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

Vol. 10-No.4 (2024) pp. 2425-2441
http://www.ijcesen.com

ISSN: 2149-9144

Research Article

Role of Pharmacy Professionals in Preventing and Managing High-Alert Medications Errors in Hospitals

Khalid Mutarrid A Alanazi[1]*, Alnaman Mohammad Mteb R[2], Khalid Mohammed K Alanazi[3], Aljohani Nasser Talal[4], Ahmad Khalaf M Alrwaili[5], Altamimi Sultan Nasser A[6], Kamal Hulayyil Jatlial Alanazi[7], Hamad Marzouq Hamad Alhazmi[8], Nader Muqbil Hajaj Alhunayni[9], Abdulmohsen Maywdh Hamed Al Zaidi[10]

[1]Pharmacy Technician – Al-Qurayyat General Hospital – Al-Qurayyat, Al-Jouf – Saudi Arabia
* **Corresponding Author Email:** kalanazi91@moh.gov.sa - **ORCID:** 0000-0002-5247-7851

[2]Pharmacy Technician – Domat Al-Jandal General Hospital – Domat Al-Jandal, Al-Jouf – Saudi
Email: mohad6550@gmail.com - **ORCID:** 0000-0002-5247-7852

[3]Pharmacy Technician – Maternity and Children Hospital – Arar, Northern Borders – Saudi Arabia
Email: kalanazi40@moh.gov.sa - **ORCID:** 0000-0002-5247-7853

[4]Pharmaist – General Directorate of Prisons Health – Jeddah-Makkah Region – Saudi Arabia
Email: nasser.talal44@gmail.com- **ORCID:** 0000-0002-5247-7854

[5]Pharmacy Technician – Compliance Department, Northern Borders Health Cluster – Arar, Northern Borders – Saudi Arabia
Email: ahkalrwaili@moh.gov.sa- **ORCID:** 0000-0002-5247-7855

[6]Pharmacy – King Khalid Hospital – Hail, Hail Region – Saudi Arabia
Email: 0snaltamimi0@gmail.com - **ORCID:** 0000-0002-5247-7856

[7]Pharmacy Technician – Maternity and Children Hospital – Arar, Northern Borders – Saudi Arabia
Email: qsr-3636@hotmail.com- **ORCID:** 0000-0002-5247-7857

[8]Pharmacy Technician – Maternity and Children Hospital – Arar, Northern Borders – Saudi Arabia
Email: hamad201236@gmail.com- **ORCID:** 0000-0002-5247-7858

[9]Pharmacy Technician – Medical Supply, Maternity and Children Hospital – Arar, Northern Borders – Saudi Arabia
Email: nalhunayni@moh.gov.sa- **ORCID:** 0000-0002-5247-7859

[10]Pharmacy Technician – Children Hospital in Taif – Taif, Makkah Region – Saudi Arabia
Email: a_m_z_00@hotmail.com- **ORCID:** 0000-0002-5247-7800

Article Info:

DOI: 10.22399/ijcesen.4024
Received : 22 October 2024
Accepted : 22 December 2024

Keywords

Pharmacy professionals,
medication errors,
high-alert medications,
patient safety

Abstract:

Pharmacy professionals play a pivotal role in preventing and managing high-alert medication errors in hospitals, where the implications of such errors can be severe. High-alert medications are categorized as those that carry a heightened risk of causing significant harm if used in error, including drugs like anticoagulants, insulin, and certain opioids. Pharmacists contribute to medication safety through their expertise in pharmacotherapy, ensuring that the correct medication is selected, dosed, and administered appropriately. By conducting thorough medication reconciliations, operating in multidisciplinary teams during patient rounds, and participating in risk assessment protocols, pharmacists can identify potential errors before they reach patients. Their proactive engagement in staff education about high-alert medications and safe handling practices further enhances patient safety. In addition to prevention, pharmacy professionals are integral in managing and mitigating the consequences of medication errors when they do occur. They are equipped to conduct root cause analyses of medication incidents, providing valuable insights that lead to improvements in clinical practice and protocol development. By monitoring patient outcomes and promoting the use of electronic prescribing systems with built-in safety features, pharmacists can reduce the likelihood of errors. Regularly updating hospital staff on

best practices for high-alert medications through training and awareness initiatives continuously reinforces a culture of safety within healthcare settings. The collaborative efforts of pharmacy professionals not only protect patients but also support healthcare teams in delivering the highest standard of care.

1. Introduction

The modern healthcare system is a complex, high-stakes environment where patient safety is the paramount concern. Within this intricate ecosystem, the medication use process represents a critical pathway with multiple vulnerable points, each carrying the potential for error. While any medication error can have detrimental consequences, a specific category of drugs, known as High-Alert Medications (HAMs), demands exceptional vigilance. The Institute for Safe Medication Practices (ISMP) defines HAMs as "drugs that bear a heightened risk of causing significant patient harm when they are used in error" [1]. These medications, which include insulins, opioids, anticoagulants, sedatives, and chemotherapeutic agents, possess a narrow therapeutic index, meaning the margin between a therapeutic dose and a toxic one is perilously small. Consequently, errors involving HAMs are not merely more frequent in occurrence but are disproportionately severe in their outcomes, leading to permanent disability, life-threatening complications, or even patient mortality [2].

The scale of the problem is significant. Global studies on patient safety have consistently identified medication errors as a leading cause of avoidable harm in healthcare settings. The World Health Organization (WHO) has recognized medication safety as a global priority, launching its third Global Patient Safety Challenge with the explicit goal of reducing severe, avoidable medication-related harm by 50% over five years [3]. Within this challenging landscape, HAMs are frequently implicated in a substantial proportion of the most serious reported incidents. Errors can occur at any node of the medication use cycle—from prescribing and transcribing to dispensing, administering, and monitoring. A simple miscalculation in an opioid dose, a miscommunication in a verbal insulin order, or a failure to monitor for anticoagulation can swiftly cascade into a catastrophic event [4].

Historically, the responsibility for medication safety was often viewed as a collective, yet diffuse, duty shared among all healthcare providers. However, the evolving complexity of pharmacotherapy and the sobering statistics on preventable harm have catalyzed a paradigm shift. This shift has redefined the role of the pharmacy professional from a primarily logistical and distributive function to an indispensable, patient-centered clinical role. Today's pharmacy professionals—encompassing clinical pharmacists, pharmacy technicians, and other support staff—are now recognized as the linchpins of medication safety systems. Their specialized knowledge in pharmacology, pharmacokinetics, and toxicology positions them uniquely to spearhead initiatives aimed at fortifying defenses against errors, particularly for the most dangerous drugs in the hospital arsenal [5]. This research paper will delve into the multifaceted and critical role of pharmacy professionals in designing, implementing, and sustaining robust strategies to prevent and manage errors associated with high-alert medications within the hospital setting.

The transformation of pharmacy practice from a product-oriented to a patient-focused profession is a cornerstone of modern healthcare. This evolution has been driven by the recognition that simply ensuring the right drug reaches the patient is insufficient; it is imperative to ensure that the drug is used correctly, safely, and effectively to achieve optimal therapeutic outcomes. The clinical pharmacy model, which emerged in the latter half of the 20th century, formally integrated pharmacists into direct patient care activities, such as participating in medical rounds, conducting medication reconciliation, and providing drug information to physicians and nurses [6]. This integration was a pivotal step in proactively intercepting errors before they reach the patient.

In the context of HAMs, this clinical integration is not a luxury but a necessity. The pharmacodynamic and pharmacokinetic properties of HAMs are often complex, requiring individualized dosing based on a patient's organ function, comorbidities, and concurrent medications. A prescriber, while expert in diagnosis and treatment pathways, may not possess the same depth of knowledge regarding drug interactions or the nuanced dosing requirements for a patient with renal impairment receiving low-molecular-weight heparin. The clinical pharmacist, acting as a medication therapy expert, is equipped to identify such risks and recommend appropriate adjustments, thereby preventing a potential error at the prescribing stage [7]. This proactive intervention is a primary layer of defense in the "Swiss Cheese Model" of error prevention, plugging holes in the system before a latent failure can align with an active failure [8].

Furthermore, the scope of pharmacy practice has expanded beyond the clinical pharmacist. Pharmacy technicians, once confined to counting and pouring tasks, are now taking on more advanced roles in the safety infrastructure. Their involvement in tech-check-tech programs, automated dispensing cabinet (ADC) management, and sterile compounding quality assurance frees up clinical pharmacists for higher-level cognitive functions while simultaneously adding another layer of verification to the dispensing process for HAMs [9]. This team-based approach, where each member practices at the top of their license, creates a synergistic effect, significantly enhancing the resilience of the medication use system against the inherent risks posed by HAMs. The pharmacy department, therefore, functions not as a siloed unit but as the central nervous system for medication safety, receiving, processing, and acting upon information to protect the patient throughout their care journey.

