

COST-EFFECTIVENESS ANALYSIS OF PROLANIS OF TYPE 2 DIABETES MELLITUS PATIENTS ON THREE COMMUNITY HEALTH CENTERS IN BANDUNG, INDONESIA

RIANI TANJUNG¹, YULIA WARDATI², NYI MEKAR SAPTARINI^{3*}

¹Departement of Accounting, Pos Indonesia Polytechnic, West Java, Indonesia 40151, ²Departement of Pharmacy, Faculty of Mathematic and Natural Sciences, Al Ghifari University, West Java, Indonesia 40293, ³Department of Pharmaceutical Analysis and Medicinal Chemistry, Faculty of Pharmacy, Universitas Padjadjaran, West Java, Indonesia 45363

*Email: nyi.mekar@unpad.ac.id

Received: 04 Sep 2020, Revised and Accepted: 07 Oct 2020

ABSTRACT

Objective: The purpose of this study was to compare the cost-effectiveness of T2DM patients in community health centers (*Pusat Kesehatan Masyarakat*, Puskesmas) of Rancaekek, Linggar, and Nanjungmekar.

Methods: The medicine was a combination of metformin and glimepiride; the outcome parameter was fasting glucose level, cost components were fee of BPJS class III and transportation cost with the patient's perspective. Pharmacoeconomic method was cost-effectiveness analysis. Respondents were given counseling about the importance of medicine consumption.

Results: There were 60 respondents, which met the inclusion criteria, then grouped by gender (male (15%) and female (85%)) and age (the highest incidence was the range from 56 to 65 y old, 36.67%). The average cost-effectiveness ratio of Prolanis in the Puskesmas of Rancaekek, Linggar, and Nanjungmekar was 1,073, 956 and 1,885 IDR per decreased glucose level, respectively. The statistical analysis of decreased blood glucose was 0.341 and the Prolanis cost was 0.399, which no difference between decreased blood glucose and Prolanis costs in the three Puskesmas.

Conclusions: The Prolanis of Linggar Puskesmas was the most cost-effective compared to the Rancaekek and Nanjungmekar Puskesmas.

Keywords: Puskesmas, Fasting glucose level, Cost component, Pharmacoeconomic analysis

© 2021 The Authors. Published by Innovare Academic Sciences Pvt Ltd. This is an open access article under the CCBY license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>) DOI: <https://dx.doi.org/10.22159/ijap.2021.v13s3.05> Journal homepage: <https://innovareacademics.in/journals/index.php/ijap>

INTRODUCTION

Diabetes is associated with a significant clinical and economic burden in the world, including Indonesia. The global projection for diabetes was 438 million in 2025 [1]. Diabetes mellitus (DM) is a clinical syndrome with signs of hyperglycemia due to absolute and relative insulin deficiency. Deficiency of insulin, which release by pancreas β -cells, significantly interferes with carbohydrate, protein, and fat metabolism [2, 3]. Blood glucose levels are regulated by insulin as the main regulator of metabolic intermediaries [2]. Type 2 diabetes (T2DM), known as adult-onset diabetes, is characterized by high blood glucose levels, insulin resistance, and a relative lack of insulin [3].

The community health center (*Pusat Kesehatan Masyarakat*, Puskesmas) is a health service facility, which organizes first-level public and private health efforts, with preventive and promotive priorities to achieve the highest degree of public health. The Health Social Security Administering Agency (Badan Penyelenggara Jaminan Sosial, BPJS) implements a Disease Management Program (Program Pengelolaan Penyakit Kronis, Prolanis) to control T2DM. The Prolanis goal is to encourage diabetes patients to achieve optimal quality of life at an effective and rational cost [4]. Regulation No. 40 of 2004 article 24 mandates Health BPJS to control of quality and costs, which implemented by Prolanis [5].

