

The Impact of Pharmacovigilance on Herbal Drugs' Safety Monitoring

Vedansh Singh^[1], Prof. (Dr) Mohd. Wasiullah², Piyush Yadav³, Sushil Yadav^{4*}

1. Dept. of Pharmacy, Prasad Institute of Technology, Jaunpur (222001) U.P, India.

2. Principal, Dept. of Pharmacy, Prasad Institute of Technology, Jaunpur (222001) U.P, India.

3. Principal, Dept. of Pharmacy, Prasad Polytechnic, Jaunpur (222001) U.P, India.

4. Assistant Professor, Dept. of Pharmacy, Prasad Institute of Technology, Jaunpur (222001) U.P, India.

Submitted: 08-05-2023

Accepted: 20-05-2023

ABSTRACT: The potential for herbal products and herbal medicines increases globally, one of the most important tasks in pharmacovigilance systems is to consider the importance of herbal remedies. Nowadays, drug development is centred on identifying novel active substances or combinations, but expenses are also rising, making herbal medicines an alluring, risk-free, and less expensive substitute for synthetic treatments. Like all medications, herbal ones carry some risk, and numerous studies point to possible interactions and adverse reactions. Statistics available indicate that some herbal products, used in conventional medicine for decades, may be cancer-causing, toxic to the liver and heart, and other harmful effects. For drugs intended to be used continuously for more than three months or intermittently for more than six months, long-term rodent carcinogenicity tests, reproductive and developmental toxicity studies, and an analysis of the effects on drug-metabolizing enzymes should at the very least be included in the safety assessment process. It is important to develop the drug safety of herbal remedies while concentrating on particular patient populations.

Keywords: Herbal; Pharmacovigilance; Herbal vigilance; Adverse effect; Adverse reactions; Safety; Herb-drug interactions; Pharmacist; Medicine; Public health; Herb; Evidence based medicine

I. INTRODUCTION:

Pharmacovigilance is described as "the study of the safety of commercially available drugs under the actual circumstances of clinical use in significant populations^[1]. The goal is to increase safety monitoring and identify pharmacological adverse events that had gone unrecognised in the past while being assessed in clinical trials. These techniques were designed to monitor pharmaceutical drugs, but they are also used to assess the safety of other treatments, such as herbal remedies, blood products, vaccines, and even

medical devices. The reports of suspected toxicity and adverse events have increased along with the usage of herbal medications. Such unintended reactions may emerge from (i) side effects, which are typically detectable by pharmacodynamics and frequently predicted; (ii) reactions brought on by overdose, overuse, tolerance, dependency, or addiction (detectable either by pharmacodynamics or pharmacovigilance); (iii) hypersensitivity, allergic and idiosyncratic reactions (detectable by pharmacovigilance), (iv) mid-term Pharmacovigilance is crucial for spotting adverse responses because many herbal medications on the market haven't been extensively examined for their toxicity and pharmacology. Additionally, there is a persistent issue with unexpected toxicity of herbal products as a result of concerns with quality, such as the use of subpar herbal material, incorrect or misidentified herbs, improper processing techniques, and the provision of adulterated or contaminated herbs or products^[2]. By establishing GMP standards for production, better regulation can partially alleviate these quality difficulties. However, medical herbs and products come from a variety of nations with varying production standards and regulatory enforcement, so low-quality goods are likely to continue to be an issue. safety of herbal medicines has become an issue for the regulatory authorities, as serious effects have been reported, including hepatotoxicity, renal failure and allergic reaction^[3;4]. The World Health Organisation, recognising the growing importance of the use of herbal Guidelines were created by medicines worldwide for the existing pharmacovigilance framework to monitor herbal safety^[5].

