Original Research

Economic implications of polypharmacy in Nepal: Multicenter community-based study

Binaya Sapkota^{1,*}, Suraj Shakya¹, Saroj Sah^{1,a}, Narendra Chaudhary^{1,a}, Bijendra Tamang^{1,a}, Saugat Singh Karki^{1,a}

¹Nobel College Faculty of Health Sciences, Sinamangal, Kathmandu, Pokhara University, Nepal.

^aAll authors have equal contributions.

*Corresponding author: Binaya Sapkota, PharmD Email: binaya@nobelcollege.edu.np. Phone: +977-9851134925. ORCID: 0000-0002-4125-9866

Competing interests

The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

Authors' Contributions

All authors made substantial contributions to conception and design, acquisition of data, or analysis and interpretation of data; took part in drafting the article or revising it critically for important intellectual content; gave final approval of the version to be published; and agree to be accountable for all aspects of the work.

Abstract

Objective: Improper management of polypharmacy in community and hospital pharmacies may lead to adverse effects and drug interactions in patients of all age groups, especially children and the elderly. This study aimed to determine the scenario of polypharmacy in multiple communities in Nepal and the costs associated with them.

Design: Cross-sectional study

Setting: Local communities of nine districts in Nepal

Participants: Total 400 patients of all age groups, who were consuming medicines and who fulfilled inclusion criteria from May 2017 to August 2018

Primary and secondary outcome measures: A semi-structured questionnaire, based on the prescription optimization method, was used for data collection. Multinomial logistic regression was performed to analyze the statistical significance of polypharmacy with the predictor variables (e.g., age, education level, occupation, diagnosis, total cost of medicines). The p-value <0.05 was considered statistically significant at 95% confidence interval. Polypharmacy cases and their economic implications were reported.

Results: Eighty-one patients (20.3%) with an age group of 22-31 years with female patients (219, 54.8%) reported more polypharmacy events. There were 216 patients (54%) with prescriptions of five medicines i.e., moderate polypharmacy. Total number of medicines consumed by all 400 patients was 2269, with a mean±SD 5.67 ±1.08. Total expenditure by all 400 patients was USD 3409.54 during the study period, with a mean±SD 8.66±6.04. Both moderate and severe polypharmacy cases were non-significantly related with age, gender and total cost of medications. They had significant relationship in almost all levels of education

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

and occupation and showed mixed type of significance and non-significance with the diagnosis of the respondents.

Conclusion: Polypharmacy cases can be minimized, considering adverse drug reactions and drug interactions. Further studies are warranted in medication utilization and avoidable polypharmacy along with detailed pharmacoeconomic evaluation.

Keywords: Adverse effects; community; economic implication; Nepal; polypharmacy

Background

Polypharmacy is not an entity with unanimously accepted definition.¹⁻³ There are many viewpoints that the concomitant use of multiple (more than four) medications by a patient is regarded as polypharmacy.⁴⁻⁸ Even worse is the excessive polypharmacy with ≥ 10 medications.^{3,4} Prevalence of polypharmacy was 7% in the USA and 1.2% in Denmark.^{3,9} Problems of polypharmacy may be encountered in all health care settings, including inpatients, an outpatient unit, discharge patients, long-term care facilities (LTCFs) such as nursing homes. Polypharmacy cases are yet the under-researched domains in the developing countries, including Nepal. Major risk factors for polypharmacy can be grouped into demographic (eg, advancing age, education), health status (eg, depression, hypertension, anemia, asthma, angina, osteoarthritis, gout, diabetes mellitus), and access to health care (eg, health care visits, health insurance).¹ Therapeutic errors of treating ADRs of a medicine as a separate diagnosis further potentiate polypharmacy.⁶

Polypharmacy poses a huge economic impact and significantly deteriorates patients' quality of life (QoL) via the potential therapeutic failure. In 2012, the US Institute for Healthcare Informatics found that preventable polypharmacy contributes to 4% of the costs that is equivalent to USD 18 billion worldwide. Incorporating pharmacoeconomic evaluations by the pharmacists along with the prescribers can reduce the health care burden posed by polypharmacy.¹⁰ Other complications such as adverse drug reactions (ADRs), interactions, non-adherence, and geriatric syndromes of organ dysfunction are also attributed to polypharmacy.^{4,6-8,11} Jansen and Brouwers concluded that pharmacists and geriatricians can play a pivotal role to optimize polypharmacy in the elderly.⁶ Polypharmacy cases are further associated with the avoidable but significant increment of the cost of medications. Rozenfeld et al. studied medicines utilization by 800 retirees of the Brazilian Institute of Social Security aged ≥ 60 years with the average age 72.27 (64.5–80) years, and observed that muscle relaxants, antihistamines, and long-acting benzodiazepines led to anticholinergic adverse effects (eg, sedation, weakness, falls, and fractures).¹²

Research conducted by Basnet et al. in Nepal showed that 225 geriatric in-patients (aged ≥ 65 years) were prescribed with average of 18.44 medicines during hospital stay, with an average of 8.19 ± 3.5 per person.¹³ Similarly, Lohani et al. studied the prescribing pattern among geriatric in-patients (≥ 65 years) at Tribhuvan University Teaching Hospital (TUTH), Nepal from July 2002 to June 2003 and found an average of 10.73 medicines prescribed, 89% of patients prescribed with > 5 medicines.¹⁴

Aim of the study

The present study was intended to explore polypharmacy with demographics and costs incurred with polypharmacy in select Nepalese communities.

Methods and Materials

Study design and study variables:

Multi-center community-based cross-sectional study was conducted by collecting various predictor variables such as age, gender, education level, occupation, diagnosis, total cost of medications associated with polypharmacy as the known determinants of polypharmacy. Outcome variable such as status of polypharmacy based on number of simultaneous medications used was taken into consideration.

