



The Herbal and Dietary Supplement Blind Spot:

Why Standard Drug Screening Tools Aren't Enough?

By: Mr. Mohammad Suhaidi Sha'ari, Dr. Norkasih Ibrahim

Despite the growing prevalence of herbal and dietary supplement (HDS) use, existing drug-related problem-screening tools remain alarmingly inadequate in detecting risks linked to HDS. As more patients self-prescribe these products, this gap in detection becomes a critical threat to patient safety.

The Performance Gap: Tools Struggling with HDS Complexity

Standard drug-drug interaction (DDI) screening tools, fundamental to pharmacy workflows, exhibit alarmingly poor sensitivity in identifying herb-drug interactions (HDIs). A comparative study of eight major DDI tools, including paid resources like Micromedex, Lexicomp, PEPID, and Facts & Comparisons, and free platforms such as Drugs.com, Medscape, WebMD, and RxList, found that all tools missed over 80% of potential HDIs, with sensitivities below 0.20 [1]. While Lexicomp demonstrated the highest positive predictive value (0.98) and best overall performance score (0.54), and Medscape was the top-performing free tool (score 0.52), their capabilities in HDI detection remained significantly inferior compared to their performance for traditional DDIs [1]. These tools are not engineered for botanical complexity. This profound performance gap is especially critical in vulnerable populations like oncology [1] and HIV patients [2], where supplement interactions threaten treatment efficacy.



HDS-related interactions evade detection due to three systemic flaws:



Regulatory gaps enabling poor labelling [3]



Database limitations (only 3% of tools flag HDS [4])



Inconsistent composition (e.g., adulterants in "natural" supplements [5])



"Lexicomp and Medscape lead in HDS screening yet still fail patients. Complexity demands pharmacist vigilance, not just software."

Emerging technologies like artificial intelligence promise future solutions [3] but remain clinically inaccessible. Meanwhile, Marcath et al. confirmed standardised protocols reduce missed interactions in oncology [6], yet few tools integrate HDS risks. Until technology bridges this gap, pharmacists must lead with four actionable defences:



The path forward demands collaboration: Advocate for stricter labelling, support HDI screening standardisation [6], and demand tools that address real-world HDS variability. Pharmacist vigilance remains the strongest safeguard against these invisible threats.

REFERENCE:

- 1.Shakeel F, Fang F, Kidwell KM, Marcath LA, Hertz DL. Comparison of eight screening tools to detect interactions between herbal supplements and oncology agents. Journal of Oncology Pharmacy Practice. 2020;26(8):1843-9.
- 2.Jalloh MA, Gregory PJ, Hein DJ, Cochrane ZR, Rodriguez AD. Dietary supplement interactions with antiretrovirals: a systematic review. International Journal of STD & AIDS. 2016;28(1):4-15.
- 3.Souza-Peres JP, Flores K, Umloff B, Heinan M, Herscu P, Babos M. Everyday evaluation of herb/dietary supplement–drug interaction: a pilot study. Medicines. 2023;10(3):20.
- 4.Rajj R, Schaadt N, Bezsilá K, Balázs O, Jancsó M, Auer M, et al. Survey of potential drug interactions, use of non-medical health products, and immunization status among patients receiving targeted therapies. Pharmaceuticals. 2024;17(7):942.
- 5.Kim B, Lee W, Kim Y, Lee J, Hong J. Efficient matrix cleanup of soft-gel-type dietary supplements for rapid screening of 92 illegal adulterants using EMR-lipid dSPE and UHPLC-Q/TOF-MS. Pharmaceuticals. 2021;14(6):570.
- 6.Marcath LA, Xi J, Hoylman EK, Kidwell KM, Kraft SL, Hertz DL. Comparison of nine tools for screening drug-drug interactions of oral oncolytics. Journal of Oncology Practice. 2018;14(6):e368-e374.