Challenges of herbal pharmacovigilance:

Herbal remedies in Europe are derived from a variety of traditions, including Chinese, Indian, North and South American, and African systems, as well as European systems. This variety

contributes to the difficulties of herbal pharmacovigilance, including simple problems like as well as defining the best herb naming system (botanical, common, pharmaceutical, or herbal drug name) and validating the botanical identity of the herbal constituents. Normally, these are not a problem while monitoring synthetic medications. Some of these difficulties, such as naming issues or adulterations, do not easily fit into existing pharmacovigilance systems or electronic data systems established for medicines^[6,7]. However, while certain changes may be required, establishing separate systems for herbals is not the solution. If several forms or systems are utilised, it is likely to increase difficulties and confusion, thereby lowering reporting rates even further^[8]. As an example of harmonisation, the Uppsala Monitoring Centre collects ADR reports from over 100 countries worldwide, and its database contains over 4 million reports in 2010, over 21,000 of which included herbal or natural products^[7]. These are all combined into a single database, with suspected signals reviewed by professionals in relevant domains.

II. SPECIFIC CHALLENGES:

Herbal medications, unlike synthetic medicines, are often chemically rich and complex products rather than isolated single compounds. A variety of factors can have an impact on the qualitative and quantitative chemical profile, including:

- Geographic origin - climate, soil, and photoperiod.
- The genotype.
- Plant parts such as leaves, stems, roots, root bark, and so on.
- Harvesting conditions (year, season, and time of day).
- Preservation, processing, and extraction.
- Herb combinations and/or the processing of mixed herbs as medicines.

Because standardisation of herbs relative to active components is uncommon, this inherent variability results in products that may be extremely varied and not necessarily bioequivalent even when derived from the same single herbal ingredient^[9]. Combining accounts of adverse effects (or efficacy) necessitates a careful examination of the differences and similarities of the findings. Chemistry or biological activity; nonetheless, if seeking for safety signals for further exploration, studying groupings of herbs containing similar compounds could be a potentially effective method.

2.1.1. Herbal medicines and dietary supplement:

Herbal product classification and regulation may differ between countries/jurisdictions. They are categorised as herbal medicines (regulatory implications) in the EU. Safety and quality standards are required. Some herbs may be sold as dietary supplements. Herbal products are classified as dietary supplements or botanicals in the United States, not as medications. Although the FDA adopted GMP criteria in 2007, quality will vary. Manufacturers are not required to report pharmacovigilance. The legal distinction between dietary supplements and herbal medicine is nuanced. However, in general, a pharmaceutical product is defined as "any substance or combination of substances presented as having properties for the treatment or prevention of disease in humans." A food supplement, on the other hand, cannot claim to treat or prevent disease or to include a pharmacologically active chemical. This can be a complicated subject because the same herb can be used as both a herbal medication and as an ingredient in a nutritional supplement. There are legal ramifications. Herbal medicines are licenced in Europe under two directives: 'well-established use' or 'traditional herbal medical goods,' both of which have stringent quality (GMP) and safety (amongst other standards). Food supplements do not have the same legal quality control requirements as food. The classification of a herbal product as a food or medication may thus have a significant impact.

2.2. Nomenclature and what was used:

Adverse reaction reports, whether submitted to regulatory authorities or not Authorities or medical literature are meaningless unless the therapeutic herb(s) or components of a product can be recognised. Latin scientific names are used for medicinal herbs name, common or vernacular name, pharmaceutical or pharmacopoeal name, or specific herbal medicine names (as used in Traditional Chinese Medicine (TCM)). Depending on the source and regulatory status of the product, herbal prescriptions, product packaging, or labels may contain one or more of these (or no label at all). These must be taken with caution because even scientific names may have synonyms. The common or vernacular name is the least exact, and the same name may be used for plants belonging to various genera or species, thus it should be avoided if at all feasible. However, in Europe and the United States, the common name is widely used as a reference, despite the fact that EU

requirements require the Latin scientific name to be labelled. If a product meets pharmacopoeial standards, the identity of the species and plant part will be defined in the European Pharmacopoeia (PhEur). When applied to raw plant material or unlicensed herbal remedies that are not PhEur compliant, the popular name may be deceptive or confusing. To minimise ambiguity, the genus, species, and portion of the plant should be stated somewhere on the product or packaging of the crude material. Unfortunately, a botanically correct label does not guarantee that the product includes the ingredients specified on the label. In cases of severe adverse reactions when specific toxins are suspected, laboratory analysis of the product/herb may be recommended to validate the reports.