The DM economic burden and its impact on a patient's life can be measured by economic analysis, which calculates the most cost-effective therapeutic option [1]. Pharmacoeconomic study using the Cost-Effectiveness Analysis (CEA) method was conducted to control cost-effectiveness [6, 7]. The purpose of this study was to determine the decreased fasting glucose levels and the cost-effectiveness of T2DM patients in the Puskesmas of Rancaekek, Linggar, and Nanjungmekar. This study compared the implementation of Prolanis in three Puskesmas.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Subjects

The study was approved by the Health Research Ethics Committee of Dr. Hasan Sadikin Hospital, Indonesia, and was conducted accordingly

to an approved method. The patients were undertaken for observation only after their informed consent. This study was a prospective observational study, T2DM patients were enrolled in the study for 3 mo from May to July 2019. The population in this study was 109 patients, but only 60 patients who willing to participating in the study. The sampling technique was total sampling [8]. This study compared the cost-effectiveness of Prolanis patients in the Rancaekek, Linggar, and Nanjungmekar Puskesmas, West Java, Indonesia.

The inclusion criteria were:

- Patients participate in Prolanis activities and check-up routinely.
- Prolanis patients with T2DM.
- Patients receiving a combination of 500 mg metformin (three tablets per day) and 1 mg glimepiride (one tablet per day) [9].
- Patients over 18 y old.

The exclusion criteria were:

- The patient was not a Prolanis participant.
- The patient less than 18 y old.
- The T2DM Prolanis participant who did not want to participate in the study.
- Patients with co-morbid conditions such as hypertension, hypothyroidism, dyslipidemia, coronary artery disease, and myocardial infarction.

Methods

Determination of outcome

The outcome as an indication of medication successful was fasting glucose levels for 3 mo.

Determine the cost component

- Determination of perspective. The perspective of this study was the patient's perspective.

b) Determination of cost components. The cost components were fee of BPJS class III (25,500 IDR) [10] and transportation cost for every month. Transportation costs were obtained from interviews.

c) Pharmacoeconomic analysis. Cost-effectiveness analysis was evaluated in follow-up cases, which achieving glycemic control, i.e. fasting blood glucose <130 mg/dl [11]. The cost of health interventions was measured in monetary units (Indonesian Rupiah, IDR) and the intervention results were health indicators, both clinical and non-clinical (non-monetary). Data analysis was performed by calculating the Cost-Effectiveness Ratio (CER) with formula 1 and the cost-effectiveness table [12].

$$\text{CER} = \frac{\text{Cost}}{\text{Effectiveness}} = \frac{\text{cost of treatment}}{\text{fasting glucose level}} \dots (1)$$

Statistical analysis

Data were presented as the mean±standard deviation (SD). Data were conducted to statistical analysis using the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test, followed by ANOVA for parametric analysis or Kruskal Wallis Test for non-parametric analysis.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The Prolanis goal is to encourage participants with chronic diseases to achieve optimal quality of life with an indicator of 75% of registered participants visiting first-level health facilities having "good" results of specific tests for T2DM and hypertension according to the relevant clinical guidelines to prevent disease complications. The forms of Prolanis implementation include medical or

educational consultation activities, home visit, reminder, club activities and health status monitoring [4].

The T2DM patients, which Prolanis participant at Rancaekek, Linggar, and Nanjungmekar Puskesmas were 49, 24, and 36 patients, respectively. Patients who met the inclusion criteria were 20 patients in each Puskesmas, then filled in the informed consent and given counseling about the importance of medicine consumption. The patient distribution based on gender (table 1) showed that female patients (85%) higher than men (15%). This result was similar to the results of Alghadir *et al.* (2012) [13] and Awad *et al.* (2013) [14]. Female have a higher risk of developing diabetes than men, due to insulin resistance [15].

This study targeted T2DM patients ranging from 18 y old, but patients who came to the Puskesmas and participated in Prolanis were over 45 y old. This was because the Puskesmas service time was limited, from 8.00-12.00, but the patients have to start queuing at 6.00. This limitation caused there were no T2DM patients with productive age, i.e. 18-45 y old. The patient distribution based on age (table 1) showed that T2DM was mostly affected the 56-65 y (36.67%), followed by the 46-55 y (35.00%) and over 65 y (28.33%). This was due to the decreased organs function, thereby the increased disease risk [16]. In the world, diabetic patients are range from 45 to 64 y [17], with 80% of these patients are living in low-and middle-income countries, such as Indonesia [1]. The elderly people affect T2DM due to decreased physiology in body function and decreased insulin secretion and resistance, so the ability of the body's function to control blood glucose is less than optimal [18].