Study area and study site

The study was conducted in local pharmacies of nine districts namely Kathmandu, Bhaktapur, Lalitpur, Nuwakot, Makawanpur, Chitwan, Dhanusha, Sunsari, and Siraha. The population distribution among the districts aforementioned was 435,544, 68,557, 109,505, 59,194, 86,045, 132,345, 138,225, 162,279 and 117,929 and altogether 1,309,623.¹⁵ The districts and study sites (ie, local pharmacies) were randomly selected (with the help of computer-generated table of random numbers) using the principles of multistage sampling, and finally simple random sampling technique.

Patient and Public Involvement

The study included the uneducated and the educated patients of all age groups, who were consuming medicines for their health problems. All the respondents who fulfilled the inclusion criteria within the study duration of May 2017 to August 2018 were selected for the study. Respondents were selected based on the pharmacy exit interview. Patients' exit interview was performed in the community pharmacies along with their prescriptions to avoid the potential bias. Data were collected for nine months, starting from May 2017, and one pharmacy for a month.

Ethics approval

Ethics approval was taken from the Nobel College Institutional Review Committee (IRC), Sinamangal, Kathmandu (NIRC 0103/2017). National ethics guidelines developed by Nepal Health Research Council (NHRC) was followed during the whole research period. Both verbal and written informed consents were received from the respondents. However, the interview session was not electronically recorded, and was only manually recorded in the semi-structured questionnaire. In the case of vulnerable age group respondents, such as children under 16 years old, written informed consent was obtained from their family guardians, and they were interviewed on their behalf.

Inclusion and exclusion criteria

Respondents prescribed with polypharmacy were included in the study. Community people not willing to participate in the study, as well as those not taking medicines for their health problems, were excluded.

Sample size

Altogether 400 patients from nine districts were selected based on the established formula for cross-sectional studies:

$$n = z^2 p(1-p)/d^2$$

where, $z = 1.96$ at 95% confidence interval; $p = 0.5$ (since it was unknown); $d = 0.05$

Calculating the parameters, $n = 385$ (rounding to 400) was taken for the study.

Data collection tools

Semi-structured data collection sheet based on the prescription optimization method, developed for appropriate prescribing,¹¹ was used for data collection. Researchers interviewed the respondents (originally in Nepali language and later transcribed in the English) along with a review of their prescriptions as well as over-the-counter (OTC) and prescription-only medications (POM) they were taking during the study period. The output of the interview was manually recorded in the data collection sheet. The sheet filled were checked and initially processed (ie, edited, coded/decoded; later classified and tabulated during data analysis) at the field level on the same day of the data collection. Medicines prescribed were classified according to the ATC (Anatomic Therapeutic Chemical) classification proposed by the WHO.¹⁶ (Annex 1 and Annex 2) Information about the cost of the medicines was taken from the maximum retail prices (MRPs) of the medications at the local pharmacies, where the study was performed. Categorization of the OTC or POM medications was based on the University of Maryland Health Partners (UMHP) OTC Drug List (updated on May 2018)²¹ and verified with the Nepalese Drug Act 1978.¹⁷

Reliability and validity

Pretesting of the sheet was done in 10% of the total sample size estimated (ie, 40) in a similar setting as of the final study. The pretested data were utilized only for the modification of the sheet and were not included in the final data analysis. Internal validity (ie, confidence in concluding outcome due to the predictor variables) as well as external validity (ie, generalizability) were assured with the extensive literature review and timely pre-testing.

Data analysis

Data were statistically analyzed with the R programming 4.0.1.¹⁸ Descriptive analysis was performed by mean, standard deviation, frequency distribution and percentage. Multinomial logistic regression analysis was performed to analyze the statistical significance status of polypharmacy with various predictor variables (eg, age, gender, education level, occupation, diagnosis, total cost of medicines). The p -value < 0.05 was considered statistically significant at 95% confidence interval. Status of polypharmacy was assessed as follows: mild polypharmacy: 1–4 medications, moderate polypharmacy: 5–9 medications, and severe polypharmacy: ≥ 10 medications.¹⁹ These all categorizations were based on the number of medications prescribed and/or consumed. Since the health system in Nepal is mainly focused on the out-of-pocket (OOP) payment, the cost of the medication was borne by the patients themselves.

Results

Eighty-one patients (20.3%) aged 22-31 years, with more female patients (219, 54.8%) experienced polypharmacy. Two hundred twenty-three (55.8%) illiterate respondent experienced polypharmacy. More housewives (187, 46.8%) responded in the study. There were 204 patients (51%) from various locations of Siraha district. (Table 1) One hundred one patients (25.3%) reported problems of fever, cough, and muscle pain. (Table 2) There were 216 patients (54%) with prescriptions of five medicines. (Table 3) Total expenditure by all 400 patients was USD 3409.54, with mean $\pm$ SD 8.66 $\pm$ 6.04. (Table 4)

The multinomial logistic regression analysis showed that the odd of a male suffering from moderate polypharmacy with respect to mild one was $1/2.33 = 0.43$ time the odds for a female whereas it was $1/(9.82 \times 10^{32}) = 1.01 \times 10^{-33}$ time in case of severe polypharmacy. There were significant impacts of all levels of education on both moderate and severe polypharmacy with reference to the mild one (except postgraduate for moderate only). Occupation-wise also, there were significant impacts of all occupations on both moderate and severe polypharmacy with reference to the mild one (except military, garment worker and retired worker for moderate only). Diagnosis-wise there were mixed types of significance for various disease conditions on both moderate and severe polypharmacy. Total cost of medications had no significant impact on both moderate and severe polypharmacy (p-values 0.443 and 0.393 respectively). (Table 5)

Pantoprazole was the most frequently prescribed medicine (177, 7.8%) and azithromycin (118, 5.2%) the commonest antibiotic prescribed. A combination of simeticone, aluminium hydroxide and sodium carboxymethyl cellulose was the commonest combination medicine (75, 3.3%) used. Total number of medicines consumed by all 400 patients was 2269, with mean $\pm$ SD 5.67 $\pm$ 1.08. (Annex 2)

