug Information Journal. 2008;42(5):409-19.
36. Strom BL, Kimmel SE, Hennessy S. *Pharmacoepidemiology*. 5th ed. West Sussex: Wiley-Blackwell; 2012.
37. Backstrom M, Mjorndal T, Dahlqvist R. Spontaneous reporting of adverse drug reactions by nurses. Pharmacoepidemiology and Drug Safety. 2002;11(7):647-50.
38. Avery AJ, Anderson C, Bond CM, Fortnum H, Gifford A, Hannaford PC, Hazell L, Krska J, Lee AJ, McLernon DJ, Murphy E, Shakir S, Watson MC. Evaluation of patient reporting of adverse drug reactions. *British Journal of Clinical Pharmacology*. 2011;72(5):671-78.
39. World Health Organization. Safety monitoring of medicinal products: guidelines for setting up and running a pharmacovigilance centre. Geneva: WHO; 2000.
40. Harpaz R, DuMouchel W, LePendu P, Bauer-Mehren A, Ryan P, Shah NH. Performance of pharmacovigilance signal-detection algorithms. Clinical Pharmacology & Therapeutics. 2013;93(6):539-46.
41. Lanas A, Chan FK. Peptic ulcer disease. The Lancet. 2017;390(10094):613-24.
42. Laine L. Approaches to nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory drug use in the high-risk patient. Gastroenterology. 2001;120(3):594-606.
43. Cryer B, Feldman M. Cyclooxygenase-1 and cyclooxygenase-2 selectivity of widely used NSAIDs. American Journal of Medicine. 1998;104(5):413-21.
44. Bresalier RS, Sandler RS, Quan H, Bolognese JA, Oxenius B, Horgan K, Lines C, Riddell R, Morton D, Lanas A, Konstam MA, Baron JA. Cardiovascular events associated with rofecoxib in a colorectal adenoma chemoprevention trial. *New England Journal of Medicine*. 2005;352(11):1092-102.
45. McGettigan P, Henry D. Cardiovascular risk and inhibition of cyclooxygenase. JAMA. 2006;296(13):1633-44.
46. Antman EM, Bennett JS, Daugherty A, Furberg C, Roberts H, Taubert KA. Use of nonsteroidal antiinflammatory drugs: an update for clinicians. Circulation. 2007;115(12):1634-42.
47. Whelton A. Nephrotoxicity of nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory drugs. American Journal of Medicine. 1999;106(5B):13S-24S.
48. Clive DM, Stoff JS. Renal syndromes associated with nonsteroidal antiinflammatory drugs. New England Journal of Medicine. 1984;310(9):563-72.
49. Ejaz P, Bhojani K, Joshi VR. NSAIDs and kidney. Journal of the Association of Physicians of India. 2004;52:632-40.
50. Aithal GP, Day CP. Nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory drug-induced hepatotoxicity. Clinical Liver Disease. 2007;11(3):563-75.
51. García Rodríguez LA, Hernández-Díaz S. The risk of upper gastrointestinal complications associated with NSAIDs. Arthritis Research. 2001;3(Suppl 3):S10-6.
52. Szczeklik A, Stevenson DD. Aspirin-induced asthma. Journal of Allergy and Clinical Immunology. 2003;111(5):913-21.
53. Kowalski ML, Makowska JS. Seven steps to the diagnosis of NSAID hypersensitivity. Allergy Asthma Immunology Research. 2015;7(4):312-20.
54. Helin-Salmivaara A, Virtanen A, Vesalainen R, Grönroos JM, Klaukka T, Huupponen R. NSAID use and risk of hospitalization for first myocardial infarction. American Journal of Medicine. 2006;119(7):552-59.
55. Grosser T, Ricciotti E, FitzGerald GA. The cardiovascular pharmacology of nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory drugs. Trends in Pharmacological Sciences. 2017;38(8):733-48.
56. Bjarnason I. Gastrointestinal safety of NSAIDs and over-the-counter analgesics. International Journal of Clinical Practice Supplement. 2013;(178):37-42.
57. Kremer JM. Toward a better understanding of methotrexate. Arthritis & Rheumatism. 2004;50(5):1370-82.
58. Visser K, van der Heijde DM. Optimal dosage and route of administration of methotrexate in rheumatoid arthritis. Annals of the Rheumatic Diseases. 2009;68(7):1094-99.
59. Shea B, Swinden MV, Ghogomu ET, Ortiz Z, Katchamart W, Rader T, Bombardier C, Wells GA, Tugwell P. Folic acid and folinic acid for reducing side effects in patients receiving methotrexate for rheumatoid arthritis. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews*. 2013;(5):CD000951.
60. Plosker GL, Croom KF. Sulfasalazine: a review of its use in the management of rheumatoid arthritis. Drugs. 2005;65(13):1825-49.
61. Pullar T, Hunter JA, Capell HA. Sulphasalazine in rheumatoid arthritis: toxicity in 774 patients monitored for one to 11 years. British Medical Journal. 1983;287(6399):1102-4.
62. van Ede AE, Laan RF, Blom HJ, De Abreu RA, van de Putte LB. Methotrexate in rheumatoid arthritis: an update with focus on mechanisms involved in toxicity. Seminars in Arthritis and Rheumatism. 1998;27(5):277-92.
63. Schrezenmeier E, Dörner T. Mechanisms of action of hydroxychloroquine and chloroquine. Nature Reviews Rheumatology. 2020;16(3):155-66.
64. Marmor MF, Kellner U, Lai TY, Lyons JS, Mieler WF. Recommendations on screening for chloroquine and hydroxychloroquine retinopathy. American Academy of Ophthalmology. 2016;123(6):1386-94.
65. Costedoat-Chalumeau N, Leroux G, Piette JC, Amoura Z. Why all systemic lupus erythematosus patients should be given hydroxychloroquine treatment. Joint Bone Spine. 2010;77(1):4-5.
66. Fox RI. Mechanism of action of leflunomide in rheumatoid arthritis. Journal of Rheumatology Supplement. 1998;53:20-26.
67. Strand V, Cohen S, Schiff M, Weaver A, Fleischmann R, Cannon G, Fox R, Olsen N, Furst D, Caldwell J, Kaine J, Sharp J, Hurley F, Loew-Friedrich I. Treatment of active rheumatoid arthritis with leflunomide compared with placebo and methotrexate. *Archives of Internal Medicine*. 1999;159(21):2542-50.
68. Emery P, Breedveld FC, Lemmel EM, Kaltwasser JP, Dawes PT, Gömör B, Van Den Bosch F, Nordström D, Bjorneboe O, Dahl R, Horslev-Petersen K, Rodriguez-Valverde V, Smolen JS, Loew-Friedrich I,