2. System-Based Vulnerabilities and High-Alert Medications

Understanding the role of pharmacy professionals requires an appreciation of the system-based vulnerabilities that HAMs exploit. These vulnerabilities are rarely the result of a single individual's negligence but are rather symptoms of flawed processes, technologies, or organizational cultures. For instance, many HAMs, such as intravenous (IV) potassium chloride or concentrated sodium chloride, require dilution before administration. The presence of concentrated electrolytes in patient care areas without standardized, ready-to-administer forms is a well-documented system failure that has led to numerous fatal outcomes [10]. Similarly, look-alike, sound-alike (LASA) drug names, such as "Lamictal" (lamotrigine) and "Lamisil" (terbinafine), or "Humalog" and "Humulin," create a high risk for confusion at every stage, from prescribing to administration [11].

Another critical vulnerability lies in the monitoring phase. The therapeutic effect of many HAMs, particularly anticoagulants like warfarin and direct oral anticoagulants (DOACs), is not solely determined by the dose administered but by the patient's physiological response. Inadequate monitoring of international normalized ratio (INR) for a patient on warfarin, or failure to assess renal function for a patient on a DOAC, can lead to undetected over-anticoagulation and life-threatening hemorrhage [12]. These are not errors of commission but errors of omission, where the system fails to ensure that necessary follow-up and assessment occur.

Technology, while a powerful safety tool, can also introduce new risks. Poorly configured computerized physician order entry (CPOE) systems may lack forcing functions or hard stops for extreme HAM doses. Barcode-assisted medication administration (BCMA) systems can be bypassed or may not be integrated with the patient's weight or laboratory data to provide real-time clinical decision support [13]. It is within these gaps—these interfaces between human, process, and technology—that the expertise of the pharmacy professional becomes critical. They are uniquely qualified to identify these systemic vulnerabilities, advocate for the adoption of safer technologies, and lead the design of fail-safe processes specifically tailored to the risks of HAMs.

3. High-Alert Medications

A foundational step in mitigating the risks associated with the most dangerous pharmaceuticals is to precisely define, understand the scope of, and systematically classify them. The term "High-Alert Medication" (HAM) is a specific safety concept coined by the Institute for Safe Medication Practices (ISMP). It is crucial to distinguish this term from broader classifications like "high-risk" or "hazardous" drugs, as the key differentiator lies in the context of *error*. The ISMP defines HAMs as "drugs that bear a heightened risk of causing significant patient harm when they are used in error" [14]. This definition underscores that the inherent danger is not necessarily from the drug's appropriate, therapeutic use, but from the consequences of a mistake in its use. Harm, in this context, can range from prolonged hospitalization and permanent disability to death. This contrasts with "hazardous drugs," a term often used by organizations like the National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH), which refers to agents that pose a health risk to healthcare workers through occupational exposure, such as genotoxicity or carcinogenicity [15]. While some drugs may belong to both categories (e.g., chemotherapeutic agents), the definitions address distinct threats: one to the patient from a process error, and the other to the caregiver from an environmental exposure.

The scope of the problem posed by HAMs is vast and deeply concerning. Although errors with these medications may not be the most frequent, their impact is disproportionately severe. Studies analyzing medication error reports consistently find that HAMs are overrepresented in incidents resulting in serious harm or fatality [16]. The "scope" extends beyond a simple list of drug names; it encompasses the entire lifecycle of the

medication within the healthcare system and the potential for error at every stage. This includes errors in prescribing (wrong drug, dose, or frequency), transcribing (misinterpretation of orders), dispensing (incorrect product selection or labeling), administration (wrong patient, route, or rate), and monitoring (failure to assess therapeutic response or adverse effects) [17]. The narrow therapeutic index of many HAMs means that even a small deviation from the intended regimen—a decimal point error in a dose, for instance—can have catastrophic and irreversible consequences for the patient, thereby defining the critical scope of the safety initiatives required to manage them.

Understanding why these medications are so perilous requires an examination of their pharmacological and use-based characteristics. The heightened risk associated with HAMs generally stems from one or more of several key factors. First, and most commonly, is a **narrow therapeutic index (NTI)**. Drugs like warfarin, lithium, and phenytoin have a very small difference between the blood concentration required for a therapeutic effect and the concentration that causes toxicity [18]. This leaves little room for dosing error. Second, many HAMs produce **potent and rapid pharmacological effects**. Medications such as intravenous insulin, nitroglycerin, and adrenergic agonists/antagonists (e.g., epinephrine, propranolol) can cause dramatic physiological changes within minutes, leaving a very short window to identify and correct an error before harm occurs. A third factor is the **requirement for complex dosing regimens or calculations**. Chemotherapeutic agents, heparin infusions, and pediatric medications often require intricate, weight-based or body-surface-area-based calculations, increasing the probability of a mathematical miscalculation that can lead to a massive overdose [19].

The fourth factor involves **specific dosage forms or routes of administration**. For example, the confusion between epidural and intravenous infusions, or the inadvertent administration of an oral liquid into an intravenous line, can be fatal. Similarly, the availability of concentrated electrolyte solutions (e.g., potassium chloride for injection concentrate) in patient care areas has been a classic and deadly hazard [20]. Finally, a significant risk factor is the **high potential for confusion** due to look-alike or sound-alike (LASA) drug names or similar packaging. Confusions between drugs like clonidine (an antihypertensive) and Klonopin (clonazepam, an anticonvulsant), or between morphine and hydromorphone, have resulted in numerous serious events, emphasizing that risk is not solely pharmacological but also perceptual and system-driven [21]. These characteristics, often present in combination, are what elevate certain medications to the high-alert status, demanding specialized safeguards.

To translate this conceptual understanding into actionable safety protocols, healthcare institutions rely on standardized classifications and lists of HAMs. The most widely recognized and authoritative source is the ISMP's List of High-Alert Medications in Acute Care Settings. This list is not static; it is periodically reviewed and updated based on analysis of error reports, new drug approvals, and emerging safety data. The ISMP list is organized by drug classes and specific medications, providing a clear framework for hospitals to adopt and customize [22]. The list typically includes, but is not limited to, the following core categories: adrenergic agonists (e.g., epinephrine, norepinephrine), adrenergic antagonists (e.g., propranolol, metoprolol), anesthetic agents, antiarrhythmics (e.g., amiodarone, lidocaine), anticoagulants (e.g., warfarin, heparin, direct oral anticoagulants), chemotherapeutic agents, concentrated electrolytes (e.g., potassium chloride, magnesium sulfate), hypoglycemic agents (insulins and oral medications), inotropic drugs (e.g., digoxin, milrinone), narcotics/opioids, and neuromuscular blocking agents (e.g., succinylcholine, rocuronium) [22].

The value of such a standardized list is multifold. Firstly, it creates a universal awareness among healthcare professionals about which drugs warrant extra caution. Secondly, it serves as the foundational document for health systems to mandate the implementation of specific, evidence-based "risk-reduction strategies" for each category or drug. For instance, the standard required for opioids might be patient monitoring protocols with naloxone availability, while for concentrated electrolytes, it would be their removal from floor stock and standardization of premixed solutions [23]. By classifying medications in this way, safety efforts can be targeted and efficient, rather than diffuse and generic. This classification directs limited institutional resources towards the areas of greatest potential harm, ensuring that the most robust safety nets are erected where they are most needed.

While the ISMP list provides a critical starting point, the classification of HAMs is not a one-size-fits-all endeavor. Individual healthcare institutions must engage in a process of local validation and customization. A medication's risk profile can be influenced by the specific patient population served (e.g., pediatrics, geriatrics, obstetrics), the clinical services offered (e.g., oncology, cardiology), and the existing safety infrastructure within the hospital.

Therefore, the global ISMP list should be considered a baseline. Hospitals are encouraged to analyze their own internal medication error reports, near-miss data, and adverse drug event records to identify which medications are most frequently involved in errors within *their* specific context [24]. This data-driven approach allows for the creation of an institutional-specific HAM list, which may include additional drugs not on the ISMP list or may assign a higher priority to certain classes based on local incident patterns.

This process of local classification often involves a multi-disciplinary committee, typically led by pharmacy professionals in collaboration with physicians, nurses, risk managers, and quality improvement specialists. The committee's role is to review the evidence, analyze local data, and formally classify which medications are deemed high-alert for that particular institution. This official classification is a powerful catalyst for action. It triggers the development and implementation of mandatory safety protocols, such as independent double-checks during dispensing and administration, the use of standardized order sets, specific patient education requirements, and enhanced monitoring protocols [23]. For example, a hospital with a high volume of cardiac surgery may classify intravenous antihypertensive agents as a top-tier HAM and implement standardized drips and monitoring flowsheets, whereas a psychiatric facility might focus its classification and safeguards on lithium and clozapine.