Discussions

Maximum patients (ie, 382, 95.5%) experienced moderate polypharmacy (5-9 medications) in the present research. Both moderate and severe polypharmacy cases were non-significantly related with age, gender and total cost of medications. They had significant relationship in almost all levels of education and occupation and showed mixed type of significance and non-significance with the diagnosis of the respondents. A survey carried out in the USA showed the trend of polypharmacy among the patients aged 65 years as 42% (taking ≥ 5 medications), and 13% (taking ≥ 10 medications).²⁰ Various researches also confirmed that the prevalence of polypharmacy increases with advancing age.^{3,19,21} Maanen et al. reported the majority of polypharmacy cases among patients aged >70 years.¹¹ However, Jansen and Brouwers reported the reduced incidence of polypharmacy among the frail community-dwellers aged >85 years due to the underuse of medications for chronic diseases.⁶ But Hajjar et al. found that polypharmacy was in the increasing trend in the elderly, especially among aged >85 years.¹ Rozenfeld et al. reported that 37.2% of women and 25.8% of men used ≥ 5 medicines in Brazil.¹²

The studies conducted in different countries such as Saudi Arabia²², Oman²³, Brazil²⁴, and England²⁵ also showed that gender had no significant impact on polypharmacy. However, research conducted in Kuwait showed significant relation of gender with polypharmacy.²⁶ Such discrepancy in the output with the demographic characteristics might be one of the beauties of epidemiologic research with a diverse population. The study also reported that education beyond primary education significantly decreased polypharmacy as the case in the present study i.e, the lower the education, the higher was the incidence of polypharmacy.^{22,26-28} Salih et al. reported significant relationship of eight different diagnoses such as dyslipidemia, hypertension, diabetes mellitus, osteoarthritis, bronchial asthma, osteoporosis, heart failure and coronary artery disease with the polypharmacy.²² Similarly, the study by Al-Hashar et al. also reported that polypharmacy was significantly correlated with the number of comorbidities as well as with the cardiovascular disease as the admitting diagnosis.²³ Mukete and Ferdinand found that the hypertensive adults were more likely to be the victims of polypharmacy, and the associated complications namely increased risk of adverse events (fall injury, hyperkalemia and hypokalemia, heart failure, and blood pressure exacerbation), drug-drug interaction, and augmented costs. They reported that the use of non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs (NSAIDs) by older people might increase the risk of antihypertensive medication initiation by 1.5 to 1.8 times. The estimated direct and indirect costs of treatment of hypertension might rise to USD274 billion by 2030 from USD46.4 billion in 2010. Control in polypharmacy could avoid USD900 million to USD 1.7 billion unwanted expenses in medicines.²⁹ Hajjar et al. reported that patients taking >2 psychotropic agents might be in 2.4 to 4.5-fold increased risk of falling.¹

Rozenfeld et al. analyzed both the quantitative and qualitative implications of polypharmacy and found that polypharmacy cannot be totally avoided in every instance because of the advancing diseases such as hypertension and diabetes mellitus (highly prevalent among the elderly), requiring necessity for polypharmacy.¹² Rational prescribing and dispensing is the essence of cost-effective health care as it helps reduce health care burden and future potential complications. The prescribing indicators developed by the WHO in collaboration with the International Network for Rational Use of Drugs (INRUD) can be used to detect and solve prescribing problems, including polypharmacy.³⁰ Both prescription and non-prescription medications (and even those brought by the patients during all health care visits for review) should be considered during detection of polypharmacy cases.^{1,12} The Beers Criteria was developed to explore a list of potentially harmful medications in the community-dwelling elderly.³¹ Unnecessary use of medicines can be reduced by adhering to the guidelines; avoiding prescribing to relieve the common self-limiting ailments; regular medication reviews; prescription audits; and with the computerized alert systems.¹²

The present research explored that pantoprazole was the commonest medicine (177, 7.8%), and azithromycin (118, 5.2%) the commonest antibiotic prescribed. A combination of simeticone, aluminum hydroxide and sodium carboxymethyl cellulose was the commonest combination medicine (75, 3.3%) used. Hajjar et al. reported that the most frequently prescribed medications were estrogen products, levothyroxine, hydrochlorothiazide, atorvastatin, and lisinopril. Most widely used non-prescription medications were pain

medications (acetaminophen, ibuprofen, acetylsalicylic acid), cold and cough medications (eg, pseudoephedrine, diphenhydramine), and vitamin or nutrient products (eg, multivitamins, vitamins E and C, ginseng, Ginkgo biloba extract).¹ The data collected by National Health and Nutrition Examination Surveys (NHANES) from 1988-1994, 1999-2004 and 2005-2010 confirmed that an increased number of antihypertensives were used by older Americans. They explored the reasons and found that advancing age was leading to a decline in hypertension control.³² Guaraldo et al. stated that the practical alterations in all pharmacokinetic processes (absorption, first-pass metabolism, bioavailability, distribution, protein binding, renal and hepatic clearance) in the elderly patients are the commonly experienced phenomena in their therapy.³³

Mismanagement of polypharmacy in community and hospital pharmacies may contribute to ADR development and drug-drug interaction in patients of all age groups, especially children and the elderly. Pharmacists' interventions on irrational and avoidable polypharmacy minimization can improve patients' economic, clinical and humanistic outcomes (ECHO) in health care settings.^{34,35} Responsible use of medicines can eliminate at least USD213 billion by addressing six key areas namely non-adherence, delayed evidence-based therapy, antibiotic misuse, medication errors, suboptimal generic use, and mismanaged polypharmacy.²⁰

Strengths and limitations of this study:

- The present study was one of the largest community-based researches in Nepal to explore polypharmacy cases and costs associated with polypharmacy.
- Still, the few communities might not represent the whole country and the whole population.
- Generalizability (external validity) on polypharmacy issues may be somehow limited in the wider arena.
- Nevertheless, it might serve as a beacon to explore the polypharmacy cases in the similar settings. Prospective cohort studies could be conducted later based on the findings of the present study.

