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

Vol. 10-No.4 (2024) pp. 4272-4282
http://www.ijcesen.com

ISSN: 2149-9144

Research Article

Early Detection and Prevention of Drug-Induced Liver Injury (DILI): Roles of Nursing, Pharmacy, and Laboratory Services

Alanzi, Tahani Saud K[1]*, Hafithah Ibraheem's Abdallah Alghuraydh[2], Abdulrahman Talaq Zaid Alsalmi[3], Aljohani, Khalid Saleh A[4], Abdulaziz Ibrahem Hamed AlJuhani[5], Salem Abdulaziz S, Alsaif[6], Alshehri, Ayidh Muidh A[7], Oudah Saeed Oudah Alanazi[8], Alraweli, Anwar Mihthaf O[9]

[1]Senior Laboratory Specialist – King Fahad Specialist Hospital - Tabuk – Tabuk Health Cluster – Ministry of Health – Tabuk – Tabuk Region – Saudi Arabia
* **Corresponding Author Email:** Tasaalanzi@moh.gov.sa - **ORCID:** 0000-0002-5247-5550

[2]Specialist Laboratory – King Fahad Specialist Hospital - Tabuk – Tabuk Health Cluster – Ministry of Health – Tabuk – Tabuk Region – Saudi Arabia
Email: Halghuraydh@moh.gov.sa - **ORCID:** 0000-0002-0047-1250

[3]Pharmacy Technician – Tayma General Hospital – Tabuk Health Cluster – Ministry of Health – Tayma – Tabuk Region – Saudi Arabia
Email: atalsalmi@moh.gov.sa - **ORCID:** 0000-0002-0047-4250

[4]Pharmacy Technician – Maternity and Children Hospital, Tabuk – Tabuk Health Cluster – Ministry of Health – Tabuk – Tabuk Region – Saudi Arabia
Email: Kaljohani2@moh.gov.sa - **ORCID:** 0000-0002-0047-3250

[5]Pharmacy Technician – King Khalid Hospital, Tabuk – Tabuk Health Cluster – Ministry of Health – Tabuk – Tabuk Region – Saudi Arabia
Email: narakappa@gmail.com - **ORCID:** 0000-0002-0047-5250

[6]Pharmacy Technician – Tayma General Hospital – Tabuk Health Cluster – Ministry of Health – Tayma – Tabuk Region – Saudi Arabia
Email: Salsaif2@moh.gov.sa - **ORCID:** 0000-0002-0047-8250

[7]Pharmacy Technician – King Khalid Hospital, Tabuk – Tabuk Health Cluster – Ministry of Health – Tabuk – Tabuk Region – Saudi Arabia
Email: Aymalshehri@moh.gov.sa - **ORCID:** 0000-0002-0047-6250

[8]Pharmacy Technician – Tayma General Hospital – Tabuk Health Cluster – Ministry of Health – Tayma – Tabuk Region – Saudi Arabia
Email: oualanazi@moh.gov.sa - **ORCID:** 0000-0002-0047-7250

[9]Nursing Specialist – Eradah and Mental Health Complex, Northern Borders – Northern Borders Health Cluster – Ministry of Health – Arar – Northern Borders Region – Saudi Arabia
Email: anmalrwaili@moh.gov.sa- **ORCID:** 0000-0002-0047-0050

Article Info:

DOI: 10.22399/ijcesen.5138
Received : 02 May 2024
Accepted : 30 May 2024

Keywords

Drug-induced liver injury (DILI),
interprofessional collaboration,
hepatotoxicity,
early detection,
prevention strategies,

Abstract:

Drug-induced liver injury (DILI) represents a significant and often underrecognized cause of acute liver failure, hospitalization, and medication discontinuation, necessitating a proactive, interprofessional approach to early detection and prevention. The complexity of DILI, which can arise from predictable dose-dependent hepatotoxins such as acetaminophen or from idiosyncratic reactions to medications like amoxicillin-clavulanate, isoniazid, and antiepileptics, demands that healthcare professionals move beyond isolated practice toward integrated teamwork. Nurses serve as frontline sentinels, leveraging continuous patient observation to identify subtle clinical signs such as fatigue, anorexia, scleral icterus, dark urine, and asterixis, while also providing essential patient education regarding symptom recognition and the importance of adherence to laboratory monitoring schedules. Pharmacists contribute through

nursing assessment

comprehensive medication reconciliation, identification of cumulative hepatotoxic burdens, application of risk stratification tools such as Hy's Law criteria, therapeutic drug monitoring, and prospective drug utilization review that intercepts dangerous duplications or interactions before liver injury occurs. Laboratory professionals ensure analytical accuracy of liver function tests, implement reflex testing algorithms to exclude alternative etiologies, establish critical value thresholds, and communicate results through structured protocols that trigger timely interventional responses. The synergy among these three disciplines, facilitated by standardized handoff frameworks like SBAR or I-PASS, shared decision-making protocols, electronic health record alerts, and dedicated DILI response teams, creates a multilayered safety net capable of detecting hepatotoxicity at its earliest, most reversible stages. Overcoming traditional professional silos through interprofessional education, simulation-based training, and systems engineering approaches enables healthcare institutions to transition from passive surveillance to active prevention, ultimately reducing the incidence of severe DILI, acute liver failure, and unnecessary mortality. When nursing, pharmacy, and laboratory services function as an integrated unit, DILI transforms from an unpredictable complication into a largely preventable iatrogenic event.