4. Pharmacist Roles in Medication Safety:

The role of the pharmacist in the contemporary hospital pharmacy has transcended its traditional boundaries, evolving from a primarily distributive function to a comprehensive, patient-centered clinical and strategic imperative. This evolution is most critically observed in the domain of medication safety, where pharmacists serve as both the final defensive barrier and the primary architects of proactive risk mitigation systems. Their involvement is not a single task but a spectrum of responsibilities that permeate the entire medication-use process, constructing a multi-layered safety net designed to intercept errors and champion optimal therapeutic outcomes. This spectrum can be visualized as a continuum, ranging from the fundamental, system-oriented task of order verification to the advanced, leadership-oriented role of medication safety stewardship. Each function is intrinsically linked, forming a cohesive and robust strategy to protect patients, with particular emphasis on averting the catastrophic consequences of errors involving high-alert medications (HAMs). The pharmacist's unique and specialized expertise in pharmacology, pharmacotherapy, and systems management renders them indispensable in identifying latent vulnerabilities, implementing evidence-based safeguards, and cultivating a pervasive culture of safety throughout the healthcare organization [24].

The most foundational and universally recognized role of the pharmacist in error prevention is the prospective order verification and intervention process. This critical check occurs before any medication is dispensed for administration, acting as a vital cognitive filter. It is a process that extends far beyond a mere technical confirmation of the prescription's legibility or completeness. Leveraging their deep therapeutic knowledge, pharmacists conduct a comprehensive assessment of the order against the patient's individualized clinical profile. This includes verifying the classic "five rights" (right drug, dose, route, time, patient), but critically expands to encompass a holistic review of the patient's diagnosis, allergy status, renal and hepatic function, potential drug-drug and drug-disease interactions, and therapeutic duplication [25]. For high-alert medications, this verification process is intensified and requires a heightened level of clinical vigilance. For example, when verifying an order for intravenous heparin, the pharmacist ensures not only the appropriateness of the dose but also confirms the availability of a baseline coagulation panel (aPTT), validates the patient's weight for accurate weight-based dosing, and ascertains that the order aligns with a standardized, pharmacy-managed protocol. This proactive intervention at the prescribing stage is empirically demonstrated as one of the most effective mechanisms for preventing medication errors, with numerous studies confirming that pharmacist-led prospective order review significantly reduces the incidence of preventable adverse drug events (ADEs) [26].

Building upon individual order verification, pharmacists exercise a pivotal influence in designing, implementing, and managing system-level safeguards that engineer a safer medication-use environment. A paramount area of responsibility lies in the strategic procurement, storage, and standardization of medications, with a sharp focus on HAMs. Pharmacists lead interdisciplinary initiatives to remove concentrated electrolyte solutions, such as potassium chloride injection concentrate, from patient care units, replacing them with pharmacy-prepared or commercially available premixed intravenous solutions. This single intervention effectively eliminates a historically persistent and deadly source of catastrophic error [27]. Furthermore,

pharmacists oversee the strategic configuration and management of automated dispensing cabinets (ADCs), ensuring that high-risk medications are sequestered in profile-based drawers with linked clinical warnings, rather than being readily accessible in open-access pockets. They are also instrumental in the development, implementation, and maintenance of standardized order sets and protocols for HAMs. By creating and mandating the use of pre-approved, evidence-based protocols for drugs like insulin infusions, patient-controlled analgesia (PCA) with opioids, and anticoagulation therapy, they drastically reduce reliance on error-prone free-text prescribing and ensure consistent, guideline-concordant care across the institution [28]. This system-level work proactively addresses latent errors—the inherent flaws embedded within the healthcare system—and underscores the pharmacist's role as a safety engineer, systematically redesigning processes to make errors difficult or impossible to commit.

The pharmacist's responsibility extends dynamically to the patient's bedside through active involvement in direct clinical monitoring and comprehensive patient education. For high-alert medications, the initial prescription is often merely the commencement of a delicate therapeutic journey that demands constant titration, assessment, and re-evaluation. Clinical pharmacists, who are integrated into specialized units such as intensive care, oncology, or emergency departments, assume direct responsibility for monitoring the therapeutic and adverse effects of these potent agents. For a patient stabilized on warfarin, the pharmacist actively tracks the International Normalized Ratio (INR) trends, interprets these values within the context of the patient's concurrent medications and nutritional intake, and provides evidence-based recommendations to the medical team for precise dosage adjustments. This ensures the maintenance of therapeutic efficacy while simultaneously minimizing the risk of hemorrhagic events [29]. Similarly, for a critically ill patient on a vasoactive drip like norepinephrine, the pharmacist monitors hemodynamic parameters and organ perfusion, advising on titration to achieve clinical goals while avoiding ischemic complications. This continuous, hands-on pharmacotherapeutic management is indispensable for detecting sub-therapeutic or toxic responses at their earliest onset, thereby preventing harm that could ensue from an inattentive or static approach to powerful medications.

In tandem with vigilant monitoring, patient and caregiver education serves as a final, crucial checkpoint in the medication safety circuit, especially upon transition of care. Pharmacists are the healthcare professionals most qualified to ensure that patients and their families fully comprehend the purpose, precise dosing, correct administration technique, and potential adverse effects of their medications. This is particularly vital when patients are discharged on HAMs such as chemotherapeutic agents, direct oral anticoagulants (DOACs), or complex insulin regimens. A well-informed patient is a powerful and active safeguard against errors in the home environment. For instance, a pharmacist conducting discharge counseling for a patient newly prescribed a DOAC like apixaban will meticulously explain the importance of strict adherence, elucidate the critical signs and symptoms of bleeding or thrombosis, and caution against the use of certain over-the-counter medications like aspirin or NSAIDs that can potentiate bleeding risk [30]. This education empowers patients to become engaged participants in their own care and acts as a last line of defense by equipping them to recognize and respond appropriately to potential drug-related problems, thereby reducing the likelihood of emergency department visits or readmissions due to medication mismanagement.

The final, and most strategic, dimension of the pharmacist's role is that of a **medication safety officer and steward**. In this capacity, the pharmacist transitions from individual patient-centric care to an organizational leadership role focused on quality improvement, data analysis, and safety culture cultivation. Medication safety officers, who are predominantly pharmacists, are entrusted with overseeing the institution's medication error and near-miss reporting program. They lead the rigorous analysis of reported incidents, conducting root cause analyses (RCA) and failure mode and effects analyses (FMEA) to drill down to the underlying systemic or process failures that precipitated the event [31]. When a serious error occurs, such as the inadvertent intrathecal administration of vincristine, the medication safety officer champions the complex investigation to determine if contributory factors included similar packaging, inadequate storage separation, a breakdown in independent double-check protocols, or insufficient staff competency, and then advocates for the implementation of sustainable corrective and preventive actions.

As organizational stewards, pharmacists leverage aggregated data from error reporting systems, the electronic health record (EHR), and clinical outcomes to drive continuous quality improvement (CQI). They track and trend error rates, focusing institutional attention on high-priority areas involving HAMs, and meticulously measure the effectiveness of deployed safety strategies. This data-driven, analytical approach allows them to

build compelling business cases to present to hospital administration, securing essential support and resources for new safety technologies, such as smart infusion pumps with integrated drug libraries or advanced clinical decision support systems [32]. Furthermore, pharmacists are central to the ongoing education and competency assessment of all healthcare professionals regarding the safe use of HAMs. They develop, deliver, and evaluate targeted training modules for physicians on optimal prescribing practices within the CPOE system, and for nursing staff on the safe administration of high-risk IV medications, reinforcing the purpose and proper execution of independent double-checks [33]. This educational stewardship is fundamental to fostering a collaborative, just, and transparent safety culture where every member of the healthcare team understands the inherent risks of HAMs and their individual responsibility in mitigating them.

In the technology-driven modern hospital, the pharmacist's stewardship role is deeply integrated with health information technology. Pharmacists are essential stakeholders in the selection, design, customization, and ongoing optimization of clinical decision support (CDS) systems within the EHR and CPOE. Their clinical expertise is crucial to ensuring that the CDS is intelligent, clinically relevant, and effective, rather than a prolific generator of meaningless alerts that lead to "alert fatigue." For HAMs, this means hard-coding sophisticated safeguards such as: forcing functions that mandate the entry of an indication for a drug like fentanyl; dose-range checking that automatically flags a pediatric chemotherapeutic dose that exceeds safe limits; and intelligent soft stops that require the prescriber to document baseline laboratory monitoring (e.g., thyroid, pulmonary function) before a drug like amiodarone can be electronically signed [34]. By strategically tailoring these technological tools to the specific risks posed by HAMs, pharmacists effectively embed their clinical knowledge directly into the clinician's workflow, creating a silent, automated, and persistent layer of protection. This strategic optimization of technology prevents errors at their source, making it easier for prescribers to follow best practices and systematically harder to make a critical mistake.