Conclusions

Polypharmacy has two domains: appropriate and avoidable; the former can be continued as such as the latter is to be prevented as far as possible. Both moderate and severe polypharmacy cases were non-significantly related with age, gender and total cost of medications. They had significant relationship in almost all levels of education and occupation and showed mixed type of significance and non-significance with the diagnosis of the respondents. Polypharmacy cases can be minimized, taking into consideration the ADRs and drug interactions. Further studies are warranted in medication utilization and avoidable polypharmacy along with the detailed pharmacoeconomic evaluation (i.e., cost-effectiveness, cost-utility analysis) of the same.

Acknowledgements

The authors are grateful to Pokhara University Research Center (PURC) for providing the research grant (PURC 1/2073/74) to carry out the present research. They are also very much grateful to all the respondents for their valuable time and active cooperation throughout the research. The authors would like to acknowledge Dr. Sunil Shrestha, PharmD from Nepal Health Research and Innovation Foundation (NHRIF) for his thorough English language editing of the manuscript.

Declarations

Ethics approval and consent to participate

The study was ethically approved by the Nobel College Institutional Review Committee, Sinamangal, Kathmandu (NIRC 0103/2017).

Consent for publication

Not applicable

Availability of data and material

All data supporting the findings of this study are contained within the manuscript. Any additional information regarding the study including the questionnaires would be shared by the corresponding author upon request.

Funding

This research was funded by Pokhara University Research Center (PURC) (PURC: 1/2073/74). However, the funding agency had no control over the ideas, views and findings presented in the research.

Conflicts of interest

The authors declare no potential conflicts of interest related to the present research and publication.

References

1. Hajjar ER, Cafiero AC, Hanlon JT. Polypharmacy in Elderly Patients. *Am J Geriatr Pharmacother*. 2007;5(4):345-351.
2. Masnoon N, Shakib S, Kalisch-Ellett L, Caughey GE. What is polypharmacy? A systematic review of definitions. *BMC Geriatrics* 2017; 17:230. doi: 10.1186/s12877-017-0621-2.
3. Shah BM, Hajjar ER. Polypharmacy, Adverse Drug Reactions, and Geriatric Syndromes. *Clin Geriatr Med* 2012; 28:173–186.
4. Benetos A, Rossignol P, Cherubini A, Joly L, Grodzicki T, Rajkumar C, Strandberg TE, Petrovic M. Polypharmacy in the Aging Patient Management of Hypertension in Octogenarians. *JAMA* 2015;314(2):170-180.
5. Bretherton A, Day L, Lewis G. Polypharmacy and older people. *Nurs Times* 2005;99(17):54-5.
6. Jansen PAF, Brouwers JRB. Clinical Pharmacology in Old Persons. *Scientifica* 2012:1-17.

7. Martial L, Mantel-Teeuwisse AK, Jansen PAF. Background Paper 7.3: Priority Medicines for Elderly. WHO Collaborating Centre for Pharmaceutical Policy and Regulation 2013: 1-66.
8. Viktil KK, Blix HS, Moger TA, Reikvam A. Polypharmacy as commonly defined is an indicator of limited value in the assessment of drug-related problems. *Br J Clin Pharmacol* 2006;63(2):187–195.
9. Werder SF, Preskorn SH. Managing polypharmacy: walking a fine line between help and harm. *Current Psychiatry Online*. 2003;2(2):24-36.
10. Mair A, Wilson M, Dreischulte T. Addressing the Challenge of Polypharmacy. *Annu. Rev. Pharmacol. Toxicol.* 2020;60:661–81.
11. Maanen ACD, Marum RJ, Knol W, Linde CMJ, Jansen PAF. Prescribing Optimization Method for Improving Prescribing in Elderly Patients Receiving Polypharmacy: Results of Application to Case Histories by General Practitioners. *Drugs Aging* 2009;26(8):687-701.
12. Rozenfeld S, Fonseca MJM, Acurcio FA. Drug utilization and polypharmacy among the elderly: a survey in Rio de Janeiro City, Brazil. *Pan Am J Public Health* 2008;23(1):34-43.
13. Basnet S, Paudel KR, Sah AK, Jha RK, Sah P, Adhikari S, Shrestha S. Prescribing pattern, polypharmacy and potentially inappropriate prescribing in hospitalized elderly patients: a retrospective study in teaching hospital in Nepal. *Int J Sci Rep.* 2016;2(1):7-12.
14. Lohani SP, Thapa P, Aryal U, Satyal KR. Polypharmacy and Geriatric Patients: Patterns of Prescribing in the Tribhuvan University Teaching Hospital in Nepal. *JNHRC* 2006;4(1):1-4.
15. GoN. National Population and Housing Census 2011 (National Report). Government of Nepal National Planning Commission Secretariat Central Bureau of Statistics 2011;01:1-262.
16. WHO. WHO Guidelines for ATC classification and DDD assignment 2020 23rd edition. WHO Collaborating Centre for Drug Statistics Methodology. Oslo, Norway 2019: 10-247.
17. DDA. Drugs Act, 2035, (1978). Government of Nepal Department of Drug Administration. Retrieved from <http://www.dda.gov.np/content/drugs-act-2035> on June 15, 2018.
18. R Core Team. R: A language and environment for statistical computing. R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria, 2020. <https://www.R-project.org/>
19. Sirois C, Domingues NS, Laroche M, Zongo A, Lunghi C, Guénette L, Kröger E, Émond V. Polypharmacy Definitions for Multimorbid Older Adults Need Stronger Foundations to Guide Research, Clinical Practice and Public Health. *Pharmacy* 2019; 7: 126; doi:10.3390/pharmacy7030126.
20. Aitken M, Valkova S. Avoidable Costs in U.S. Healthcare: The \$200 Billion Opportunity from Using Medicines More Responsibly. Report by the IMS Institute for Healthcare Informatics. IMS Institute for Healthcare Informatics 2013: 1-54.
21. UMHP. Over-the-Counter Drug List. University of Maryland Health Partners (UMHP). Retrieved from <https://www.umhealthpartners.com/wp->

[content/uploads/2016/09/Over-The-Counter-OTC-Drug-List-May-1-c.pdf](#) on September 20, 2018.