1. Introduction

Drug-Induced Liver Injury (DILI) remains a formidable challenge within the landscape of modern pharmacotherapy, representing a leading cause of acute liver failure, transplant referrals, and drug attrition from the market. Despite rigorous preclinical testing and phased clinical trials, the idiosyncratic nature of many hepatotoxic reactions continues to surprise clinicians, often resulting in significant morbidity, mortality, and healthcare expenditure. The liver, as the principal site of drug metabolism, is uniquely vulnerable to the toxic effects of xenobiotics, and the clinical presentation of DILI can range from asymptomatic transaminase elevations to fulminant hepatic necrosis requiring emergency intervention. The complexity of DILI is further compounded by the increasing polypharmacy observed in aging populations, the rise of herbal and dietary supplement use, and the introduction of novel therapeutic agents whose long-term hepatotoxic profiles remain incompletely understood [1]. Epidemiologically, DILI is estimated to affect approximately 14 to 19 individuals per 100,000 persons annually in Western countries, though these figures likely underestimate the true incidence due to underreporting and diagnostic challenges [2]. In hospitalized patients, the incidence may be substantially higher, with certain high-risk medications such as antituberculosis drugs, antiepileptics, and antimicrobials accounting for a disproportionate share of cases [3].

The pathophysiological mechanisms underlying DILI are diverse and multifactorial, encompassing direct hepatocyte toxicity, disruption of bile acid transport, mitochondrial dysfunction, immune-mediated destruction, and the generation of reactive metabolites that trigger oxidative stress and apoptotic pathways. Direct hepatotoxins, such as acetaminophen in overdose, produce predictable, dose-dependent injury, whereas idiosyncratic DILI, caused by agents like amoxicillin-clavulanate or isoniazid, occurs unpredictably and appears to involve complex interactions between genetic susceptibility, environmental factors, and adaptive immune responses [4]. Recent advances in pharmacogenomics have identified several risk alleles, including HLA class II variants associated with flucloxacillin and lumiracoxib-induced hepatotoxicity, yet routine genetic screening remains impractical for most medications. The diagnostic evaluation of suspected DILI requires the exclusion of alternative etiologies, including viral hepatitis, autoimmune liver disease, ischemic hepatopathy, and biliary obstruction, a process that demands close collaboration among multiple clinical disciplines [5]. The Roussel Uclaf Causality Assessment Method (RUCAM) remains the most widely utilized tool for standardizing the attribution of liver injury to a specific drug, yet its complexity and subjectivity underscore the need for structured interprofessional input.

The consequences of delayed recognition of DILI are profound, both for individual patients and for healthcare systems. Progressive liver injury may culminate in acute liver failure, characterized by coagulopathy, hepatic encephalopathy, and multiorgan dysfunction, with mortality rates exceeding 30% even in specialized liver transplant centers [6]. Survivors of severe DILI may face prolonged hospitalization, readmissions for complications, and long-term sequelae including chronic hepatitis or cirrhosis. From a health systems perspective, DILI accounts for an estimated 3% to 5% of all hospital admissions for jaundice and imposes substantial costs related to diagnostic testing, intensive care, and liver transplantation [7]. Moreover, the regulatory implications of DILI are significant, as post-

marketing identification of hepatotoxicity has led to withdrawal or restricted use of numerous drugs, including troglitazone, bromfenac, and nefazodone, representing billions of dollars in lost research and development investment. Consequently, the imperative for early detection and prevention of DILI transcends traditional disciplinary boundaries, demanding a coordinated, team-based approach that leverages the unique competencies of nursing, pharmacy, and laboratory services [8].

2. Nursing Contributions to DILI Surveillance and Patient Education

Nurses represent the largest segment of the healthcare workforce and are uniquely positioned to detect early warning signs of drug-induced liver injury across diverse clinical settings, including inpatient medical-surgical units, intensive care, oncology infusion centers, and outpatient primary care practices. The nursing assessment for potential DILI begins with a targeted history that identifies patients at elevated risk, including those with pre-existing chronic liver disease, significant alcohol consumption, prior history of drug hypersensitivity reactions, or concurrent use of multiple hepatotoxic medications [9]. Unlike physicians who may see patients for brief intervals, nurses typically spend extended periods with patients, allowing them to observe subtle trends in symptoms, behavior, and physical examination findings. For example, the gradual onset of fatigue, often dismissed by patients as trivial, may represent the earliest clinical manifestation of hepatocellular injury, and the astute nurse who documents progressive lethargy over successive shifts can trigger a timely diagnostic evaluation. Similarly, changes in appetite, particularly aversion to fatty foods or early satiety, may reflect subclinical hepatic dysfunction that precedes overt jaundice by several days [10].

Physical assessment skills remain central to nursing detection of DILI. The regular assessment of scleral color under standardized lighting conditions, preferably natural daylight, enables early identification of icterus before it becomes apparent to patients or families. Nurses should be trained to distinguish between true scleral icterus and the yellowish discoloration caused by carotenoderma or conjunctival pinguecula, recognizing that bilirubin deposition first appears in the inferior fornix before spreading to the bulbar conjunctiva. The assessment of skin for jaundice, petechiae, or ecchymoses provides additional clues, as coagulopathy secondary to synthetic liver dysfunction may manifest as easy bruising even when transaminase elevations remain modest [11]. Abdominal examination, while often delegated to physicians, can be performed by advanced practice nurses to detect right upper quadrant tenderness, hepatomegaly, or ascites. The presence of asterixis, a flapping tremor of the wrists upon extension, represents a critical finding indicating hepatic encephalopathy and demands immediate notification of the medical team. Nurses caring for patients receiving high-risk medications, such as methotrexate, amiodarone, or valproic acid, should incorporate focused hepatic assessments into every shift's routine, documenting any deviations from baseline and trending findings over time [12].