2.2.1. Initiatives to address nomenclature and quality issues:

There is currently no one reference list of medicinal plants that gives an authoritative opinion on their current scientific name while also linking all synonyms of those plants found in the literature. Only Latin scientific names (e.g., *Bupleurum chinense* DC.) are standardised; this is achieved through the 'International Code of Nomenclature of Algae, Fungi, and Plants' (ICN formerly ICBN). The Royal Botanic Gardens Kew's new Medicinal Plants Names Index (MPNI) will address this issue. One of the main goals of this project is to provide an authoritative index of scientific plant names linked to commonly used vernacular, trade, and pharmacopoeia names in order to facilitate the development of worldwide, industry-wide medicinal data standards. This is a three-year initiative (supported by the Wellcome Trust) that will be freely accessible via the internet, with a variety of supplementary information services being built to meet specific needs. To facilitate international reporting of herbal ADRs, the UMC collaborated with the Royal Botanic Gardens Kew and Uppsala University to develop proper standards and cross-referencing of herbal names for their database. A review of potential signals in the UMC database clearly demonstrates the complexities and issues of herbal pharmacovigilance, ranging from identifying what was utilised (plant, plant component, extract, dose) to clinical data available from various nations. Following that, the UMC created the WHO Herbal Dictionary, an international reference source of herbal products designed to be used for classifying and analysing medication safety data both before and after marketing. There are several attempts underway to

address botanical identification and establish quality standards. In addition to specific country pharmacopoeias (for example, the British Pharmacopoeia), the European Pharmacopoeia is developing a large number of herbal monographs, including herbs from China and the Indian subcontinent. In addition, the European Medicines Agency is working on herbal monographs. The American Herbal Pharmacopoeia, USP, and the WHO have also issued herbal monographs (5 volumes). These monographs can set plant quality standards; but, for them to be effective, they must be accompanied by adequate regulation and enforcement to assure implementation. GMP is required in Europe for all registered herbal goods (well-established use or traditional herbal products). Although this should enhance the overall quality of herbal goods on the market, less scrupulous dealers may sell subpar items over the internet, mail order, or other unregulated supply channels. Products sold as foods or supplements will also be exempt from GMP regulations.

2.3. Source—users of herbal medicine:

Consumers tend to self-prescribe herbal remedies without consulting a professional herbal practitioner or other health professional, according to surveys^[10,11]. Products can be purchased without consulting a health professional from pharmacies, supermarkets, markets, or the internet. Herbal medicines are prescribed by conventional medical practitioners in a few European nations, including Germany. Consumers may be unaware that bad effects of herbal medications can be reported to their general practitioner or that regulatory authorities can be contacted. Furthermore, customers may not associate the herbal product with the impact. Several studies have found that customers are hesitant to reveal to their doctor that they have been using herbal medicine^[12]. Some customers will seek herbal practitioners, however legislation governing who can supply herbal remedies vary greatly across Europe. From highly qualified experts to untrained and uncontrolled individuals, training and practise standards differ.

III. IDENTIFYING ADVERSE REACTIONS:

The classification of adverse responses is widely established in conventional medicine and also applies to herbal treatment.

adverse responses are characterised as follows^[13]:
Type A (acute/augmented); dose-related and described by plant pharmacology.

Type B (bizarre/idiosyncratic); not dose-related or pharmacologically predictable.

Type C (chronic/cumulative): the effect is cumulative.

Carcinogenic and genotoxic to type D (delayed onset).

Herb safety is primarily based on practical experience, and it is efficient in diagnosing acute toxicity with symptoms that appear within hours or days after using any herbal therapy. This traditional expertise, however, is ineffective in identifying herb(s) that produce cumulative, chronic, or delayed toxicity. If the first evidence of detrimental effects do not appear for months or years after starting or discontinuing usage of the herbs/drugs, the use of the herbs is likely to be forgotten.