22. Salih SB, Yousuf M, Durihim H, Almodaimegh H, Tamim H. Prevalence and associated factors of polypharmacy among adult Saudi medical outpatients at a tertiary care center. *Journal of Family and Community Medicine* 2013;20(3):162-167.
23. Al-Hashar A, Sinawi HA, Mahrizi AA, Al-Hatrushi M. Prevalence and Covariates of Polypharmacy in Elderly Patients on Discharge from a Tertiary Care Hospital in Oman. *Oman Medical Journal* 2016;31(6): 421–425.
24. Venturini CD, Engroff P, Ely LS, Zago LFA, Schroeter G, Gomes I, Carli GAD, Morrone FB. Gender differences, polypharmacy, and potential pharmacological interactions in the elderly. *Clinics* 2011;66(11):1867-1872.
25. Slater N, White S, Venables R, Frisher M. Factors associated with polypharmacy in primary care: a cross-sectional analysis of data from The English Longitudinal Study of Ageing (ELSA). *BMJ Open* 2018;8:e020270.
26. Badawy NA, Labeeb SA, Alsamdan MF, Alazemi BF. Prevalence and Risk of Polypharmacy among Community-Dwelling, Elderly Kuwaiti Patients. *Med Princ Pract* 2020;29:166–173.
27. Rawle MJ, Richards M, Davis D, Kuh D. The prevalence and determinants of polypharmacy at age 69: a British birth cohort study. *BMC Geriatrics* 2018;18:118. doi: 10.1186/s12877-018-0795-2.
28. Sarwar MR, Iftikhar S, Sarfraz M. Influence of Education Level of Older Patients on Polypharmacy, Potentially Inappropriate Medications Listed in Beer's Criteria, and Unplanned Hospitalization: A Cross-Sectional Study in Lahore, Pakistan. *Medicina* 2018;54: 57. doi:10.3390/medicina54040057.
29. Mukete BN, Ferdinand KC. Polypharmacy in Older Adults with Hypertension: A Comprehensive Review. *Journal of Clinical Hypertension* 2016;18(1):10-18.
30. WHO. Drug and therapeutics committees: A practical guide. World Health Organization Department of Essential Drugs and Medicines Policy Geneva, Switzerland 2003: 1-146.
31. Pugh MJV, Hanlon JT, Zeber JE, Bierman A, Cornell J, Berlowitz DR. Assessing Potentially Inappropriate Prescribing in the Elderly Veterans Affairs Population Using the HEDIS 2006 Quality Measure. *Journal of Managed Care Pharmacy* 2006;12(7):537-545.
32. Egan BM, Li J, Shatat IF, Fuller JM, Sinopoli A. Closing the Gap in Hypertension Control between Younger and Older Adults: NHANES 1988 to 2010. *Circulation* 2014;129(20):2052–61.
33. Guaraldo L, Cano FG, Damasceno GS, Rozenfeld S. Inappropriate medication use among the elderly: a systematic review of administrative databases. *BMC Geriatrics* 2011; 11:79. doi:10.1186/1471-2318-11-79.
34. Chumney EC, Robinson LC. The effects of pharmacist interventions on patients with polypharmacy. *Pharmacy Practice* 2006; 4(3): 103-109.
35. Shrestha S, Shrestha S, Khanal S. Polypharmacy in elderly cancer patients: Challenges and the way clinical pharmacists can contribute in resource-limited settings. *Aging Med.* 2019;2:42–49.

Table 1: Demographic characteristics of study population (n= 400)

Study variables	Frequency (%)
Age of patients (yr) (Mean $\pm$ SD: 38.45$\pm$19.65)	
<= 1	7 (1.8)
2 - 11	32 (8)
12 - 21	40 (10)
22 - 31	81 (20.3)
32 - 41	75 (18.8)
42 - 51	59 (14.8)
52 - 61	45 (11.3)
62 - 71	39 (9.8)
72 - 81	18 (4.5)
82+	4 (1)
Gender of the respondents	
Male	181 (45.3)
Female	219 (54.8)
Education level of the respondents	
Illiterate (cannot read and write)	223 (55.8)
Primary education (class 1 to 8)	18 (4.5)
Secondary education (class 9-10)	13 (3.3)
Higher secondary education (class 11-12)	134 (33.5)
Undergraduate education (Bachelor level)	11 (2.8)
Postgraduate education (Master level)	1 (0.3)
Occupation/profession of the respondents	
None	39 (9.8)
Housewife	187 (46.8)
Farmer	130 (32.5)
Student	29 (7.2)
Businessman	6 (1.5)
Shopkeeper	3 (0.8)
Garment worker	2 (0.5)
Retired worker	2 (0.5)
Engineer	1 (0.3)
Army	1 (0.3)
Districts of data collection	
Siraha	204 (51)
Kathmandu	88 (22)
Lalitpur	44 (11)
Bhaktapur	21 (5.25)
Nuwakot	18 (4.5)
Makawanpur	7 (1.75)

Dhanusha	6 (1.5)
Chitwan	6 (1.5)
Sunsari	6 (1.5)
Total	400 (100)

Table 2: Diagnosis mentioned in the prescription of the respondents (n =400)

Diagnosis	Frequency (%)
Fever, Cough, Muscle Pain	101 (25.3)
Hypertension, Diabetes mellitus, Gastritis, High Cholesterol level	36 (9)
Kidney stone, Abdominal pain, Gastritis	33 (8.3)
Muscle pain, Weakness	23 (5.8)
Fever, Headache, Joint pain	16 (4)
Constipation	15 (3.8)
Cough, Fever, Headache, Tonsillitis	15 (3.8)
Hyperthyroidism	13 (3.3)
Nausea, Vomiting, Abdominal pain	11 (2.8)
Type II diabetes	11 (2.8)
Total [#]	400 (100.5)

[#]Only cases with frequency of two digits have been included in table.