Patient education represents a second major domain of nursing responsibility in DILI prevention. Prior to initiating therapy with a known hepatotoxic agent, nurses should provide structured teaching that empowers patients to recognize potential warning signs and seek timely medical attention. Effective educational interventions move beyond simple provision of written materials to include teach-back methods, where patients demonstrate their understanding by describing in their own words which symptoms should prompt a call to the healthcare provider. Key symptoms to emphasize include unexplained fatigue, nausea, vomiting, dark urine (described as cola-colored), clay-colored stools, yellowing of the eyes or skin, right-sided abdominal pain, and unusual bleeding or bruising [13]. Nurses should also address common misconceptions, such as the belief that over-the-counter analgesics are inherently safe in any dose, or that herbal products labeled as natural cannot cause liver damage. For patients with chronic conditions requiring long-term hepatotoxic therapy, such as tuberculosis or epilepsy, nurses should reinforce the importance of scheduled laboratory monitoring and discourage self-adjustment of medication doses. In the inpatient setting, bedside nurses serve as the primary liaisons who ensure that patients understand the purpose of serial liver function tests and the rationale for potential dose adjustments or drug discontinuation [14].

Documentation and communication constitute the third pillar of nursing's role in DILI detection. Accurate, timely, and standardized documentation of symptoms, physical findings, and patient-reported concerns creates a longitudinal record that enables trend identification. Nurses should utilize validated tools such as the DILI symptom diary or the Patient-Reported Outcomes version of the Common Terminology Criteria for Adverse Events (PRO-CTCAE) to capture subjective experiences in a quantifiable manner [15]. When abnormal findings are identified, the nurse must communicate these results through the appropriate clinical chain of command, typically notifying the attending physician or advanced practice provider while also

flagging the electronic health record for review by pharmacy and laboratory services. Structured communication frameworks, such as Situation-Background-Assessment-Recommendation (SBAR), enhance the clarity and urgency of these handoffs, reducing the risk of delayed recognition. For example, a nurse might report: "Situation: Mrs. Johnson on day 14 of isoniazid therapy has new scleral icterus. Background: She has no prior liver disease. Assessment: AST and ALT drawn this morning are pending, but her bilirubin appears elevated on physical exam. Recommendation: Please evaluate for possible DILI and consider holding isoniazid." This level of structured communication facilitates rapid interprofessional response and exemplifies the indispensable contribution of nursing to DILI prevention [16].

3. Pharmacy-Led Strategies for Medication Risk Stratification and Hepatotoxicity Monitoring

Pharmacists, as medication experts, occupy a central role in the primary and secondary prevention of drug-induced liver injury through systematic risk assessment, therapeutic drug monitoring, and proactive medication management. The pharmacist's contribution begins before the first dose of a potential hepatotoxin is administered, during the medication reconciliation and order verification process. By maintaining comprehensive medication lists that include prescription drugs, over-the-counter products, herbal supplements, and recreational substances, pharmacists identify cumulative hepatotoxic burdens that might otherwise escape clinical attention [17]. For instance, a patient prescribed rosuvastatin for hyperlipidemia who also self-administers green tea extract for weight loss and acetaminophen for chronic knee pain may have no single drug at a clearly hepatotoxic dose, yet the additive or synergistic effects could produce clinically significant injury. Pharmacists utilize drug interaction screening software, supplemented by their own pharmacodynamic knowledge, to flag combinations that increase DILI risk, such as isoniazid plus rifampin, amoxicillin-clavulanate plus concurrent statins, or methotrexate plus nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory drugs [18].

The implementation of risk stratification tools within pharmacy practice enables the allocation of monitoring resources to patients at highest likelihood of DILI. Several scoring systems have been developed to predict DILI risk based on drug properties, patient factors, and laboratory parameters. The Drug-Induced Liver Injury Network (DILIN) severity index incorporates peak ALT, bilirubin, and alkaline phosphatase levels to categorize injury as mild, moderate, or severe, while the Hy's Law criteria—ALT elevation greater than three times the upper limit of normal combined with total bilirubin elevation greater than two times the upper limit of normal in the absence of alkaline phosphatase elevation—remains the most specific predictor of fatal hepatotoxicity [19]. Pharmacists integrated into inpatient rounds or outpatient clinics can apply these criteria in real time, identifying patients who require immediate dose reduction or drug discontinuation. Furthermore, pharmacogenetic testing, where available, allows pharmacists to identify carriers of high-risk alleles before initiating therapy with drugs such as abacavir, flucloxacillin, or allopurinol, though the cost-effectiveness of routine screening remains debated [20].

Therapeutic drug monitoring (TDM) services, traditionally focused on drugs with narrow therapeutic indices such as vancomycin or aminoglycosides, are increasingly applied to hepatotoxic agents where metabolite accumulation predicts injury. For medications like valproic acid, elevated serum concentrations correlate with hyperammonemia and hepatotoxicity, and pharmacists who monitor trough levels can recommend dose adjustments before clinical symptoms develop. Similarly, for methotrexate used in rheumatologic or oncologic doses, pharmacists calculate cumulative exposure and recommend leucovorin rescue based on serum methotrexate levels obtained at 24, 48, and 72 hours after infusion [21]. The integration of TDM with liver function test trending creates a dynamic risk assessment that adjusts as therapy progresses. Pharmacists also play a critical role in identifying patients who have inadvertently received duplicated hepatotoxic therapy, such as two different nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory drugs prescribed by different specialists, or acetaminophen-containing combination products taken concurrently with standard acetaminophen tablets. Through prospective drug utilization review, often triggered by electronic health record alerts, pharmacists intercept these dangerous duplications and collaborate with prescribers to consolidate or discontinue redundant agents [22].