Aristolochic acid nephropathy (AAN) is an excellent example of Type C chronic toxicity. The effects are cumulative, and renal symptoms can be delayed for up to two years after the herbs are stopped^[14]. Although aristolochic acids were known to have the potential to cause renal toxicity, various species of *Aristolochia* have been used in traditional medicines of many countries^[15] (*Aristolochiamanshuriensis* is Komand *Aristolochiafangchi* Y.C. Wu ex L.D. Chou & S.M. Hwang in Chinese medicine). Only because of a cluster of cases in Belgium with comprehensive follow-up was the pattern of toxicity recognised and documented, complete with histological description, information of illness course, and the likely development of urothelial carcinomas.

Idiosyncratic reactions (Type B) can occur within days or weeks of starting treatment but are difficult to identify because they are unpredictable, not dose or time dependent, and are not always related to pharmacological activities but can result from reactive metabolites and immune-mediated reactions^[13]. Such reactions occur infrequently but they are significant because they can be dangerous or even lethal. Drug-induced hepatotoxicity is frequently caused by an atypical reaction. Because symptoms may be non-specific and there is no clearly identifiable poisonous ingredient that can be quantified in laboratory analysis, it is difficult to substantiate single case reports of suspected herbal toxicity that may be attributable to idiosyncratic reactions. Such an unusual unpleasant reaction

IV. PHARMACOVIGILANCE METHODS:

For post-marketing medication safety monitoring, a variety of approaches are utilised,

including spontaneous reporting and prescription event monitoring^[6,7]. These approaches can be used to monitor herbal safety, but they must be modified to handle specific concerns such as botanical nomenclature, quality, adulteration, labelling issues, prescriber/reporter differences, and under-reporting.

4.1. Spontaneous report:

Medicine safety is frequently evaluated through spontaneous reporting mechanisms. Although there are small variances between countries, the principles remain the same. Medical professionals, including physicians, chemists, nurses, and, in some countries, consumers^[17], use standardised forms to report potential adverse reactions to regulatory authorities. The reports are of 'suspected' adverse responses, and the reporter is not required to confirm the link between medicine and effect. The reporting centres evaluate such causality on a case-by-case basis. Statistical approaches are utilised to detect disproportionate reporting rates, which might serve as a warning indication. A 'signal' merely indicates a negative consequence of interest that requires additional evaluation and investigation - the link to the drug or herb has not been established.

Spontaneous reports are more likely to be effective when goods are controlled as medicines and administered by health experts who are well-versed in their use. This reporting mechanism. Consumers may be unaware of the significance of reporting negative impacts. Where herbal medicines/natural products are sold as dietary supplements in the United States, health professionals and consumers can report potential adverse events to the FDA MedWatch programme. The spontaneous reporting mechanism is known as the 'yellow card' method in the United Kingdom; blue cards are used in other nations such as Australia. In the United Kingdom, the yellow card was changed in 2000 to allow for the inclusion of herbals. There are still issues with proper component listings, botanical naming of medicinal herbs, processing, and product quality^[17].

In the United Kingdom, the Medicines and Healthcare Products Regulatory Agency receives over 20,000 yellow card reports every year, although only about 100 of these are herbal reports. Despite efforts to expand reporting to nurses, chemists, and consumers, there has been no significant increase in herbal reports. Herbal ADRs have been studied in countries such as Sweden and Italy^[8,18]. Because there are few 'yellow card' herbal

reports in the UK, identifying adverse effects of concern by evaluating individual reports without waiting for statistical signal detection is extremely simple.

Manufacturers have pharmacovigilance requirements under European directives and maybe additional National rules where medicines are regulated (e.g., licenced as a well-established or traditional herbal medical product in Europe). These requirements apply to both conventional and natural treatments. This includes deadlines and other reporting requirements for notifying regulatory authorities of any reports of undesirable or unexpected adverse effects from their products. This order does not apply to unlicensed or unregulated items or dietary supplements.

4.2. Problems with spontaneous reports: With spontaneous reporting systems, underreporting is a well-known issue^[19]. This is regarded to be a more serious issue with herbal treatments. The following factors contribute to the under-reporting of herbal ADRs:

- A lack of link between herb and adverse effect.