Table 3: Number of medicines prescribed simultaneously and used by the patients (Mean $\pm$ SD: 5.67 $\pm$ 1.083) (Total no. of medicines consumed by all 400 pts: 2269) (n =400)

No. of medicines	n (%)	Status of polypharmacy
4	16 (4)	Mild (1 to 4 medicines) (16, 4%)
5	216 (54)	Moderate (4 to 5 medicines) (382, 95.5%)
6	96 (24)	
7	35 (8.8)	
8	32 (8)	
9	3 (0.8)	
10	1 (0.2)	Severe polypharmacy (≥ 10 medications) (2, 0.5%)
11	1 (0.2)	
Total	400 (100)	

Table 4: Total direct expenditure on medicines (USD) (Total expenditure by all 400 patients: USD 3409.54) (Mean $\pm$ SD: 8.66 $\pm$ 6.04) (Mean expenditure per medicine: 1.5)

Expenditure (USD)	Frequency (%)
1.01 - 11	314 (78.5)
11.01 - 21	72 (18)
21.01 - 31	11 (2.8)
31.01 - 41	2 (0.5)
61.01+	1 (0.3)
Total	400 (100)

Table 5: Multinomial logistic regression of moderate and severe polypharmacy in reference to mild polypharmacy with various predictor variables (n = 400)

Predictors	Moderate polypharmacy			Severe polypharmacy		
	Beta (SE)	p-value	95% CI for OR (lower & upper)	Beta (SE)	p-value	95% CI for OR (lower & upper)
Intercept	271.94 (1.33)	-	$1.27*10^{118}$ ($9.25*10^{116}$ - $1.74*10^{119}$)	8.31 (0.35)		4090.78 (2047.58- 8172.82)
Age	0.007 (0.03)	0.82	1.01 (0.94- 1.07)	-2.11 (25.9)	0.934	0.12 ($1.08*10^{-23}$ - $1.34*10^{21}$)
Gender (Female)	0.84 (1.88)	0.654	2.33 (0.05- 9.45)	75.96 (0.35)	<0.001	$9.82*10^{32}$ ($4.91*10^{32}$ - $1.96*10^{33}$)
Education (Primary)	-37.06 ($1.2*10^{-9}$)	<0.001	$7.96*10^{-17}$ ($7.96*10^{-17}$ - $7.96*10^{-17}$)	57.25 ($1.2*10^{-9}$)	<0.001	$7.36*10^{24}$ ($7.36*10^{24}$ - $7.36*10^{24}$)
Education (Secondary)	15.83 ($6.14*10^{-9}$)	<0.001	$7.55*10^6$ ($7.55*10^6$ - $7.55*10^6$)	34.14 ($2.15*10^{-19}$)	<0.001	$6.77*10^{14}$ ($6.77*10^{14}$ - $6.77*10^{14}$)
Education (Higher secondary)	-2.45 (1.05)	0.02	0.08 (0.01- 0.68)	-106.81 (0.0003)	<0.001	$4.07*10^{-47}$ ($4.06*10^{-47}$ - $4.07*10^{-47}$)
Education (Undergraduate)	-328.01 (0.61)	<0.001	$3.5*10^{-143}$ ($1.05*10^{-143}$ - $1.16*10^{-142}$)	-169.27 ($4.05*10^{-24}$)	<0.001	$3.05*10^{-74}$ ($3.05*10^{-74}$ - $3.05*10^{-74}$)
Education (Postgraduate)	-7.15 (NaN)	NaN	$7.79*10^{-4}$ (NaN - NaN)	6.55 ($1.53*10^{-104}$)	<0.001	705.32 (705.32 – 705.32)
Occupation (Farmer)	-267.96 (0.92)	<0.001	$4.22*10^{-117}$ ($6.9*10^{-118}$ - $2.58*10^{-116}$)	-168.15 ($8.47*10^{-16}$)	<0.001	$9.31*10^{-74}$ ($9.31*10^{-74}$ - $9.31*10^{-74}$)
Occupation (Housewife)	-268.21 (1.46)	<0.001	$3.26*10^{-117}$ ($1.85*10^{-118}$ - $5.75*10^{-116}$)	-116.55 (0.35)	<0.001	$2.41*10^{-51}$ ($1.21*10^{-51}$ - $4.82*10^{-51}$)
Occupation (Student)	57.53 (0.61)	<0.001	$9.7*10^{24}$ ($2.92*10^{24}$ - $3.21*10^{25}$)	37.36 ($4.05*10^{-24}$)	<0.001	$1.68*10^{16}$ ($1.68*10^{16}$ - $1.68*10^{16}$)
Occupation (Businessman)	238.69 ($8.12*10^{-16}$)	<0.001	$4.62*10^{103}$ ($4.62*10^{103}$ - $4.62*10^{103}$)	-16.84 (0)	<0.001	$4.82*10^{-8}$ ($4.82*10^{-8}$ - $4.82*10^{-8}$)
Occupation (Military)	31.21 (NaN)	NaN	$3.59*10^{13}$ (NaN - NaN)	7.12 (0)	<0.001	1248.2 (1248.2 – 1248.2)
Occupation (Garment worker)	64.63 (NaN)	NaN	$1.18*10^{28}$ (NaN - NaN)	13.92 (0)	<0.001	$1.11*10^6$ ($1.11*10^6$ - $1.11*10^6$)