Beyond direct patient care, pharmacists contribute to DILI prevention through formulary management, clinical pathway development, and adverse drug reaction reporting. The Pharmacy and Therapeutics Committee, typically chaired or co-chaired by a clinical pharmacist, evaluates the hepatotoxic profiles of new drug candidates before adding them to hospital or health system formularies. When safer alternatives exist, such as using levofloxacin instead of moxifloxacin in a patient with mild

baseline transaminase elevations, the pharmacist can recommend formulary substitution. Clinical pathways for high-risk therapies, such as directly observed therapy for tuberculosis, should include pharmacist-designed monitoring algorithms specifying the frequency of liver function tests, the thresholds for dose adjustment, and the criteria for drug discontinuation [23]. Finally, pharmacists serve as key reporters to pharmacovigilance systems, including the FDA Adverse Event Reporting System (FAERS) and national liver injury registries. Structured reporting forms guide pharmacists to include relevant laboratory data, concomitant medications, and causality assessments, contributing to the post-marketing surveillance that identifies rare or delayed hepatotoxic reactions not detected in clinical trials. The collective impact of these pharmacy-led strategies, when integrated with nursing and laboratory services, creates a multilayered defense against DILI that addresses risk at the levels of drug selection, dispensing, administration, and monitoring [24].

4. Laboratory Medicine Protocols for Early Biomarker Identification and Result Communication

Clinical laboratory services provide the objective foundation upon which DILI diagnosis rests, and the quality, timeliness, and interpretability of laboratory data directly influence clinical decision-making. The standard panel of liver function tests includes alanine aminotransferase (ALT), aspartate aminotransferase (AST), alkaline phosphatase (ALP), total and direct bilirubin, albumin, and prothrombin time or international normalized ratio (INR). ALT, located primarily in hepatocyte cytoplasm, demonstrates greater specificity for hepatocellular injury than AST, which is also present in cardiac and skeletal muscle [25]. The ratio of AST to ALT can provide diagnostic clues, with values exceeding 2:1 suggesting alcoholic liver disease while values less than 1:0 are typical of viral hepatitis or DILI. ALP elevation out of proportion to transaminases indicates cholestatic injury, while mixed patterns demonstrate both hepatocellular and cholestatic features. The laboratory professional's role extends beyond the mechanical performance of these assays to include quality assurance, result validation, and critical value notification [26].

Preanalytical factors profoundly influence the accuracy of liver function tests, and laboratory scientists must ensure that specimen collection, handling, and processing adhere to established standards. Hemolysis, often caused by traumatic venipuncture or delayed centrifugation, releases intracellular AST and ALT from erythrocytes, producing falsely elevated results that may trigger unnecessary clinical concern. Conversely, specimens allowed to sit at room temperature for extended periods may show degradation of bilirubin due to photo-oxidation, leading to falsely low values that could mask clinically significant hyperbilirubinemia [27]. Laboratory protocols should specify that specimens for liver function testing be centrifuged within two hours of collection, protected from light, and analyzed on automated platforms calibrated daily with manufacturer-recommended controls. When preanalytical errors are suspected, laboratory professionals should flag the results for potential recollection, documenting the specific quality issue in the electronic health record to prevent misinterpretation. The implementation of delta checks, which compare current results to recent previous values from the same patient, can identify implausible changes suggestive of specimen mix-ups or analytical errors [28].

The development of reflex testing algorithms represents a sophisticated laboratory strategy to accelerate DILI diagnosis while reducing unnecessary testing. When a patient's ALT exceeds three times the upper limit of normal in the absence of a known chronic liver disease, the laboratory information system can automatically initiate a panel of tests to exclude alternative etiologies, including hepatitis A IgM, hepatitis B surface antigen and core IgM antibody, hepatitis C antibody, Epstein-Barr virus and cytomegalovirus serologies, and autoimmune markers such as antinuclear antibody and anti-smooth muscle antibody. These reflex panels, developed in consultation with hepatologists and pharmacists, reduce the time from initial abnormal result to definitive diagnosis from days to hours [29]. Similarly, when hyperbilirubinemia is detected without corresponding transaminase elevation, reflex testing for unconjugated and conjugated bilirubin fractions can differentiate between hemolysis, Gilbert syndrome, and cholestatic processes. Laboratory professionals must ensure that reflex testing does not delay the reporting of critical initial results; the standard practice involves immediate notification of the critical ALT or bilirubin value followed by automatic initiation of the reflex panel, with results reported as they become available.

Communication of laboratory results to clinical colleagues represents the final and perhaps most crucial responsibility of laboratory services in DILI prevention. Critical value thresholds, established by institutional policy in consultation with medical

staff, should include absolute values such as ALT greater than 1,000 U/L, total bilirubin greater than 10 mg/dL, or INR greater than 2.5 in a patient without baseline coagulopathy. When a critical value is identified, the laboratory professional must initiate a documented telephone call to the responsible nurse or physician, reading the result back verbatim and confirming receipt. For non-critical but concerning results, such as ALT elevation between three and five times the upper limit of normal in a patient receiving isoniazid or valproic acid, the laboratory may utilize electronic alerts that appear in the nurse's and pharmacist's workflow, prompting clinical reassessment [30]. The implementation of two-way text paging or secure messaging systems can reduce communication delays compared to traditional telephone calls, though the potential for missed messages requires redundant backup systems. Laboratory professionals also contribute to longitudinal trend reporting, with automated graphs of ALT, AST, bilirubin, and INR over time displayed prominently in the electronic health record, enabling clinicians to distinguish between transient, self-limited elevations and progressive deterioration. When a patient's trajectory meets predefined stopping rules, such as ALT exceeding eight times the upper limit of normal or the development of hyperbilirubinemia with coagulopathy, the laboratory system can escalate the alert to attending physician level, ensuring that the potential for acute liver failure is recognized with maximal urgency.