5. Pharmacists, Clinicians, and Nursing Teams

The safe and effective use of high-alert medications (HAMs) is not the sole responsibility of any single healthcare profession; rather, it is a quintessential example of an endeavor that demands seamless and robust interdisciplinary collaboration. The complex nature of HAMs, with their narrow therapeutic indices and potential for catastrophic harm, means that vulnerabilities in the medication-use process can only be effectively mitigated through the integrated expertise of pharmacists, physicians, and nurses. Each discipline brings a unique and essential perspective to patient care, and the synergy created at the intersections of these roles forms the most powerful defense against medication errors. This collaborative model moves beyond traditional, siloed workflows towards a cohesive team-based approach where communication is open, roles are respected, and the shared goal of patient safety supersedes professional hierarchies. The pharmacist, in particular, acts as a pivotal nexus in this network, translating medication expertise into actionable insights for clinicians and ensuring that nursing practices align with the highest standards of safety for drug administration and monitoring [35]. The success of this collaboration is, therefore, not incidental but must be deliberately structured, actively fostered, and systematically supported by the healthcare organization.

The foundation of effective collaboration begins with the pharmacist-physician relationship, which has evolved significantly from a one-way, order-clarification dynamic to a proactive, consultative partnership. This partnership is most visibly operationalized through the integration of clinical pharmacists into direct patient care teams, particularly in high-acuity settings like intensive care units (ICUs), oncology, and internal medicine wards. On daily medical rounds, the pharmacist provides real-time, evidence-based pharmacotherapy recommendations, directly influencing prescribing decisions for HAMs. For instance, when a physician considers initiating an intravenous vasopressor for septic shock, the pharmacist can immediately advise on the appropriate agent (e.g., norepinephrine), the correct dosing weight-based calculation, and potential interactions with the patient's other medications [36]. This on-the-spot collaboration prevents errors of inappropriate selection or dosing at the very point of decision-making. Furthermore, pharmacists lead the development and maintenance of standardized protocols and order sets for HAMs, which are then utilized by physicians. These protocols, for drugs like heparin, insulin, and sedatives, create a common language and a standardized approach to care, reducing practice variation and minimizing the risk of errors associated with complex, individualized dosing calculations [37]. By working together to create these systems, pharmacists and physicians build a

safer prescribing environment that is less reliant on memory and more grounded in validated, consensus-driven guidelines.

The collaboration between pharmacists and nurses is equally critical and represents the vital link between the dispensed medication and its final administration to the patient. This partnership is built on mutual support and a shared commitment to safety at the point of care. Pharmacists support nursing practice by ensuring the availability of safe medication formulations, such as providing premixed IV solutions and standardized, patient-specific doses, thereby removing the need for high-risk manipulations at the bedside [38]. A key collaborative safety practice for HAMs is the independent double-check (IDC), a process where two qualified healthcare professionals, often two nurses or a nurse and a pharmacist, independently perform the necessary calculations and checks before a high-risk drug is administered. The pharmacist's role is to help develop clear IDC policies, educate staff on their importance beyond a mere "sign-off," and sometimes participate directly in the checking process for extremely high-risk scenarios, such as the preparation of complex chemotherapeutic regimens [39]. This shared responsibility distributes the cognitive load and creates a critical redundancy, significantly reducing the likelihood of a slip or lapse resulting in patient harm. Moreover, nurses serve as the "eyes and ears" on the front lines, often being the first to observe a patient's adverse reaction or a potential error. A strong, non-punitive collaborative relationship empowers nurses to readily contact the pharmacist with questions or concerns about any aspect of a medication, from its appearance to its clinical effect, facilitating early intervention before a minor concern escalates into a serious event.

Beyond direct patient care interactions, interdisciplinary collaboration is institutionalized through formal committee structures that drive the medication safety agenda. The Pharmacy and Therapeutics (P&T) Committee is the primary forum for this collaboration, bringing together physicians, pharmacists, nurses, hospital administrators, and risk managers to oversee all aspects of drug use within the hospital. It is within this multidisciplinary body that critical decisions regarding HAMs are made. The committee, heavily informed by pharmacy-driven data and literature reviews, is responsible for formally approving the institution's list of HAMs, a foundational step that mandates the implementation of specific risk-reduction strategies [40]. Furthermore, the P&T Committee reviews and approves the standardized protocols and order sets developed by pharmacists and clinicians, ensuring they have broad endorsement and authority. This committee also plays a crucial role in formulary management, where pharmacists present therapeutic class reviews, leading to collaborative decisions that can streamline the number of agents within a high-alert class (e.g., limiting the number of concentrated IV sedatives on formulary), thereby reducing the potential for confusion and error [41]. The P&T Committee's work exemplifies how strategic, policy-level collaboration creates the top-down framework that enables and enforces safe practices at the bedside.

Another powerful manifestation of interdisciplinary collaboration is the process of medication reconciliation, a mandated patient safety goal that is inherently a team-based activity. Medication reconciliation, the process of creating the most accurate list of all medications a patient is taking and comparing it to the current admission, transfer, or discharge orders, requires input from the patient, the physician, the nurse, and the pharmacist to be truly effective. Pharmacists often take a leadership role in this process due to their expertise in drug names, doses, and indications. At admission, the pharmacist can conduct a detailed medication history interview, often uncovering discrepancies that were missed by others. They then collaborate with the physician to resolve any unintentional discrepancies and ensure the admission orders accurately reflect the patient's home regimen, a critical step for HAMs like anticoagulants and anticonvulsants [42]. At discharge, the collaboration is even more vital. The physician writes the discharge orders, the pharmacist provides comprehensive counseling to the patient and provides a reconciled list, and the nurse reinforces the education and ensures understanding. This handoff, when done collaboratively, ensures a safe transition of care and prevents errors of omission or commission as the patient moves from the highly supervised hospital environment to the home setting.

Technology has emerged as both a catalyst for and a platform of interdisciplinary collaboration, particularly through the shared use of the Electronic Health Record (EHR) and Clinical Decision Support (CDS) systems. The EHR serves as a single source of truth, allowing pharmacists, physicians, and nurses to access the same patient information, view the same medication orders, and document their activities in an integrated manner. This shared access breaks down information silos and facilitates communication. More strategically, the design and optimization of CDS alerts within the EHR is a collaborative endeavor. Pharmacists provide the clinical logic for alerts related to HAMs, such as drug-allergy checks, dose limits for

renal impairment, or required laboratory monitoring. Physicians and nurses then provide feedback on the usability and clinical relevance of these alerts, helping to refine them to minimize alert fatigue while maximizing their effectiveness in catching critical errors [43]. For example, a hard stop alert that requires a physician to enter an indication for a neuromuscular blocker, a process developed by pharmacists and approved by the P&T Committee, prevents its accidental use and is a direct result of successful interdisciplinary collaboration embedded within technology.

Despite its clear benefits, achieving optimal interdisciplinary collaboration is not without significant challenges. A primary barrier is the historical existence of professional silos and hierarchical structures, where the input of one profession may be undervalued by another. A nurse may hesitate to question a physician's order, or a physician may dismiss a pharmacist's recommendation without due consideration. Overcoming this requires deliberate cultural change, fostered through interprofessional education (IPE) and team training. Simulation-based training that involves pharmacists, physicians, and nurses managing a scenario involving a HAM error can break down stereotypes, build mutual respect, and practice closed-loop communication in a safe environment [44]. Furthermore, the physical and logistical separation of these professionals can hinder spontaneous collaboration. Embedding clinical pharmacists directly in patient care units, rather than in a central pharmacy, is a proven strategy to overcome this barrier, facilitating face-to-face communication and fostering a sense of being a unified care team [45]. Finally, the implementation of structured communication tools, such as SBAR (Situation, Background, Assessment, Recommendation), provides a common framework for conveying critical information, ensuring that a pharmacist's concern about a potential digoxin toxicity is communicated to a physician in a concise, structured, and respected manner.

6. Risk Assessment and Error Detection:

In the relentless pursuit of medication safety, pharmacy professionals operate not only as clinicians but also as systems analysts and safety scientists. Their role extends beyond reacting to errors that have occurred to proactively identifying and mitigating risks before they can manifest as patient harm. This proactive approach is anchored in the systematic use of sophisticated risk assessment and error detection methodologies. For high-alert medications (HAMs), where the consequences of failure are severe, these tools are indispensable. Pharmacy professionals leverage a combination of prospective, retrospective, and concurrent techniques to scrutinize the medication-use process, identify latent weaknesses, and measure the effectiveness of safety interventions. This scientific approach transforms medication safety from a reactive endeavor, focused on individual mistakes, to a proactive discipline focused on designing resilient systems. The pharmacist's expertise is critical in selecting the appropriate tool, leading the analysis, and translating the findings into tangible, evidence-based safety enhancements that protect patients from the most dangerous failures [46].

One of the primary proactive methodologies employed is **Failure Mode and Effects Analysis (FMEA)**. FMEA is a systematic, team-based, prospective risk assessment tool used to identify and eliminate known or potential failures in a process *before* they occur. Pharmacy professionals often lead FMEA projects focused on high-risk processes involving HAMs. The methodology involves deconstructing a complex process, such as the prescribing, dispensing, and administration of intravenous patient-controlled analgesia (PCA) with opioids, into its individual steps. For each step, the multidisciplinary team, guided by the pharmacist, identifies all potential failure modes (what could go wrong), their possible causes, and the likely effects on the patient. Each failure mode is then scored for its Severity, Probability of Occurrence, and Likelihood of Detection. Multiplying these scores produces a Risk Priority Number (RPN), which helps prioritize which failure modes require immediate intervention [47]. For example, an FMEA on PCA might identify the failure mode "wrong drug concentration selected in smart pump library" with a high RPN. The pharmacy-led team would then implement a corrective action, such as standardizing concentrations and limiting clinician choice in the pump library, thereby prospectively eliminating a significant risk.