Valente R. A comparison of the efficacy and safety of leflunomide and methotrexate. *Rheumatology*. 2000;39(6):655-65.

69. Bongartz T, Sutton AJ, Sweeting MJ, Buchan I, Matteson EL, Montori V. Anti-TNF antibody therapy in rheumatoid arthritis and the risk of serious infections and malignancies. JAMA. 2006;295(19):2275-85.

70. Winthrop KL. Risk and prevention of tuberculosis and other serious opportunistic infections associated with biologic agents. Rheumatic Disease Clinics of North America. 2017;43(1):27-39.

71. Taylor PC, Keystone EC, van der Heijde D, Weinblatt ME, Del Carmen Morales L, Reyes Gonzaga J, Yakushin S, Ishii T, Emoto K, Beattie S, Arora V, Gaich CL, Rooney TP, Schlichting DE, Macias WL, de Bono S, Tanaka Y. Baricitinib versus placebo or adalimumab in rheumatoid arthritis. *New England Journal of Medicine*. 2017;376(7):652-62.

72. Winthrop KL, Harigai M, Genovese MC, Lindsey S, Takeuchi T, Fleischmann R, Smolen JS, Kaneko Y, Inoo M, Schlichting DE, Macias WL, Cardoso A, Rooney T, Saifan C, Issa M, Wang X, Neal J, Emery P. Infections in baricitinib clinical trials for patients with active rheumatoid arthritis. *Annals of the Rheumatic Diseases*. 2020;79(10):1290-97.

73. Compston J. Glucocorticoid-induced osteoporosis: an update. Endocrine. 2018;61(1):7-16.

74. Routledge PA, O'Mahony MS, Woodhouse KW. Adverse drug reactions in elderly patients. British Journal of Clinical Pharmacology. 2004;57(2):121-26.

75. Mangoni AA, Jackson SH. Age-related changes in pharmacokinetics and pharmacodynamics. British Journal of Clinical Pharmacology. 2004;57(1):6-14.