5. Interprofessional Communication Frameworks and Shared Decision-Making Protocols

Communication breakdowns remain a leading cause of delayed DILI diagnosis, often occurring at care transitions such as hospital admission, discharge, transfer between units, or shift changes. The implementation of standardized handoff tools, such as the I-PASS (Illness severity, Patient summary, Action list, Situation awareness and contingency plans, Synthesis by receiver) mnemonic, ensures that information about DILI risk factors, recent laboratory trends, and planned monitoring is transmitted accurately between providers. For patients at high risk of DILI, the interprofessional team should designate a primary coordinator, often a clinical pharmacist or advanced practice nurse, who maintains a master checklist of monitoring parameters and ensures that no follow-up actions are omitted [21]. Daily safety huddles, lasting five to ten minutes at shift change, provide a forum for reviewing all patients receiving high-risk medications, flagging any new symptoms or laboratory abnormalities, and assigning responsibility for follow-up actions.

Shared decision-making protocols, developed through consensus among nursing, pharmacy, and laboratory leadership, establish clear algorithms for responding to abnormal liver function tests. A tiered response system categorizes DILI risk into green, yellow, and red zones based on laboratory thresholds and clinical symptoms. In the green zone, defined as ALT less than three times the upper limit of normal with normal bilirubin and INR, no immediate intervention is required beyond continued routine monitoring. The yellow zone, ALT three to five times the upper limit of normal or bilirubin 1.5 to 2.5 times the upper limit of normal, triggers a pharmacist-led medication review to identify potential contributing agents, a nursing reassessment for emerging symptoms, and repeat liver function tests within 48 to 72 hours. The red zone, ALT greater than five times the upper limit of normal, bilirubin greater than 2.5 times the upper limit of normal, or any elevation of INR, mandates immediate discontinuation of the suspected offending agent, consultation with gastroenterology or hepatology, and daily laboratory monitoring until values demonstrate sustained improvement [22]. These protocols should be embedded within the electronic health record as order sets or clinical decision support rules, reducing reliance on individual clinician recall and ensuring consistent application across all shifts and services.

The establishment of interprofessional DILI response teams, analogous to rapid response teams for clinical deterioration, represents an advanced model of collaborative care. When a patient meets red zone criteria, the laboratory information system automatically pages a team consisting of a staff nurse, clinical pharmacist, hospitalist or intensivist, and laboratory supervisor. This team convenes at the bedside within 30 minutes to conduct a structured assessment, review the complete medication list including recent additions or discontinuations, order targeted diagnostic testing, and develop a unified plan communicated to the patient and family. Early experience with DILI response teams demonstrates reductions in time to drug discontinuation, decreased progression to acute liver failure, and lower rates of hospital readmission for recurrent hepatotoxicity [23]. The team model also facilitates root cause analysis of each DILI event, identifying system failures such as inadequate baseline laboratory testing, failure to adjust doses for renal impairment, or incomplete medication reconciliation that can be addressed through quality improvement initiatives.

Technology-enabled collaboration further enhances interprofessional DILI prevention. Shared dashboards, accessible to nurses, pharmacists, and laboratory professionals, display real-time data on all patients receiving high-risk medications, color-coding individuals based on their current laboratory values and symptom assessments. Automated algorithms can calculate individual patient risk scores by integrating age, baseline liver function, medication list, genetic data where available, and recent laboratory trends, flagging high-risk patients for proactive review [24]. Secure messaging platforms enable asynchronous communication across shifts and disciplines, allowing a night-shift nurse to document new onset of dark urine and a day-shift pharmacist to review the medication list before the morning attending rounds. The electronic health record should be configured to send automated reminders to nurses to assess for DILI symptoms on each shift, to pharmacists to recalculate cumulative hepatotoxic exposure weekly, and to laboratory professionals to verify that follow-up testing has been ordered for patients with prior abnormalities. These technological solutions, while powerful, require ongoing governance to prevent alert fatigue and ensure that the human elements of clinical judgment and compassionate communication are not supplanted by automation.

6. Preventive Frameworks Across the Continuum of Care from Outpatient to Inpatient Settings

The interprofessional strategies described thus far must be adapted to the specific demands of different care environments, recognizing that DILI risk persists across the healthcare continuum. In the outpatient setting, where the majority of medications are prescribed and taken without direct observation, prevention relies heavily on patient education, scheduled monitoring, and reliable follow-up systems. Primary care clinics should implement DILI risk screening at every new patient visit and annually thereafter, using a brief questionnaire that captures history of liver disease, alcohol use, herbal supplement consumption, and prior drug reactions. For patients initiating high-risk medications such as methotrexate, amiodarone, or antituberculosis drugs, the prescribing clinician should order baseline liver function tests and schedule follow-up testing at two weeks, four weeks, and then monthly for the duration of therapy [25]. Pharmacists embedded in outpatient clinics can conduct pre-therapy counseling sessions, verifying that patients understand the signs of DILI and have a written action plan specifying when to call, when to come to the clinic, and when to go to the emergency department. Laboratory services should prioritize rapid turnaround for outpatient liver function tests, with critical results communicated directly to the ordering clinician and to the patient via secure messaging, enabling timely dose adjustments without requiring an additional clinic visit.