- The patient discontinues use of the herbal treatment when they become ill.
- The physician or patient is unaware that herbal ADRs must be reported.
- The physician is ignorant of the use of herbal medications since the patient does not consider herbal and nutritional goods to be 'medicines' and hence does not reveal use^[12,20].

Any report of bad effects is only meaningful if you know what herb/product was taken. This is dependent on the reporting correctly identifying the product/herb. When insufficient names are used, this might lead to confusion. If the word 'ginseng' is used alone in a report, it could refer to *Panax ginseng* C.A. Mey or *Panax quinquefolius* (Burk.) F.H. Chen. However, it may also refer to a variety of other plants marketed as 'ginseng', such as *Eleutherococcus senticosus* (Rupr. & Maxim) Maxim (Siberian ginseng) or the unrelated *Withania somnifera* (L.) Dunal (Indian ginseng). Collaboration with pharmacognosy departments, botanic gardens, or other toxicological units can increase the quality of ADR reports. The Chinese Medicine Advisory Service in the United Kingdom assists with inquiries about possible herbal ADRs. The identify of Chinese medicinal herbs can be confirmed by collaboration with the Royal Botanic Gardens Kew. There is some confidence in the botanical identity when ADRs are published in medical journals or reported

to authorities. The Hospital Authority Toxicology Reference Laboratory at Princess Ma Hospital in Hong KongThe hospital also conducts multidisciplinary investigations into situations of Toxicity from herbs. Products with a long history of usage or those registered under the Traditional Herbal Medicinal Product Directive (THMPD) will have a brand name and the accurately mentioned elements. Obtaining reliable ingredient lists for unregulated/unlicensed items is difficult. Poor quality products continue to be a source of concern because there is no guarantee that the product includes the substances specified on the label. Herbal items contaminated with pharmaceutical pharmaceuticals for weight loss (e.g., sibutramine), inflammatory disorders (steroids), or erectile dysfunction (sildenafil) are a worldwide issue. In an examination of herbal safety alerts issued in 2010, we discovered that pharmaceutical contamination or adulteration was responsible for 336 of 390 warnings given by regulatory authorities in the UK, US, Canada, Singapore, Hong Kong, and Australia.

With a low number of ADR reports in a single nation, herbal signals of interest may be missed, especially for unusual reactions. The WHO Collaborating Centre for Monitoring Drug Safety (UMC) is attempting to solve this issue by compiling ADR reports from over 100 countries worldwide. By early 2011, their database has grown to more than 6 million medication and herbal reports^[7]. This is the most comprehensive repository of such reports. They attempted to address nomenclature concerns as herbal reports came from nations with diverse traditional medicine systems. However, because the content of different herbal products varies, caution is advised when aggregating reviews on a same herb/product. However, groups of herbs with similar chemical compositions can be used to identify potential research targets.

V. MONITORING FOR HERB-DRUG INTERACTIONS:

There is a widespread belief that herbal treatments are safe, even when combined with prescription medications^[21]. Herbs can be utilised to cure the underlying ailment or to mitigate the negative effects of conventional treatment. Under-reporting of potential interactions between herbs and medicines is a growing concern, and it stems from the same reasons as herbal ADR under-reporting. The specific issues that must be addressed are those that may affect certain patient

groups, such as cancer patients, where the rate of combining orthodox and herbal medication use is anticipated to be high and the danger of interaction is large. Patients on treatment regimens comprising powerful pharmaceuticals metabolised by cytochrome P450 enzymes or whose bioavailability is altered by P glycoprotein are more likely to experience herb-drug interactions. Adverse effects caused by interactions may go unnoticed if the physician or other health professional is unaware of the concurrent use of medicinal herbs^[22,23]. Adverse medication interactions responses are rather prevalent, however they are largely avoidable. Recently, the UMC conducted research to demonstrate that pharmacokinetic and pharmacodynamic medication interactions can be recognised in their database^[24]. It is intended that as this investigation progresses, herb-drug interactions will be examined.

Other methods of monitoring:

Prescription event monitoring (PEM) is a non-interventional hypothesis generation method for investigating a medicine after it has been placed on the market, based on individual prescription monitoring. In practitioners. It's a good way to look at specific safety concerns about commonly used medicinal herbs^[12].