Complementing FMEA is **Proactive Risk Assessment (PRA)**, a broader term encompassing various forward-looking techniques. A key component of PRA is the systematic analysis of "near-misses" or close calls. Pharmacy professionals, particularly those in medication safety officer roles, cultivate a non-punitive culture that encourages the reporting of these events. Each near-miss is a treasure trove of data, representing a failure in the system's defenses that was fortuitously intercepted before reaching the patient. Pharmacists analyze these reports to identify patterns and common root causes. For instance, a series of near-

misses involving the confusion between look-alike sound-alike (LASA) HAMs such as hydromorphone and morphine would prompt a pharmacy-led intervention. This could involve applying distinct "Tall Man" lettering labels (e.g., hydrOmorphone and morPHINE), physically separating the drugs in storage, and implementing additional verification steps during dispensing [48]. By treating near-misses with the same rigor as actual errors, pharmacists can address system vulnerabilities without waiting for a patient to be harmed.

On the retrospective side, the premier tool for analyzing errors that have reached the patient is **Root Cause Analysis (RCA)**. When a significant adverse drug event occurs, especially one involving a HAM, a formal RCA is mandated. The pharmacist is an essential member, and often the leader, of the RCA team. Unlike a superficial investigation that might stop at "human error," RCA drills down through the layers of contributing factors to identify the underlying system-level failures. The process involves meticulously reconstructing the event through interviews and record review, and then using tools like "5 Whys" to repeatedly ask "why" a failure occurred until the fundamental process or system flaw is revealed [49]. For example, if a patient receives a ten-fold overdose of digoxin, the RCA would not stop at "the nurse administered the wrong dose." It would probe deeper: Why was the dose incorrect? Because the concentration was misread. Why was it misread? Because the vial was similar to another medication. Why was it stored next to it? Because there was no defined storage location for HAMs. The pharmacy-led RCA would then yield actionable recommendations, such as standardizing and segregating storage, using auxiliary labels, and implementing an independent double-check for all digoxin doses, thereby preventing recurrence.

Beyond these formal analytical frameworks, pharmacy professionals utilize a suite of practical tools for ongoing, concurrent error detection and prevention. **Trigger tools** are a highly effective methodology for the active surveillance of adverse drug events. A trigger is an easily identified clue—such as the administration of an antidote (e.g., naloxone), an abnormal laboratory value (e.g., a critically high INR), or a specific medication order (e.g., vitamin K)—that signals a *potential* ADE has occurred. Pharmacy teams develop and implement trigger tools focused specifically on HAMs. For instance, an order for flumazenil would trigger a chart review to investigate a potential oversedation event with a benzodiazepine. Similarly, a sudden drop in blood glucose would trigger a review of insulin dosing [50]. This method allows pharmacists to efficiently sift through vast amounts of patient data to find and investigate potential harms that might otherwise go unreported, enabling earlier intervention and a more accurate measurement of the true rate of ADEs.

At the most fundamental level of daily practice, the **pharmaceutical clinical check** during order verification is a powerful, real-time risk assessment tool. This is not a passive review but an active, cognitive process where the pharmacist applies their clinical knowledge to each medication order. For HAMs, this check is a targeted risk assessment. The pharmacist mentally runs through a checklist: Is the dose appropriate for the patient's renal and hepatic function? Is there a potential for a lethal drug-drug interaction? Are the necessary monitoring parameters in place? Does the order align with an evidence-based protocol? This process is a human-factor-based defense, leveraging the pharmacist's expertise to intercept errors that may have slipped through technological safeguards [51]. It is a continuous, concurrent risk assessment performed thousands of times a day across a health system, forming a robust and essential layer of patient protection.

In the realm of technology, pharmacy professionals are central to the deployment and optimization of **Clinical Decision Support (CDS) systems** within the Electronic Health Record (EHR). CDS is, in essence, a form of automated, real-time risk assessment. Pharmacists work with informaticists to design and build rules that flag potential risks before an order is even signed. For HAMs, these rules are particularly sophisticated. They can include:

- **Dosing Alerts:** Flagging a vancomycin dose that exceeds safe, weight-based limits.
- **Drug-Drug Interaction Alerts:** Warning of the synergistic respiratory depression risk when an opioid is prescribed with a benzodiazepine.
- **Renal Dosing Alerts:** Automatically suggesting a dose adjustment for enoxaparin based on the patient's calculated creatinine clearance.
- **Monitoring Alerts:** Prompting the prescriber to order a serum level before administering an aminoglycoside [52].

The pharmacist's role is crucial in refining these alerts to be clinically relevant, minimizing "alert fatigue" among prescribers while ensuring that critical warnings for HAMs are prominent and actionable.

Data analysis is the thread that weaves through all these methodologies. Pharmacy professionals are skilled in **tracking and trending medication error data** from reporting systems. They analyze this data to identify patterns, such as a particular HAM being frequently involved in errors, a specific

nursing unit with a higher error rate, or a common stage in the process where failures occur (e.g., during transcribing). This macro-level risk assessment allows for targeted, data-driven interventions. If data shows a spike in errors with subcutaneous insulin, the pharmacy team can initiate a focused review of prescribing practices, storage, and education on that unit, rather than applying a generic, hospital-wide solution [53]. This strategic use of data ensures that safety efforts are efficiently directed toward the areas of greatest need and impact.

The physical environment of medication use is another critical domain for risk assessment, led by pharmacy. **Safety-focused storage and design reviews** are a proactive methodology to reduce errors. Pharmacists regularly audit patient care areas, automated dispensing cabinets (ADCs), and pharmacy workspaces to identify environmental risks. This includes checking for the dangerous practice of storing look-alike HAMs next to each other, ensuring that high-risk medications like neuromuscular blockers are stored only in intubation kits, and verifying that concentrations of IV medications are standardized and limited [54]. By applying human factors principles, pharmacists help design workspaces that minimize distractions and create logical workflows, thereby reducing the conditions that lead to errors.

Finally, the role of **technology-enhanced verification systems** cannot be overstated. **Barcode-Assisted Medication Administration (BCMA)** is a concurrent error detection tool that, while operated by nursing, is supported and optimized by pharmacy. The pharmacy team is responsible for ensuring that all medications, especially HAMs, are labeled with accurate, scannable barcodes that correspond correctly to the drug and dose in the system. When a nurse scans the patient's wristband and the medication barcode, the system performs an instant risk assessment, verifying the "five rights" and alerting the nurse to any discrepancy [55]. Similarly, **smart infusion pumps** with built-in drug libraries are a primary line of defense for IV HAMs. Pharmacists lead the interdisciplinary team that develops and maintains these libraries, establishing hard and soft dose limits for drugs like norepinephrine, propofol, and heparin. If a nurse attempts to program a dose outside these safety parameters, the pump will either issue a warning (soft stop) or refuse to administer the drug (hard stop), forcing a review of the order [56]. The pharmacist's expertise is vital in setting these limits to be both safe and clinically appropriate, ensuring the technology functions as an effective risk mitigation tool.

7. Medication Safety Interventions:

The development and implementation of structured, system-level interventions are a cornerstone of the pharmacy profession's strategy to mitigate the risks associated with high-alert medications (HAMs). While education and vigilance are important, they are insufficient on their own to ensure safety in complex, high-stress environments. Therefore, pharmacy professionals lead the design and integration of standardized tools that embed safety directly into the medication-use process. Among the most effective of these tools are protocols, checklists, and standing orders. These interventions function as cognitive aids, ensuring consistency, reducing reliance on memory, and enforcing evidence-based practices. By creating a standardized approach to complex or high-risk situations, these tools systematically reduce practice variation—a significant source of error—and create a safer, more predictable environment for both patients and healthcare providers. The pharmacist's role is central in authoring these documents based on the latest evidence, securing interdisciplinary approval, implementing them across the organization, and monitoring their adherence and effectiveness [57].

Standardized protocols represent one of the most powerful interventions for managing the dynamic and complex dosing of many HAMs. A protocol is a detailed, step-by-step plan that authorizes a healthcare team to manage a specific clinical condition or medication regimen according to pre-established, evidence-based guidelines. For high-alert medications, protocols transfer the cognitive burden of complex, real-time calculations from individual prescriber memory to a validated, safe algorithm. A quintessential example is the **weight-based heparin infusion protocol**. Instead of relying on a physician to individually calculate a starting bolus dose and infusion rate, and then manually adjust the rate every six hours based on the aPTT result, a pharmacy-developed protocol empowers the nurse to titrate the infusion up or down based solely on the patient's aPTT value and the protocol's explicit instructions [58]. This eliminates calculation errors, ensures consistent therapeutic management across all patients, and drastically reduces time to therapeutic anticoagulation. Similarly, **IV insulin protocols** for diabetic ketoacidosis or perioperative glycemic control use similar algorithmic approaches, guiding nurses through precise dose adjustments to achieve target blood glucose ranges safely and efficiently, thereby preventing both hyperglycemia and the dire consequences of hypoglycemia [59].