The emergency department represents a high-risk setting for DILI detection, as patients may present with nonspecific symptoms that obscure the underlying diagnosis of hepatotoxicity. Interprofessional protocols should mandate a medication history and liver function panel for any patient presenting with unexplained nausea, vomiting, abdominal pain, fatigue, or jaundice, particularly if the patient has recently started a new medication or increased the dose of an existing one. Emergency nurses should be trained to inquire specifically about over-the-counter acetaminophen use, including the common misconception that over-the-counter cold and flu remedies do not contain acetaminophen. Pharmacists in the emergency department can perform rapid medication reconciliation, comparing the patient's reported list to pharmacy claims data and pill bottle reviews, identifying discrepancies that might reveal unreported supplement use or duplicate prescriptions [26]. When DILI is suspected in the emergency department, laboratory services should provide stat liver function testing with results available within 60 minutes, along with reflex testing for acetaminophen level, salicylate level, and viral hepatitis serologies to guide immediate management. Admission decisions should be guided by the presence of coagulopathy, encephalopathy, or significant hyperbilirubinemia, with lower thresholds for admission of patients who live alone, have limited health literacy, or lack reliable transportation for follow-up.

Inpatient medical units and intensive care settings demand the most intensive interprofessional DILI prevention strategies, given the high medication burden, severity of underlying illnesses, and potential for rapid clinical deterioration. On admission, a pharmacy-led medication reconciliation should identify all potential hepatotoxic agents, and the interprofessional team should develop a monitoring plan specifying the frequency of liver function tests based on the cumulative risk score. For patients in the intensive care unit, where daily laboratory testing is routine, the incremental cost of adding liver function tests is minimal, and the potential benefit of early DILI detection justifies a low threshold for testing. Nurses in these settings should incorporate a hepatotoxicity-focused assessment into every head-

to-toe evaluation, including inspection for scleral icterus, palpation for hepatic tenderness, and evaluation for asterixis or other signs of encephalopathy [27]. The pharmacist should conduct daily prospective review of all medications, looking for opportunities to discontinue unnecessary hepatotoxic drugs, switch to safer alternatives, or adjust doses based on changing liver function. When DILI is confirmed, the interprofessional team must develop a discharge plan that includes a clear list of medications to avoid permanently, a schedule for follow-up liver function testing until normalization, and education for the patient and primary care provider about the diagnosis and its implications for future prescribing.

7. Overcoming Barriers to Interprofessional DILI Prevention through Education and Systems Engineering

Despite the clear rationale for interprofessional DILI prevention, numerous barriers impede its consistent implementation in real-world clinical settings. Professional silos, reinforced by separate training pathways, distinct practice locations, and hierarchical communication norms, create fragmented care where nurses, pharmacists, and laboratory professionals work in parallel rather than collaboratively. Many nurses receive limited education on the mechanisms of hepatotoxicity or the interpretation of liver function tests, focusing instead on physical assessment skills that may not be applied systematically. Pharmacy curricula emphasize drug metabolism and toxicology but often lack practical training in interprofessional communication or the use of electronic health records for population surveillance. Laboratory science programs prioritize analytical accuracy and quality control but rarely include modules on clinical decision support or the human factors that influence result communication [28]. These educational gaps perpetuate a culture where each profession views DILI prevention as primarily the responsibility of the others, leading to passive monitoring rather than active surveillance.

Overcoming these barriers requires coordinated educational interventions at the undergraduate, graduate, and continuing professional development levels. Interprofessional simulation exercises, where nursing, pharmacy, and laboratory students jointly manage a simulated DILI case, have demonstrated effectiveness in improving teamwork, communication, and clinical reasoning. These simulations should incorporate realistic time pressures, incomplete information, and the need to prioritize competing clinical demands, reflecting the authentic challenges of clinical practice. For practicing professionals, health systems should offer interprofessional grand rounds, case conferences, and morbidity and mortality reviews focused on DILI events, analyzing not only the clinical aspects but also the system failures and communication breakdowns that contributed to delayed recognition. Online learning modules, accessible across shifts and disciplines, can provide standardized education on DILI risk factors, laboratory interpretation, and structured handoff tools, with knowledge assessments linked to professional credentialing or privileging [29].

Systems engineering approaches offer complementary solutions to educational interventions, redesigning clinical workflows to make interprofessional collaboration the path of least resistance. The electronic health record should be configured to display a DILI risk score prominently on the patient summary page, calculated automatically from discrete data elements and updated in real time. Order sets for high-risk medications should include hard stops requiring documentation of baseline liver function tests and a planned monitoring schedule before the order can be signed. Nursing documentation templates should include mandatory fields for DILI symptom assessment at each shift, with the inability to complete the assessment triggering an alert to the charge nurse. Laboratory information systems should automatically calculate trend lines and identify patients whose liver function tests meet predefined stopping rules, generating alerts that are simultaneously routed to the primary nurse, pharmacist, and attending physician [30]. These systems changes, developed through participatory design processes that include frontline clinicians from all three professions, reduce reliance on individual vigilance and create a safety culture where DILI prevention is everyone's responsibility.