Intensive monitoring plans can be used to encourage reporting on certain medicines and are an extension of spontaneous reporting initiatives. There is a long list of registered herbal medicines in Thailand that are also utilised in hospitals. They employed intense monitoring on nine distinct herbal items where further safety information was required^[25]. The Poisons Control Centres are another source of pharmacovigilance and safety information on herbal medications^[1]. In Europe and the United States, these centres handle inquiries about the safety of a product or a suspected poisoning. Because these inquiries are not always formal reports, supporting information such as product specifics, time course, and dose may be lacking. Often, patients seek medical assistance after taking an acute or chronic overdose; this may not provide helpful information about medium- or long-term toxicity. Poisons Control Centres are a key source of dietary supplement ADRs in the United States, according to a 2008 study that found that the primary reporting site, MedWatch, got less complaints than the poison control centres. Other pharmacoepidemiological strategies for in-depth drug research that can be applied to herbal medication safety Case control and cohort studies are examples of research methods. These can be

used to test ideas that have been generated after signals have been discovered utilising spontaneous reports. One such signal was found in reports of possible liver damage connected with the use of Chinese herbs (Perharic et al., 1995; McRae et al., 2002). A pilot case control study was utilised to establish that no specific herb was associated with an elevated risk of liver injury (Shaw, 2010b). Until now, these methods have been underutilised for herbal medications.

Herbal practitioners:

Herbal practitioners may be a useful source of ADR information, however due to differing levels of professional regulation in Europe, they are not always acknowledged as ADR reporters. Some herbal practitioner societies have set up their own reporting systems, which are not always linked to governmental agencies. Reporting by skilled herbal practitioners has advantages. They are educated in the use of medicinal plants and should be aware of the herb's properties and potential toxicity, as well as be able to spot unanticipated side effects of the treatment. Herbal prescriptions are frequently altered in order to prevent negative effects or improve responses. Although some consequences may be minimal, nonspecific symptoms (such as fatigue and liver failure) may signal a more serious condition. Because they treat a small number of patients in Europe, they may miss unusual adverse outcomes. Practitioners are less likely to disclose suspected ADRs in countries where herbal practise is not widely recognised or has a low professional standing. Clear definitions of reportable ADRs must be developed and standardised across countries.

Minimum requirements for ADRs: Various groups have developed criteria for reporting adverse events and clinical trials, including herbal products (Gagnier et al., 2006; Kelly et al., 2007). The case report requirements include the following case specifics: patient demographics (age, gender), relevant medical history, symptoms, abnormal laboratory results, drug identification, rationale for usage, dose, time course (duration of use, start of symptoms), and adverse event information. They comprise the following information for produced herbal products: product name, producer, batch number, kind and concentration of extract, and concentration of any standardised ingredients. Botanical identification is limited to the Latin scientific name of the plant, plant components, and

preparation (herb or extract). These rules, however, are insufficient for herbal medications delivered in complex formulations, as well as most traditional medicines used in Europe, such as Chinese or Ayurvedic medicine.

Any ADR report should include the name as it appears on the label/prescription. If additional information about identity is obtained by morphological or chemical analysis, the source of this information should be included. The plant name is not always included in traditional herbal formulae (or even goods). The Latin scientific name cannot be inferred from the common or drug name, and it is only correct if the plant material has been authenticated. Once the plant's identity has been confirmed, the scientific name, author, plant part, and processing should be provided. Details regarding the herbal material's processing before use (e.g., in Chinese medicine, stir frying, steaming) are essential because this might significantly alter the chemical profile or bioavailability of the herbs. The purpose for use and the herbal practitioner's diagnosis are also useful facts for any evaluation. This should be based on information provided by the practitioner. Involving a herbal practitioner in any evaluation of a possible adverse response can provide important history or understanding of the herbs' use.

Accurate adverse reaction reports are necessary in order to identify true adverse events and provide relevant warnings and guidance to practitioners and patients. If possible adverse responses are not carefully analysed, or if the herbs are erroneously identified, 'safe' or helpful plants may be banned incorrectly. To avoid misunderstandings, accurate identification of the medicinal herbs employed is required when publishing case reports in the medical literature.