Table 1: Distribution of type 2 diabetes mellitus patients

| Variable | Puskesmas | | Linggar | | Nanjungmekar | |
|-------------|-----------|----|----------|----|--------------|----|
| | Rancaekek | % | Patients | % | Patients | % |
| Gender | | | | | | |
| Male | 3 | 15 | 4 | 20 | 2 | 10 |
| Female | 17 | 85 | 16 | 80 | 18 | 90 |
| Age (years) | | | | | | |
| <45 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 46-55 | 3 | 15 | 8 | 40 | 10 | 50 |
| 56-65 | 9 | 45 | 7 | 35 | 6 | 30 |
| ≥ 65 | 8 | 40 | 5 | 25 | 4 | 20 |

BPJS fee cover health services, medicines, laboratory examinations, and administration. All the Prolanis patients (60 people) were given a combination of 500 mg metformin and 1 mg glimepiride [9, 19]. Metformin belongs to the biguanides group, suppresses hepatic glucose production, increases insulin sensitivity, increases glucose uptake, increases fatty acid oxidation, and decreases glucose absorption [20]. Glimepiride belongs to sulfonylurea group, stimulates the release of insulin from pancreatic β -cells [21]. The success of T2DM treatment was assessed by a decreased fasting glucose level. All patients were shown decreased fasting glucose

levels, in the range of 21-36 mg/dL, with an average of 29.65±22.86 mg/dl (table 2).

The decreased fasting glucose levels in the three Puskesmas were normal distribution with p value>0.05 indicated there was no significant difference between the data and the standard normal. This showed that the data were normally distributed and homogeneous, so we conducted the parametric analysis, i.e. one-way ANOVA. The results showed the significance value based on the outcome of decreased fasting sugar levels was 0.341, i.e. there was no significant difference.

Table 2: The decreased fasting glucose levels

| Decreased fasting glucose levels (mg/dl) at the puskesmas | | |
|---|-------------|--------------|
| Rancaekek | Linggar | Nanjungmekar |
| 32.15±26.03 | 21.35±17.20 | 35.45±22.76 |

The average cost at Puskesmas Nanjungmekar was higher than other Puskesmas, with a difference of 5,750±750 and 6,350±900 IDR (table 3). This was because of higher transportation cost, due to the distance between the patient's home and the Nanjungmekar Puskesmas was in the range of 6 to 8 km. The best CER was the Linggar Puskesmas (table 4). Cost analysis statistically assessed the overall cost in detail based on data with

the normality test. The total cost normality test resulted in p value<0.05, which showed a significant difference. The data were not normally distributed and not homogeneous, so it is included in the non-parametric statistical analysis. In the non-parametric analysis, a Crucial Wallis test is performed. Asymptotic significance value of 0.339 showed there was no difference between the costs in the three Puskesmas.

Table 3: Patient cost expended

| Average costs (IDR) | Patient cost expended (IDR) at the puskesmas | | |
|---------------------|--|--------------|--------------|
| | Rancaekek | Linggar | Nanjungmekar |
| BPJS fee | 25,500 | 25,500 | 25,500 |
| Transportation | 9,000±2,876 | 8,400±1,765 | 14,750±3,612 |
| Total | 34,500±3,574 | 33,900±2,583 | 40,250±4,575 |

Table 4: Calculation of cost-effectiveness ratios

| Prolanis at the puskesmas | Average cost (IDR) | Outcome (mg/dl) | CER |
|---------------------------|--------------------|-----------------|-----------|
| Rancaekek | 34,500±3,574 | 32.15±26.03 | 1,073±213 |
| Linggar | 33,900±2,583 | 21.35±17.20 | 1,587±138 |
| Nanjungmekar | 40,250±4,575 | 35.45±22.76 | 1,173±187 |

The cost-effectiveness table was used to determine health interventions relative to other health interventions [22]. The Prolanis in the Linggar Puskesmas was the most cost-effective compared to the Rancaekek and Nanjungmekar Puskesmas (table 5). All patients were educated that the T2DM can be maintained through lifestyle modification, diet control, and control of overweight and obesity. The community education was needed for

diabetes control, and disease management was needed to improve the quality of life of T2DM patients. The data of the quality of life of T2DM Prolanis patients who participated in the study could not be processed, because they were only obedient in laboratory examinations and medicines. The patients were not adherent in education, which was observed from the attendance data on Prolanis activities.