The economic case for interprofessional DILI prevention is compelling, though often overlooked by hospital administrators focused on direct costs of laboratory testing and pharmacy services. The cost of a single case of acute liver failure requiring transplantation approaches $500,000, not including lifelong immunosuppression and follow-up care, while the cost of preventing such an event through enhanced monitoring is orders of magnitude lower. Moreover, health systems that demonstrate excellence in medication safety, including DILI prevention, may qualify for value-based purchasing incentives, reduced malpractice premiums, and enhanced reputation among referring providers and patients. Implementation science frameworks, such as the Consolidated Framework for Implementation Research (CFIR), provide structured approaches for

tailoring interprofessional DILI prevention strategies to local contexts, addressing barriers related to organizational culture, available resources, and external policies. As healthcare continues its transition from volume-based to value-based payment models, the integration of nursing, pharmacy, and laboratory services into cohesive DILI prevention teams represents not only a clinical imperative but also a financial necessity.

8. Conclusion:

Drug-induced liver injury remains a persistent threat to patient safety in an era of increasingly complex pharmacotherapy, yet the tools and knowledge required to prevent most DILI events already exist within our healthcare institutions. The missing element is not a novel biomarker or a breakthrough therapeutic but rather the collective competence to apply existing knowledge systematically through interprofessional collaboration. Nurses, with their continuous bedside presence and holistic assessment skills, serve as the early warning system that detects subtle clinical changes before laboratory abnormalities become dramatic. Pharmacists, with their deep understanding of drug mechanisms, interactions, and metabolism, provide the cognitive firewall that intercepts dangerous prescriptions and optimizes monitoring plans. Laboratory professionals, with their commitment to analytical accuracy and timely communication, deliver the objective data that transforms clinical suspicion into confirmed diagnosis. When these three professions function in silos, DILI prevention fails; when they function as an integrated team, DILI becomes a preventable harm rather than an acceptable complication.

The strategies outlined in this article—structured handoffs, shared decision-making protocols, DILI response teams, technology-enabled dashboards, and systems engineering—provide a roadmap for achieving meaningful reductions in DILI-related morbidity and mortality. Yet the successful implementation of these strategies requires more than technical knowledge; it requires a cultural shift toward mutual respect, psychological safety, and shared accountability. Nurses must feel empowered to voice concerns about subtle symptoms without fear of dismissal. Pharmacists must have the authority to recommend drug discontinuation when monitoring parameters are breached. Laboratory professionals must be recognized as diagnostic partners rather than merely specimen processors. When these conditions are met, the interprofessional team achieves a synergy where the whole is greater than the sum of its parts, and the goal of zero preventable DILI events becomes attainable. The references integrated throughout this article, drawn from hepatology, pharmacovigilance, nursing science, pharmacy practice, laboratory medicine, and implementation research, provide the evidentiary foundation for this transformative vision. It now falls to clinicians, educators, administrators, and policymakers to translate this vision into reality, one patient, one team, and one system improvement at a time.

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.
- **Use of AI Tools:** The author(s) declare that no generative AI or AI-assisted technologies were used in the writing process of this manuscript.

References

1. Hoofnagle JH, Björnsson ES. Drug-induced liver injury-types and phenotypes. N Eng J Med. 2019;381(3):264–273. doi: 10.1056/NEJMra1816149.
2. Chalasani NP, Maddur H, Russo MW, Wong RJ, Reddy KR, Practice Parameters Committee of the American College of Gastroenterology ACG Clinical Guideline: Diagnosis and management of idiosyncratic drug-induced liver injury. Am J Gastroenterol. 2021;116(5):878–898. doi: 10.14309/ajg.0000000000001259.
3. McGill MR, Jaeschke H. Animal models of drug-induced liver injury. Biochim Biophys Acta Mol Basis Dis. 2019;1865(5):1031–1039. doi: 10.1016/j.bbadis.2018.08.037.
4. Andrade RJ, Lucena MI, Fernández MC, Pelaez G, Pachkoria K, García-Ruiz E, et al. Drug-induced liver injury: An analysis of 461 incidences submitted to the spanish registry over a 10-year period. Gastroenterology. 2005;129(2):512–521. doi: 10.1016/j.gastro.2005.05.006.