Occupation (Engineer)	7.74 ($9*10^{-16}$)	<0.001	2318.63 (2318.63-2318.63)	7.47 ($8.82*10^{-154}$)	<0.001	1767.23 (1767.23 – 1767.23)
Occupation (Shopkeeper)	67.21 ($1.74*10^{-15}$)	<0.001	$1.55*10^{29}$ ($1.55*10^{29}$ - $1.55*10^{29}$)	13.24 (0)	<0.001	$5.67*10^5$ ($5.67*10^5$ - $5.67*10^5$)
Occupation (Retired worker)	369.72 (NaN)	NaN	$3.69*10^{160}$ (NaN – NaN)	-4.23 (0)	<0.001	0.01 (0.01 –0.01)
Dx (Common cold, cough, fever)	145.7 ($1.54*10^{-36}$)	<0.001	$1.9*10^{63}$ ($1.9*10^{63}$ - $1.9*10^{63}$)	76.76 ($8.05*10^{-30}$)	<0.001	$2.18*10^{33}$ ($2.18*10^{33}$ - $2.18*10^{33}$)
Dx (Constipation)	96.18 ($6.75*10^{-18}$)	<0.001	$5.93*10^{41}$ ($5.93*10^{41}$ - $5.93*10^{41}$)	73.9($6.75*10^{-18}$)	<0.001	$1.24*10^{32}$ ($1.24*10^{32}$ - $1.24*10^{32}$)
Dx (COPD)	-0.38 (1.24)	0.759	0.68 (0.05- 7.79)	-45.59 ($2.15*10^{-19}$)	<0.001	$1.57*10^{-20}$ ($1.57*10^{-20}$ - $1.57*10^{-20}$)
Dx (Cough, Tonsillitis, Headache)	111.54 ($5.56*10^{-50}$)	<0.001	$2.76*10^{48}$ ($2.76*10^{48}$ - $2.76*10^{48}$)	-0.56 ($1.62*10^{-117}$)	<0.001	0.57 (0.57 –0.57)
Dx (DM)	43.85 ($2.05*10^{-14}$)	<0.001	$1.11*10^{19}$ ($1.11*10^{19}$ - $1.11*10^{19}$)	28.98 ($2.05*10^{-14}$)	<0.001	$3.89*10^{12}$ ($3.89*10^{12}$ - $3.89*10^{12}$)
Dx (Ear problem)	71.33 ($8.46*10^{-20}$)	<0.001	$9.6*10^{30}$ ($9.6*10^{30}$ - $9.6*10^{30}$)	47.14 ($8.46*10^{-20}$)	<0.001	$2.97*10^{20}$ ($2.97*10^{20}$ - $2.97*10^{20}$)
Dx (Enteric fever)	-0.37 (1.61)	0.814	0.68 (0.02- 1.62)	69.17 (0.35)	<0.001	$1.1*10^{30}$ ($5.53*10^{29}$ - $2.2*10^{30}$)
Dx (Epistaxis)	37.42 ($1.42*10^{-24}$)	<0.001	$1.78*10^{16}$ ($1.78*10^{16}$ - $1.78*10^{16}$)	21.74 ($7.42*10^{-29}$)	<0.001	$2.78*10^9$ ($2.78*10^9$ - $2.78*10^9$)
Dx (Fever, Cough)	-2.83 (1.6)	0.077	0.05 (0.01 - 1.36)	-517.62 ($6.98*10^{-135}$)	<0.001	$1.57*10^{-225}$ ($1.57*10^{-225}$ - $1.57*10^{-225}$)
Dx (Fever, Cough, Muscle pain)	-1.41 (1.62)	0.382	0.24 (0.01- 5.82)	-88.58 ($9.74*10^{-64}$)	<0.001	$3.38*10^{-39}$ ($3.38*10^{-39}$ - $3.38*10^{-39}$)
Dx (Fever, Headache, Joint pain)	93.12 ($3.99*10^{-41}$)	<0.001	$2.77*10^{40}$ ($2.77*10^{40}$ - $2.77*10^{40}$)	17.88 ($2.33*10^{-45}$)	<0.001	$5.86*10^7$ ($5.86*10^7$ - $5.86*10^7$)
Dx (Fracture, Pain, Weakness)	57.79 ($2.31*10^{-26}$)	<0.001	$1.25*10^{25}$ ($1.25*10^{25}$ - $1.25*10^{25}$)	15.12 ($1.03*10^{-99}$)	<0.001	$3.69*10^6$ ($3.69*10^6$ - $3.69*10^6$)
Dx (Fungal infection, Itching)	-0.1 (1.55)	0.945	0.89 (0.04 – 19.1)	86.87 (0.0003)	<0.001	$5.33*10^{37}$ ($5.33*10^{37}$ - $5.34*10^{37}$)
Dx (Gastritis, N,V&D)	134.34 ($8.85*10^{-59}$)	<0.001	$2.22*10^{58}$ ($2.22*10^{58}$ - $2.22*10^{58}$)	29.87 ($3.45*10^{-124}$)	<0.001	$9.44*10^{12}$ ($9.44*10^{12}$ - $9.44*10^{12}$)
Dx (Backache, Bone pain)	-0.8 (1.64)	0.625	0.44 (0.01 - 11.24)	-4.39 ($6.12*10^{-64}$)	<0.001	0.01 (0.01 –0.01)