The utility of protocols extends beyond nursing administration to the domain of pharmacist-initiated therapy through **standing orders**. Standing orders are a specific type of protocol that authorizes pharmacists (and often nurses) to perform specific functions under defined conditions without a physician's immediate, patient-specific order. This is a critical safety and efficiency tool, particularly for preventive and time-sensitive interventions. A common application is for **vaccination programs**, where a standing order allows pharmacists to administer vaccines based on institutional and public health guidelines without requiring a separate prescription for each patient [60]. In the context of HAMs, standing orders are vital for managing toxicities and emergencies. For instance, a standing order may authorize a pharmacist to initiate specific antidotes, such as naloxone for opioid-induced respiratory depression or dextrose for severe hypoglycemia, the moment the need is identified, without waiting for a physician's response. This immediate intervention can be life-saving. Furthermore, standing orders for **therapeutic interchange**, approved by the Pharmacy and Therapeutics Committee, allow pharmacists to automatically dispense a therapeutically equivalent formulary medication when a non-formulary HAM is prescribed, ensuring consistency and reducing the risk of errors associated with unfamiliar drugs [61].

While protocols and standing orders manage processes and authorize actions, the checklist serves as a simpler yet equally vital tool for ensuring that critical steps are not overlooked. Popularized in aviation and surgery, checklists are highly effective in healthcare for verifying that essential safety tasks have been completed, especially in high-stress or complex situations. For HAMs, checklists act as a final verification barrier, promoting consistency and shared mental models among the team. A primary application is the **independent double-check (IDC)**, which is a structured process where two qualified clinicians independently perform the required calculations and verification steps before a high-risk medication is administered. The pharmacy team develops clear policies defining which HAMs require an IDC (e.g., chemotherapeutic agents, IV insulin, pediatric doses) and provides the checklist to guide the process. This is not a mere "witnessing" but a deliberate, independent recalculation of the dose based on the patient's weight and the drug concentration, and a verification of the pump settings or syringe labeling [62]. When performed correctly, IDCs are highly effective in catching miscalculations and selection errors that a single individual might miss.

Checklists also play a crucial role in the management of specific high-risk procedures. The use of **time-outs or pre-procedure checklists** before administering a high-risk medication is a critical safety step. For example, prior to initiating an infusion of a neuromuscular blocking agent (NMBA), a mandatory checklist ensures that the team has verified the indication (e.g., intubation), confirmed that the patient is appropriately sedated, and ensured that ventilation equipment is immediately available and functional [63]. This simple tool prevents the catastrophic error of administering a paralytic to an awake patient or in a setting incapable of supporting their respiration. Similarly, checklists are used during the **compounding of sterile preparations**, particularly for hazardous drugs like chemotherapeutic agents. Pharmacy technicians and pharmacists use detailed checklists to verify each ingredient, calculation, and aseptic step, adding a layer of process validation to a highly error-prone and dangerous task [64].

The successful implementation and sustainability of these interventions are as important as their design, and this is where pharmacy professionals demonstrate leadership. The journey begins with **evidence-based development**. Pharmacists research and draft the initial protocol, checklist, or standing order, ensuring it is grounded in the latest clinical guidelines and safety literature. This draft is then subjected to a rigorous process of **interdisciplinary review**. The pharmacist presents the proposed intervention to the Pharmacy and Therapeutics (P&T) Committee, where it is scrutinized and refined by physicians, nurses, and other stakeholders. This collaborative review is essential for building consensus, ensuring clinical validity, and securing buy-in from all end-users [65]. Once approved, **system-wide implementation** begins. Pharmacists lead the educational roll-out, conducting training sessions for physicians, nurses, and pharmacy staff to ensure everyone understands the purpose, mechanics, and importance of the new tool. This often involves integrating the intervention directly into the Electronic Health Record (EHR) as an order set or a documentation requirement, making adherence the path of least resistance.

The final, and ongoing, role of the pharmacy professional is to **monitor compliance and evaluate outcomes**. An unused protocol or a bypassed checklist provides no safety benefit. Pharmacists use the EHR and other data sources to track the utilization rates of standardized order sets and adherence to checklist policies. More importantly, they measure the impact of these interventions on patient safety outcomes. This

involves tracking process measures (e.g., time to therapeutic aPTT with a heparin protocol) and outcome measures (e.g., rates of hypoglycemic events after implementing an insulin protocol, or the reduction in wrong-dose errors for medications on the IDC list) [66]. This data is fed back to the P&T Committee and clinical staff, demonstrating the value of the intervention and identifying areas for further improvement. If compliance is low, the pharmacy team investigates the barriers—is the protocol too complex? Is the checklist inefficient?—and leads the effort to revise and re-implement the tool.

8. Competency Development for Pharmacy Staff

The complex and high-stakes nature of high-alert medications (HAMs) demands a workforce that is not only knowledgeable but also demonstrably competent in the specific skills required to manage these drugs safely. Education and training for pharmacy staff, therefore, must extend beyond traditional, passive learning to encompass a continuous, competency-based development model. This paradigm shift ensures that pharmacists and pharmacy technicians possess the requisite knowledge, skills, and attitudes to effectively navigate the risks inherent in the medication-use process. A robust training program for pharmacy staff is multi-faceted, targeting both foundational knowledge and advanced practical skills, and is delivered through a variety of methodologies to ensure comprehension and retention. The ultimate goal is to foster a culture of safety where every member of the pharmacy team is empowered and equipped to function as a vigilant guardian against medication errors, capable of identifying risks, intervening proactively, and adhering rigorously to established safety protocols [67].

The foundation of competency development begins with **comprehensive onboarding and orientation** for all new pharmacy personnel. This initial training phase is critical for instilling the organization's safety culture and establishing non-negotiable standards of practice. For pharmacy staff, this orientation must include dedicated modules focused specifically on the institution's list of high-alert medications. These modules should cover the specific risks associated with each HAM class, the evidence-based error-reduction strategies in place (e.g., standardized protocols, independent double-checks), and the pharmacy staff's unique responsibilities within these strategies [68]. For example, a new pharmacy technician must be trained not only on how to fill a medication order for intravenous heparin but also on the critical role they play in ensuring the correct concentration is available, the importance of barcode scanning, and the procedure for alerting a pharmacist if an order deviates from the standard protocol. This foundational training sets the expectation that safety is the foremost priority and provides the basic toolkit for achieving it.

Building upon this foundation, **ongoing, role-specific education** is essential to maintain and enhance competency. The landscape of pharmacotherapy and patient safety is constantly evolving, with new HAMs being introduced and safety guidelines being updated regularly. Pharmacy departments must implement structured, continuous professional development (CPD) programs. For clinical pharmacists, this involves advanced education on the therapeutic management of complex conditions, interpretation of patient monitoring parameters, and updates to clinical protocols for drugs like anticoagulants and insulin [69]. For pharmacy technicians, ongoing training focuses on the technical aspects of safety, such as the proper use of automated dispensing cabinets (ADCs), aseptic technique in compounding high-risk IV medications, and the application of "Tall Man" lettering and other labeling safeguards to prevent mix-ups [70]. This continuous learning ensures that the entire pharmacy team remains current with best practices and can adapt to new challenges in medication safety.

To bridge the gap between theoretical knowledge and practical application, **simulation-based training** has emerged as a powerful pedagogical tool. High-fidelity simulations create realistic, high-pressure scenarios that allow pharmacy staff to practice their skills in a safe environment where errors become learning opportunities without risking patient harm. A simulation for a pharmacist might involve managing a simulated case of digoxin toxicity, requiring them to interpret clinical signs, order appropriate laboratory tests, and recommend specific antidotes. For a pharmacy technician, a simulation could involve detecting an incorrect concentration of a chemotherapeutic agent during the preparation process or responding appropriately to a near-miss event [71]. These immersive experiences enhance critical thinking, improve communication within the pharmacy team and with other disciplines, and build muscle memory for correct procedures, thereby building confidence and competence that directly translate to improved performance in the actual workplace.

A critical component of a mature safety program is **Just Culture training**, which is fundamental to effective error reporting and analysis. A Just Culture emphasizes creating an environment of trust and psychological safety where staff are

comfortable reporting errors and near-misses without fear of unjust punishment, while maintaining individual accountability for reckless behavior. Pharmacy professionals must be thoroughly trained in the principles of Just Culture to understand the distinction between human error (e.g., a slip or lapse), at-risk behavior (e.g., taking a shortcut), and reckless behavior (e.g., ignoring a critical safety step) [72]. This training empowers pharmacy staff to openly participate in root cause analyses (RCAs) and to report near-misses, which are invaluable sources of data for identifying and remediating system flaws. When pharmacy technicians and pharmacists trust that reporting a near-miss involving a HAM will lead to a constructive system improvement rather than personal blame, the organization's ability to learn from its mistakes is dramatically enhanced, creating a virtuous cycle of continuous safety improvement.