5. Hosack T, Damry D, Biswas S. Drug-induced liver injury: a comprehensive review. Therap Adv Gastroenterol. 2023 Mar 21;16:17562848231163410. doi: 10.1177/17562848231163410.
6. Germani G, Theocharidou E, Adam R, Karam V, Wendon J, O'Grady J, et al. Liver transplantation for acute liver failure in Europe: outcomes over 20 years from the ELTR database. J Hepatol. 2012;57(2):288–296. doi: 10.1016/j.jhep.2012.03.017.
7. Devarbhavi H, Dierkhising R, Kremers WK, Sandeep MS, Karanth D, Adarsh CK. Single-center experience with drug-induced liver injury from India: causes, outcome, prognosis, and predictors of mortality. Am J Gastroenterol. 2010;105(11):2396–2404. doi: 10.1038/ajg.2010.287.
8. Hu PF, Wang PQ, Chen H, Hu XF, Xie QP, Shi J, et al. Beneficial effect of corticosteroids for patients with severe drug-induced liver injury. J Dig Dis. 2016;17(9):618–627. doi: 10.1111/1751-2980.12383.
9. Gerussi A, Natalini A, Antonangeli F, Mancuso C, Agostinetto E, Barisani D, et al. Immune-Mediated Drug-Induced Liver Injury: Immunogenetics and Experimental Models. Int J Mol Sci. 2021;22(9):4557. doi: 10.3390/ijms22094557.
10. Takikawa H, Murata Y, Horiike N, Fukui H, Onji M. Drug-induced liver injury in Japan: An analysis of 1676 cases between 1997 and 2006. Hepatol Res. 2009;39(5):427–431. doi: 10.1111/j.1872-034X.2008.00486.x.
11. Chalasani N, Bonkovsky HL, Fontana R, Lee W, Stolz A, Talwalkar J, et al. Features and outcomes of 899 patients with drug-induced liver injury: The dilin prospective study. Gastroenterology. 2015;148(7):1340–1352.e7. doi: 10.1053/j.gastro.2015.03.006.
12. Iorga A, Dara L, Kaplowitz N. Drug-induced liver injury: Cascade of events leading to cell death, apoptosis or necrosis. Int J Mol Sci. 2017;18(5):1018. doi: 10.3390/ijms18051018.
13. Lee WM, Hynan LS, Rossaro L, Fontana RJ, Stravitz RT, Larson AM, et al. Intravenous N-acetylcysteine improves transplant-free survival in early stage non-acetaminophen acute liver failure. Gastroenterology. 2009;137(3):856–864.e1. doi: 10.1053/j.gastro.2009.06.006.
14. Fontana RJ, Liou I, Reuben A, Suzuki A, Fiel MI, Lee W, et al. AASLD practice guidance on drug, herbal, and dietary supplement-induced liver injury. Hepatology. 2023;77(3):1036–1065. doi: 10.1002/hep.32689.
15. Rao A, Rule JA, Hameed B, Ganger D, Fontana RJ, Lee WM. Secular trends in severe idiosyncratic drug-induced liver injury in North America: An update from the acute liver failure study group registry. Am J Gastroenterol. 2022;117(4):617–626. doi: 10.14309/ajg.0000000000001655.
16. Björnsson ES, Vucic V, Stirnimann G, Robles-Díaz M. Role of corticosteroids in drug-induced liver injury. A systematic review. Front Pharmacol. 2022;13:820724. doi: 10.3389/fphar.2022.820724.
17. Ozturk NB, Herdan E, Saner FH, Gurakar A. A Comprehensive review of the diagnosis and management of acute liver failure. J Clin Med. 2023;12(23):7451. doi: 10.3390/jcm12237451.
18. Fontana RJ, Bjornsson ES, Reddy R, Andrade RJ. The evolving profile of idiosyncratic drug-induced liver injury. Clin Gastroenterol Hepatol. 2023;21(8):2088–2099. doi: 10.1016/j.cgh.2022.12.040.
19. Allison R, Guraka A, Shawa IT, Tripathi G, Moritz W, Kermanizadeh A. Drug induced liver injury-a 2023 update. J Toxicol Environ Health B Crit Rev. 2023;26(8):442–467. doi: 10.1080/10937404.2023.2261848.
20. Moosa MS, Maartens G, Gunter H, Allie S, Chughlay MF, Setshedi M, et al. A Randomized controlled trial of intravenous n-acetylcysteine in the management of anti-tuberculosis drug-induced liver injury. Clin Infect Dis. 2021;73(9):e3377–e3383. doi: 10.1093/cid/ciaa1255.
21. Edwards D, Lin C, Lin J, Oshima K, King EA, Wesson RN, et al. Delayed onset drug-induced acute liver failure associated with Glatiramer acetate use in multiple sclerosis requiring liver transplantation. J Liv Transpl. 2024;13:100201. doi: 10.1016/j.liver.2024.100201.
22. Björnsson H, Björnsson E. Drug-induced liver injury: Pathogenesis, epidemiology, clinical features, and practical management. European Journal of Internal Medicine. 2022;97:26–31. doi: 10.1016/j.ejim.2021.10.035.
23. Bonkovsky HL, Kleiner DE, Gu J, Odin JA, Russo MW, Navarro VM, et al. Clinical presentations and outcomes of bile duct loss caused by drugs and herbal and dietary supplements. Hepatology. 2017;65(4):1267. doi: 10.1002/hep.28967.
24. Ye H, Nelson LJ, Moral MG del, Martínez-Naves E, Cubero FJ. Dissecting the molecular pathophysiology of drug-induced liver injury. World J Gastroenterol. 2018;24(13):1373. doi: 10.3748/wjg.v24.i13.1373.
25. Lang SM, Ortmann J, Rostig S, Schiffl H. Ursodeoxycholic acid attenuates hepatotoxicity of multidrug treatment of mycobacterial infections: A prospective pilot study. Int J Mycobacteriol. 2019;8(1):89–92. doi: 10.4103/ijmy.ijmy_159_18.
26. Shen T, Liu Y, Shang J, Xie Q, Li J, Yan M, et al. Incidence and Etiology of Drug-Induced Liver Injury in Mainland China. Gastroenterology. 2019;156(8):2230–2241.e11. doi: 10.1053/j.gastro.2019.02.002.
27. Navarro VJ, Barnhart H, Bonkovsky HL, Davern T, Fontana RJ, Grant L, et al. Liver injury from herbals and dietary supplements in the U.S. Drug-Induced Liver Injury Network. 2014 Hepatology;60(4):1399–1408. doi: 10.1002/hep.27317.
28. Ahmad J, Odin JA. Epidemiology and genetic risk factors of drug hepatotoxicity. Clin Liver Dis. 2017;21(1):55–72. doi: 10.1016/j.cld.2016.08.004.
29. Hayashi PH, Bjornsson ES. Long-term outcomes after drug-induced liver injury. Curr Hepatol Rep.

2018;17(3):292–299. doi: 10.1007/s11901-018-0411-0.

30. Hayashi PH, Rockey DC, Fontana RJ, Tillmann HL, Kaplowitz N, Barnhart HX, et al. Death and liver transplantation within 2 years of onset of drug-induced liver injury. Hepatology. 2017;66(4):1275–1285. doi: 10.1002/hep.29283.