As the use of herbal medications has increased around the world, there has been a dearth of knowledge on the safety of herbs as they are used in different patient groups that may differ in critical parameters such as pharmacogenomics and metabolism profiles, or gut microbiota composition and bioactivity. Effective pharmacovigilance is required to collect reliable information on the safety of herbal medications in order to produce adequate guidelines for safe and effective use.

The pharmacovigilance and the who international drug monitoring program:

Pharmacovigilance is the science and activities concerned with the detection, assessment,

comprehension, and prevention of adverse drug effects or other potential drug-related problems.[5] Its interests have recently expanded to cover the following:

Herbs

traditional and complementary treatments

blood products

biologicals

medical devices

vaccines.

Pharmacovigilance's specific goals are as follows:

enhancing patient care and safety in the use of medications and all medical and paramedical interventions

improve public health and safety in relation to medicine use;

contribute to the assessment of benefit, harm, effectiveness, and risk of medicines, encouraging their safe, rational, and more effective (including cost-effective) use;

promote understanding, education, and clinical training in pharmacovigilance and its effective communication to the public

The WHO international drug monitoring program:

National pharmacovigilance centres designated by competent health authorities are responsible under the WHO International Drug Monitoring Programme for the collection, processing, and evaluation of case reports of suspected adverse reactions supplied by health care professionals (primarily spontaneous reporting by physicians of reactions associated with the use of prescribed medicines). The Programme is documented in two publications: Safety monitoring of medical products: instructions for establishing and operating a pharmacovigilance center,[1] chapters 7 and 8; and The relevance of pharmacovigilance: safety monitoring of medicinal products,[5], particularly chapters 3 and 4.

The Programme currently consists of a network of more than 70 autonomous national pharmacovigilance centres whose duties are coordinated and assisted by the WHO and the UMC. The UMC is in charge of the worldwide WHO database, which receives all case reports submitted by national pharmacovigilance centres. The UMC employs the global WHO database to identify/detect new adverse reaction signals from cumulative data and to disseminate risk assessments to national pharmacovigilance centres and others concerned with medication safety.

VI. CONCLUSION:

To evaluate the negative effects brought on by herbal products, a "herbavigilance" system must be devised. Information obtained from patients and healthcare professionals is crucial for providing the essential data for recognising the pharmacovigilance signals. Companies must carry out a thorough drug safety and pharmacovigilance audit to determine whether they are in compliance with all applicable international laws, rules, and guidelines.

REFERENCES:

- [1]. Mann, R.D., Andrews, E.F. (Eds.), 2002. Pharmacovigilance. Wiley, Chichester.
- [2]. McLernon, D.J., Bond, C.M., Hannaford, P.C., et al., 2010. Adverse drug reaction reporting in the UK. *Drug Safety* 33
- [3]. Shaw, D., 2010a. Toxicological risks of Chinese herbs. *Planta Medica* 76, 2012–2018.
- [4]. Perharic, L., Shaw, D., Leon, C., De Smet, P.A., Murray, V.S., 1995. Possible association of liver damage with the use of Chinese herbal medicine for skin disease. *Veterinary and Human Toxicology* 37, 562–566
- [5]. Nortier, J., Vanherweghem, J.L., 2007. For patients taking herbal therapy – lessons from aristolochic acid nephropathy. *Nephrology Dialysis and Transplantation* 22, 1512–1517
- [6]. World Health Organisation, 2004. WHO Guidelines on Safety Monitoring of Herbal Medicines in Pharmacovigilance Systems. WHO, Geneva.
- [7]. DynPage, 2011. <http://www.who-umc.org/DynPage.aspx?id=97218&mn1=7347&mn2=7252>.
- [8]. UMC. 2011. (accessed 24.10.11.).
- [9]. Menniti-Ippolito, F., Mazzanti, G., Santuccio, C., Moro, P., Calapai, G., Firenzuoli, Valeri, F., Raschetti, R., 2008. Surveillance of suspected adverse reactions to natural health products in Italy. *Pharmacoepidemiology and Drug Safety* 17, 626–635.
- [10]. Loew, D., Kaszkin, M., 2002. Approaching the problem of bioequivalence of herbal medicinal products. *Phytotherapy Research* 16, 705–711
- [11]. Barnes, J., Mills, S.Y., Abbot, N.C., et al., 1998. Different standards for reporting ADRs to herbal remedies and conventional OTC medicines: face-to-face interviews with 515 users of herbal remedies. *British Journal of Clinical Pharmacology* 45, 496–500.
- [12]. Ipsos Mori, 2008. Public Perceptions of Herbal Medicines General Public Qualitative and Quantitative Research, <http://www.mhra.gov.uk/home/groups/commmspo/documents/news/con036073.pdf> (accessed October 2011)
- [13]. Barnes, J., 2003. Pharmacovigilance of herbal medicines: A UK perspective. *Drug Safety* 26, 829–851
- [14]. Edwards, I.R., Aronson, J.K., 2000. Adverse drug reactions: definitions, diagnosis and management. *Lancet* 356, 1255–1259.
- [15]. Reginster, F., Jadoul, M., van Ypersele de Strihou, C., 1995. Chinese herbs nephropathy presentation, natural history and fate after transplantation. *Nephrology Dialysis and Transplantation* 10, 157–160.
- [16]. Heinrich, M., Chan, J., Wanke, S., Neinhuis, C., Simmonds, M., 2009. Local uses of Aristolochia species and content of nephrotoxic aristolochic acids 1 and 2 – a global assessment based on bibliographic sources. *Journal of Ethnopharmacology* 125, 108–144.
- [17]. Delgoda, R., Ellington, C., Barrett, S., Gordon, N., Clarke, N., Younger, N., 2004. The practice of polypharmacy involving herbal and prescription medicines in the treatment of diabetes mellitus, hypertension and gastrointestinal disorders in Jamaica. *West Indian Medical Journal* 53, 400–405.
- [18]. McLernon, D.J., Bond, C.M., Hannaford, P.C., et al., 2010. Adverse drug reaction reporting in the UK. *Drug Safety* 33, 775–786
- [19]. Jacobsson, I., Jonsson, A., Gerden, B., Hagg, S., 2009. Spontaneously reported adverse reactions in association with complementary and alternative medicine substances in Sweden. *Pharmacoepidemiology and Drug Safety* 18, 1039–1047.
- [20]. Hazell, L., Shakir, S.A.W., 2006. Under reporting of adverse drug reactions: a systematic review. *Drug Safety* 29, 38



- [20]. Williamson, E.M., Driver, S., Baxter, K. (Eds.), 2009. Stockley's Herbal Medicines Interactions. Pharmaceutical Press, UK
- [21]. Delgoda, R., Ellington, C., Barrett, S., Gordon, N., Clarke, N., Younger, N., 2004. The practice of polypharmacy involving herbal and prescription medicines in the treatment of diabetes mellitus, hypertension and gastrointestinal disorders in Jamaica. *West Indian Medical Journal* 53, 400–405.
- [22]. Giveon, S.M., Liberman, N., Klang, S., Kahan, E., 2004. Are people who use natural drugs aware of their potentially harmful side effects and reporting to family physician. *Patient Education Counsel* 53, 5–11.
- [23]. Goldstein, L.H., Elias, M., Ron-Avraham, G., Biniurishvili, B.Z., Madjar, M., Kamargash, I., Braunstein, R., Berkovitch, M., Golik, A., 2007. Consumption of herbal remedies and dietary supplements amongst patients hospitalized in medical wards. *British Journal of Clinical Pharmacology* 64, 373–380.
- [24]. Strandell, J., Caster, O., Bate, A., Norén, G.N., Edwards, I.R., 2011. Reporting patterns indicative of adverse drug interactions: a systematic evaluation in Vigibase. *Drug Safety* 34, 253–266
- [25]. Saokaew, S., Suwankesawong, W., Permsuwann, U., et al., 2011. Safety of herbal products in Thailand. *Drug Safety* 34, 339–350