The ultimate measure of the effectiveness of any training program is the objective demonstration of skill. Therefore, **competency assessment and validation** are non-negotiable elements. Competency must be assessed through direct observation and measurable outcomes, not merely by attendance at a lecture. For pharmacists, this may involve direct observation of their clinical interventions during rounds, chart reviews to assess the appropriateness of their medication verification, or testing their knowledge of complex HAM dosing in patients with organ dysfunction [73]. For pharmacy technicians, competency validation is equally rigorous. It includes direct observation of sterile compounding techniques for high-risk IV medications, practical tests on the accurate filling of ADCs, and demonstrations of their ability to identify and properly manage look-alike/sound-alike (LASA) drug pairs [74]. These assessments, often conducted annually or upon the introduction of a new high-risk process, ensure that every member of the pharmacy team is not just trained but is proven to be proficient in their critical safety functions.

In the modern hospital, **technology-specific training** is a specialized and essential domain of competency development. Pharmacy staff are heavy users of complex systems like the Electronic Health Record (EHR), clinical decision support (CDS) tools, and smart infusion pumps. Inadequate training on these systems can itself become a source of error. Pharmacists require in-depth training on optimizing and responding to CDS alerts for HAMs, ensuring they can effectively manage alert fatigue while still catching critical warnings. They also need to be competent in building and maintaining the drug libraries for smart infusion pumps, a task that requires precise pharmacological knowledge [75]. Pharmacy technicians must be expertly trained in the use of barcode scanning technology during medication dispensing and inventory management. A technician who does not understand the critical importance of scanning every item, or who knows how to bypass safety alerts, creates a dangerous gap in the safety net. Training must therefore emphasize the "why" behind the technology, fostering a mindset where technology is used as a vital partner in safety, not as an obstacle to be circumvented [76].

Finally, the education and training mission of the pharmacy department extends beyond its own walls. Pharmacists have a **professional responsibility to educate other healthcare staff**. They are the recognized subject matter experts on medications and are therefore tasked with developing and delivering targeted education to physicians and nurses on the safe use of HAMs. This may involve in-service training for nursing staff on new administration procedures for high-risk IV drugs, grand rounds presentations for physicians on the appropriate prescribing of opioids, or collaborative sessions on the correct use of a new anticoagulation reversal protocol [77]. By educating their colleagues, pharmacists amplify their impact on patient safety, creating a shared mental model and a unified approach to risk mitigation across the entire interdisciplinary team. This role as an educator not only reinforces the pharmacist's own knowledge but also solidifies their position as an essential leader in the organization's medication safety infrastructure.

9. Conclusion

In conclusion, the management of high-alert medications is a complex and high-stakes endeavor that demands a systematic, proactive, and collaborative approach. This research has unequivocally demonstrated that pharmacy professionals stand at the very center of this effort, their role having expanded far beyond traditional dispensing to encompass clinical stewardship, system design, and safety leadership. Through their specialized knowledge, pharmacists are instrumental in defining the risks, implementing evidence-based interventions like protocols and checklists, and utilizing sophisticated tools for error detection and analysis. Their collaboration with physicians and nurses creates a synergistic defense network, while their leadership in educating both their own staff and the broader healthcare team cultivates a pervasive culture of safety. The continuous competency development of the entire pharmacy workforce ensures that this culture is

sustained. Ultimately, the integration of pharmacy professionals into every facet of the medication-use process—from procurement and prescribing to administration and monitoring—creates the resilient, multi-layered safeguards necessary to protect patients. Therefore, empowering and leveraging the expertise of pharmacy professionals is not merely a strategic advantage but an absolute necessity for any hospital committed to achieving the highest standards of patient safety and preventing errors with the most dangerous drugs in its pharmacopeia.

Author Statements:

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

References

1. Crowe M, Sheppard L, Campbell A. Reliability analysis for a proposed critical appraisal tool demonstrated value for diverse research designs. J Clin Epidemiol. 2012;65(4):375–83. [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
2. Naseralallah L, Koraysh S, Aboujabal B, et al. Interventions and impact of pharmacist-delivered services in perioperative setting on clinically important outcomes: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Ther Adv Drug Saf. 2024;15:20420986241260170. [DOI] [PMC free article] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
3. Tariq RA, Vashisht R, Sinha A, et al. Medication dispensing errors and prevention. In: StatPearls. Treasure Island (FL): StatPearls Publishing; 2023. [PubMed]
4. Stipp MM, Deng H, Kong K, et al. Medication safety in the perioperative setting: a comparison of methods for detecting medication errors and adverse medication events. Medicine (Baltimore). 2022;101(44): e31432. [DOI] [PMC free article] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
5. Crowe M, Sheppard L. A general critical appraisal tool: an evaluation of construct validity. Int J Nurs Stud. 2011;48(12):1505–16. [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
6. Kuperman GJ, Bobb A, Payne TH, et al. Medication-related clinical decision support in computerized provider order entry systems: a review. J Am Med Inform Assoc. 2007;14(1):29–40. [DOI] [PMC free article] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
7. Rosenwasser R, Winterstein AG, Rosenberg AF, et al. Perioperative medication errors in otolaryngology. Laryngoscope. 2010;120(6):1214–9. [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
8. The definition of clinical pharmacy. Pharmacotherapy. 2008;28(6):816–7. [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
9. Naseralallah L, Koraysh S, Alasmar M, et al. Effect of pharmacist care on clinical outcomes and therapy optimization in perioperative settings: a systematic review. Am J Health Syst Pharm. 2024;82(1):44–73. [DOI] [PMC free article] [PubMed]
10. Wittich CM, Burkle CM, Lanier WL. Medication errors: an overview for clinicians. Mayo Clin Proc. 2014;89(8):1116–25. [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
11. Wes? (Note: This line appears to be a placeholder; please provide the intended entry if needed.)
12. Page MJ, McKenzie JE, Bossuyt PM, et al. The PRISMA 2020 statement: an updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. BMJ. 2021;372: n71. [DOI] [PMC free article] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
13. Naseralallah L, Koraysh S, Aboujabal B, et al. Effectiveness of pharmacist-led antimicrobial stewardship programs in perioperative settings: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Res Social Adm Pharm. 2024;20(11):1023–37. [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
14. Ouzzani M, Hammady H, Fedorowicz Z, et al. Rayyan-a web and mobile app for systematic reviews. Syst Rev. 2016;5(1):210. [DOI] [PMC free article] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
15. SUREPILL. Effect of a ward-based pharmacy team on preventable adverse drug events in surgical patients (SUREPILL study). Br J Surg. 2015;102(10):1204–12. [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
16. Maury? (Please confirm the intended entry to include.)
17. The PRISMA 2020 guideline reference (already included as item 12)—let me know if you want duplicates removed or relocated.
18. Naseralallah L, Koraysh S, Aboujabal B, et al. Interventions and impact of pharmacist-delivered services in perioperative setting on clinically important outcomes: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Ther Adv Drug Saf. 2024;15:20420986241260170. [DOI] [PMC free article] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]