Dx(Hyperlipidemia, HTN)	38.66 (2.31*10 ⁻¹⁸)	<0.001	6.21*10 ¹⁶ (6.21*10 ¹⁶ - 6.21*10 ¹⁶)	10.82 (1.84*10 ⁻¹²¹)	<0.001	50440.14 (50440.14 – 50440.14)
Dx (Hyperlipidemia, HTN, DM)	133.57 (1.01*10 ⁻⁵⁸)	<0.001	1.02*10 ⁵⁸ (1.02*10 ⁵⁸ - 1.02*10 ⁵⁸)	14.15 (1.52*10 ⁻¹³⁸)	<0.001	1.4*10 ⁶ (1.4*10 ⁶ - 1.4*10 ⁶)
Dx (HTN, DM)	33.06 (1.16*10 ⁻⁸⁰)	<0.001	2.298*10 ¹⁴ (2.02*10 ³³ - 2.02*10 ³³)	11.15 (1.16*10 ⁻⁸⁰)	<0.001	70130.22 (70130.22 – 70130.22)
Dx (HTN, DM, Asthma)	76.68 (1.2*10 ⁻⁹)	<0.001	2.02*10 ³³ (2.02*10 ³³ - 2.02*10 ³³)	87.32 (1.2*10 ⁻⁹)	<0.001	8.43*10 ³⁷ (8.43*10 ³⁷ - 8.43*10 ³⁷)
Dx (HTN, Muscle pain)	33.69 (1.42*10 ⁻¹⁵⁹)	<0.001	4.27*10 ¹⁴ (4.27*10 ¹⁴ - 4.27*10 ¹⁴)	6.71 (0)	<0.001	823.14 (823.14 – 823.14)
Dx (Hyperthyroidism)	-0.15 (1.63)	0.923	0.85 (0.03 – 21.18)	35.64 (6.16*10 ⁻⁴²)	<0.001	3.01*10 ¹⁵ (3.01*10 ¹⁵ - 3.01*10 ¹⁵)
Dx (Hyperuricemia, Arthritis)	48.05(6.08*10 ⁻²¹)	<0.001	7.37*10 ²⁰ (7.37*10 ²⁰ - 7.37*10 ²⁰)	83.71 (2.71*10 ⁻⁴⁹)	<0.001	2.27*10 ³⁶ (2.27*10 ³⁶ - 2.27*10 ³⁶)
Dx (Urolithiasis, Fever)	122.82 (3.69*10 ⁻⁵⁴)	<0.001	2.2*10 ⁵³ (2.2*10 ⁵³ - 2.2*10 ⁵³)	5.57 (1.75*10 ⁻¹¹⁸)	<0.001	262.9 (262.9 – 262.9)
Dx (Urolithiasis, Urine problem)	-0.37 (1.53)	0.806	0.68 (0.03 – 13.91)	35.02 (3.09*10 ⁻¹⁷)	<0.001	1.62*10 ¹⁵ (1.62*10 ¹⁵ - 1.62*10 ¹⁵)
Dx (Migraine headache)	43.36 (4.24*10 ⁻²⁰)	<0.001	6.82*10 ¹⁸ (6.82*10 ¹⁸ - 6.82*10 ¹⁸)	24.56 (8.82*10 ⁻⁷²)	<0.001	4.67*10 ¹⁰ (4.67*10 ¹⁰ - 4.67*10 ¹⁰)
Dx (Nerve pain)	100.7 (9.44*10 ⁻⁴⁵)	<0.001	5.46*10 ⁴³ (5.46*10 ⁴³ - 5.46*10 ⁴³)	-9.09 (5.46*10 ⁻⁶⁶)	<0.001	1.12*10 ⁻⁴ (1.12*10 ⁻⁴ - 1.12*10 ⁻⁴)
Dx (Parasitic infection)	-0.96 (1.32)	0.465	0.38 (0.02 - 5.08)	-222.64 (2.07*10 ⁻⁸⁴)	<0.001	2.01*10 ⁻⁹⁷ (2.01*10 ⁻⁹⁷ - 2.01*10 ⁻⁹⁷)
Dx (Per vaginal bleeding, weakness)	-875.48 (0)	<0.001	0	-307.85 (0)	<0.001	1.99*10 ⁻¹³⁴ (1.99*10 ⁻¹³⁴ - 1.99*10 ⁻¹³⁴)
Dx (Piles, Constipation)	189.52 (8.48*10 ⁻⁸³)	<0.001	2.04*10 ⁸² (2.04*10 ⁸² - 2.04*10 ⁸²)	7.46 (0)	<0.001	1740.31 (1740.31 – 1740.31)
Dx (RTI)	252.71 (8.47*10 ⁻¹⁶)	<0.001	5.67*10 ¹⁰⁹ (5.67*10 ¹⁰⁹ - 5.67*10 ¹⁰⁹)	421.47 (8.47*10 ⁻¹⁶)	<0.001	1.1*10 ¹⁸³ (1.1*10 ¹⁸³ - 1.107737*10 ¹⁸³)
Dx (Scabies)	18.22 (1.13*10 ⁻⁹)	<0.001	82449914.29 (8.24*10 ⁷ - 8.24*10 ⁷)	7.24 (9.3*10 ⁻⁹⁴)	<0.001	1401.27 (1401.27 – 1401.27)

Dx (Sleeplessness, Anxiety)	120.83 (2.5×10^{-53})	<0.001	2.99×10^{52} (2.99×10^{52} - 2.99×10^{52})	3.5 (4.05×10^{-99})	<0.001	8.99 (8.99–8.99)
Dx (TB)	188.33 (3.13×10^{-82})	<0.001	6.22×10^{81} (6.22×10^{81} - 6.22×10^{81})	7.73 (0)	<0.001	2297.85 (2297.85 – 2297.85)
Total Cost of Medications (USD)	0.03 (0.03)	0.443	1.03 (0.95- 1.11)	5.74 (6.72)	0.393	312.57 (5.87×10^{-4} - 1.66×10^8)
Dx: Diagnosis; RTI: Respiratory tract infection; TB: tuberculosis; HTN: hypertension; DM: diabetes mellitus; mild polypharmacy: 1–4 medications; moderate polypharmacy: 5–9 medications; severe polypharmacy: ≥ 10 medications Model: $P(\text{Status of Polypharmacy}) = 1 / \{ 1 + e^{-(a + b1\text{Age} + b2\text{Gender} + b3\text{Education level} + b4\text{Occupation} + b5\text{Diagnosis} + b6\text{Total cost of medicines (USD)})} \}$						