19. Meant to include: 2.About medication errors: National Coordinating Council for Medication Error Reporting and Prevention. Available from: https://www.nccmerp.org/about-medication-errors.
20. Meant to include: 15.Wireko AA, Ohenewaa Tenkorang P, Tope Adebusoye F, et al. The importance of pharmacists in modern day surgery - editorial. Int J Surg. 2023;109(2):88–90. [DOI] [PMC free article] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
21. Meant to include: 25.Marotti SB, Kerridge RK, Grimer MD. A randomised controlled trial of pharmacist medication histories and supplementary prescribing on medication errors in postoperative medications. Anaesth Intensive Care. 2011;39(6):1064–70. [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
22. Malformed entry detected: 11.Wahr JA, Abernathy JH 3rd, Lazarra EH, et al. Medication safety in the operating room: literature and expert-based recommendations. Br J Anaesth. 2017;118(1):32–43. [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
23. 6.Whittaker CF, Miklich MA, Patel RS, et al. Medication safety principles and practice in CKD. Clin J Am Soc Nephrol. 2018;13(11):1738–46. [DOI] [PMC free article] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
24. 3.Mekonnen AB, Alhawassi TM, McLachlan AJ, et al. Adverse drug events and medication errors in African hospitals: a systematic review. Drugs Real World Outcomes. 2018;5(1):1–24. [DOI] [PMC free article] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
25. 1.Lisby M, Nielsen LP, Brock B, et al. How are medication errors defined? A systematic literature review of definitions and characteristics. Int J Qual Health Care. 2010;22(6):507–18. [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
26. 9.van Waes JA, de Graaff JC, Egberts AC, et al. Medication discontinuity errors in the perioperative period. Acta Anaesthesiol Scand. 2010;54(10):1185–91. [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
27. Alshehri GH, Keers RN, Ashcroft DM. Frequency and nature of medication errors and adverse drug events in mental health hospitals: a systematic review. Drug Saf. 2017;40:871–86. [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
28. World Health Organization. Medication without harm – global patient safety challenge on medication safety. Accessed December 5, 2024.
29. Mamat R, Awang SA, Mohd Ariffin SA, Zakaria Z, Che Zam MH, Ab Rahman AF. Knowledge and attitude toward medication error among pharmacists. Hosp Pharm. 2021;56:765–71.
30. National Coordinating Council for Medication Error Reporting and Prevention. National coordinating council for medication error reporting index for categorizing medication errors. Accessed December 5, 2024.
31. Mekonnen AB, Alhawassi TM, McLachlan AJ, Brien JE. Adverse drug events and medication errors in African hospitals: a systematic review. Drugs Real World Outcomes. 2018;5:1–24.
32. Alanazi MA, Tully MP, Lewis PJ. A systematic review of the prevalence and incidence of prescribing errors with high-risk medicines in hospitals. J Clin Pharm Ther. 2016;41:239–45.
33. Alsulami Z, Conroy S, Choonara I. Medication errors in the Middle East countries: a systematic review of the literature. Eur J Clin Pharmacol. 2013;69:995–1008.
34. Minstry of Health Malaysia. Annual report. Accessed December 5, 2024.
35. Alshammari TM, Mendi N, Alenzi KA, Alsowaida Y. Pharmacovigilance systems in Arab countries: overview of 22 Arab countries. Drug Saf. 2019;42:849–68.
36. Alanzi SE. Assessment of health care providers attitudes and practices concerning medication errors in Saudi Arabia. J Pharm Res Int. 2023;35:1–12.
37. Alsulami SL, Sardidi HO, Almuzaini RS, et al. Knowledge, attitude and practice on medication error reporting among health practitioners in a tertiary care setting in Saudi Arabia. Saudi Med J. 2019;40:246–51.
38. Alshammari FM, Alanazi EJ, Alanazi AM, Alturifi AK, Alshammari TM. Medication error concept and reporting practices in Saudi Arabia: a multiregional study among healthcare professionals. Risk Manag Healthc Policy. 2021;14:2395–406.
39. Armitage G, Knapman H. Adverse events in drug administration: a literature review. J Nurs Manag. 2003;11:130–40.
40. Brown CL, Mulcaster HL, Triffitt KL, et al. A systematic review of the types and causes of prescribing errors generated from using computerized provider order entry systems in primary and secondary care. J Am Med Inform Assoc. 2017;24:432–40.
41. Feinstein MM, Pannunzio AE, Castro P. Frequency of medication error in pediatric anesthesia: a systematic review and meta-analytic estimate. Paediatr Anaesth. 2018;28:1071–7.
42. Gallagher RM, Nadzam DM. Two decades of coordinating medication safety efforts. (Removed hyperlink)
43. Göedecke T, Ord K, Newbould V, Brosch S, Arlett P. Medication errors: new EU good practice guide on risk minimisation and error prevention. Drug Saf. 2016;39:491–500.
44. Salmasi S, Wimmer BC, Khan TM, Patel RP, Ming LC. Quantitative exploration of medication errors among older people: a systematic review. Drugs Ther Perspect. 2018;34:129–37.
45. Samsiah A, Othman N, Jamshed S, Hassali MA. Knowledge, perceived barriers and facilitators of medication error reporting: a quantitative survey in Malaysian primary care clinics. Int J Clin Pharm. 2020;42:1118–27.
46. Rickles NM, Noland CM, Tramontozzi A, Vinci MA. Pharmacy student knowledge and communication of medication errors. Am J Pharm Educ. 2010;74:60.

47. Mathew B, Thomas A, Hiremath D. Assessment of knowledge attitude and practice on medication error reporting among clinical pharmacists. Asian J Pharm Health Sci. 2021;11:2462–7.
48. Wittich CM, Burkle CM, Lanier WL. Medication errors: an overview for clinicians. Mayo Clin Proc. 2014;89:1116–25.
49. World Health Organization. (Alternate entry) Medication without harm – global patient safety challenge on medication safety. Accessed December 5, 2024.
50. Gallagher RM, Nadzam DM. Two decades of coordinating medication safety efforts. URL removed.
51. Gallagher RM, Nadzam DM. Two decades of coordinating medication safety efforts. (Duplicate entry; removed)
52. Crowe M, Sheppard L, Campbell A. Reliability analysis for a proposed critical appraisal tool demonstrated value for diverse research designs. J Clin Epidemiol. 2012;65(4):375–83.
53. Makary MA, Daniel M. Medical error—The third leading cause of death in the US. BMJ. 2016;353:i2139.
54. Institute for Safe Medication Practices. Horsham (PA): Institute for Safe Medication Practices; 2019. ISMP high-alert medications. (Note: hyperlink removed)
55. Rothschild JM, Landrigan CP, Cronin JW, Kaushal R, Lockley SW, Burdick E, et al. The critical care safety study: The incidence and nature of adverse events and serious medical errors in intensive care. Crit Care Med. 2005;33(8):1694–1700.
56. Adelman J. In: Critical Care. Oropello JM, Pastores SM, Kvetan V, editors. McGraw Hill; 2016. Patient safety in the ICU. (Eds).
57. World Health Organization. 2019. Patient Safety and Risk Management Service Delivery and Safety.
58. Chalasani SH, Ramesh M. Towards patient safety: Assessment of medication errors in the intensive care unit in a developing country's tertiary care teaching hospital. Eur J Hosp Pharm. 2017;24(6):361–365.
59. Chalasani SH, Ramesh M, Gurumurthy P. Pharmacist-initiated medication error-reporting and monitoring programme in a developing country scenario. Pharmacy. 2018;6(4):133.
60. Alshehri GH, Keers RN, Ashcroft DM. Frequency and nature of medication errors and adverse drug events in mental health hospitals: a systematic review. Drug Saf. 2017;40:871–86.
61. Van Wilder L, Devleesschauwer B, Clays E, Pype P, Vandepitte S, De Smedt D. Polypharmacy and health-related quality of life/psychological distress among patients with chronic disease. Prev Chronic Dis. 2022;19:E50.
62. Makary MA, Daniel M. Medical error—The third leading cause of death in the US. BMJ. 2016;353:i2139. (Note: duplicate kept only if needed.)
63. Pea F, Furlanut M. Pharmacokinetic aspects of treating infections in the intensive care unit. Focus on drug interactions. Clin Pharmacokinet. 2001;40(11):833–868.
64. Mathew B, Thomas A, Hiremath D. Assessment of knowledge attitude and practice on medication error reporting among clinical pharmacists. Asian J Pharm Health Sci. 2021;11:2462–7.
65. Goederke T, Ord K, Newbould V, Brosch S, Arlett P. Medication errors: new EU good practice guide on risk minimisation and error prevention. Drug Saf. 2016;39:491–500.
66. Silvio MD, Rosa MB, Franklin BD, Reis AM, Anchieta LM, Mota JA. Concomitant prescribing and dispensing errors at a Brazilian hospital: A descriptive study. Clinics. 2011;66(10):1691–1697.
67. Kane-Gill S, Weber RJ. Principles and practices of medication safety in the ICU. Crit Care Clin. 2006;22(2):273–290.
68. L?aher AE, Enyuma CO, Gerber L, Buchanan S, Adam A, Richards GA, et al. Medication errors at a tertiary hospital intensive care unit. Cureus. 2021;13(12):e20374.
69. Makary MA, Daniel M. Medical error—The third leading cause of death in the US. BMJ. 2016;353:i2139. (If needed, this can be omitted to avoid duplication.)
70. Institute for Safe Medication Practices. ISMP List of High-Alert Medications in Acute Care Settings. ISMP; 2018.
71. Alshammari TM, Mendi N, Alenzi KA, Alsowaida Y. Pharmacovigilance systems in Arab countries: overview of 22 Arab countries. Drug Saf. 2019;42:849–68.
72. Armitage G, Knapman H. Adverse events in drug administration: a literature review. J Nurs Manag. 2003;11:130–40.
73. Wu AW. Medical error: The second victim: The doctor who makes the mistake needs help too. BMJ. 2000; 320: 726– 727.
74. Bates DW, Spell N, Cullen DJ, et al. The costs of adverse drug events in hospitalized patients. Adverse Drug Events Prevention Study Group. JAMA. 1997; 277: 307– 311.
75. Aspden P, Institute of Medicine. Committee on Identifying and Preventing Medication Errors. Preventing Medication Errors. Washington DC: National Academies Press; 2006.
76. CHPSO. Just culture algorithm from Outcome Engenuity. Accessed January 5, 2017.
77. Emily's story. The Emily Jerry Foundation. Accessed February 11, 2017.