Table 5: Alternative groups based on cost-effectiveness

| Cost-effectiveness | Lower cost | Same cost | Higher cost |
|----------------------|--|-----------|--|
| Lower effectiveness | A (need ICER calculation) | B | Rancaekek to Linggar Nanjungmekar to Linggar Nanjungmekar to Rancaekek |
| Same effectiveness | D | E | F |
| Higher effectiveness | Rancaekek to Nanjungmekar Linggar to Nanjungmekar Linggar to Rancaekek | H | I (need ICER calculation) |

CONCLUSION

The Prolanis of Linggar Puskesmas was the most cost-effective compared to the Rancaekek and Nanjungmekar Puskesmas.

FUNDING

Nil

AUTHORS CONTRIBUTIONS

All the authors contributed equally.

CONFLICT OF INTERESTS

Declared none

REFERENCES

- International Diabetes Foundation. IDF Diabetes Atlas: Global burden of diabetes. 9th ed. Brussels, Belgium; 2019. Available from: <https://www.diabetesatlas.org>. [Last accessed on 20 Feb 2020].
- American Diabetes Association. Diabetes care in the hospital: standards of medical care in diabetes-2019. *Diabetes Care* 2019;42:S173-81.
- Schwinghammer TL. Diabetes mellitus. In: Pharmacotherapy Handbook. 7th ed. Wells BG, DiPiro JT, Schwinghammer TL, DiPiro CV. (eds). Mc Graw Hill Medical, Singapore; 2009. p. 210-27.
- Idris F. The integration of PT Askes (Persero) type 2 diabetes mellitus preventive program into the health social security organizing agency (BPJS Kesehatan). *J Indonesia Med Assoc* 2014;64:115-21.
- President of the Republic of Indonesia. UU No 40 of 2004 about National Social Guarantee System. Available from: <https://www.bpjs-kesehatan.go.id/bpjs/dmdocuments/06-PROLANIS.pdf> [Last accessed on 20 Feb 2020].
- Klonoff DC, Schwartz DM. An economic analysis of interventions for diabetes. *Diabetes Care* 2000;23:390-404.
- Grosse SD. Assessing cost-effectiveness in health care: the history of the \$50,000 per QALY threshold. *Value Health* 2008;8:165-78.
- Setiadi. Nursing research concepts and writing. Graha Ilmu, Yogyakarta, Indonesia; 2007.
- Health BPJS. Guidelines for management of DM type 2 chronic diseases, Jakarta; 2015.
- BPJS health fees. Available from: <https://www.bpjs-kesehatan.go.id/bpjs/pages/detail/2014/13> [Last accessed on 20 May 2019]
- Tripathi KD. Essentials of medical pharmacology. 7th ed. Jaypee Brothers Medical Publishers, India; 2013.
- Sharma R, Stano M, Hass M. Adjusting to changes in health: implications for cost-effectiveness analysis. *J Health Eco* 2004;23:335-51.
- Alghadir A, Awad H, Al-Elsa E, Alghwiri A. Diabetes risk 10 Y forecast in the capital of Saudi Arabia: canadian diabetes risk assessment questionnaire (CANRISK) perspective. *Biomed Res* 2014;25:88-96.
- Awad N, Langi AY, Pandelaki K. Risk factor overview of type II diabetes mellitus patients in endocrine polyclinic/FK-UNSRAT section of general hospital, Prof. Dr. R. Kandou manado period May 2011-October 2011. *J e-Biomedik* 2013;1:45-9.
- Wilmot E, Idris I. Early-onset type 2 diabetes: risk factors, clinical impact and management. *Ther Adv Chronic Dis* 2014;5:234-44.
- Olokoba AB, Obateru OA, Olokoba LB. Type 2 diabetes mellitus: a review of current trends. *Oman Med J* 2012;27:269-73.
- Wild S, Roglic G, Green A, Sicree R, King H. Global prevalence of diabetes: estimate for the year 2000 and projections for 2030. *Diabetes Care* 2004;27:1047-53.
- Ripsin CM, Kang H, Urban RJ. Management of blood glucose in type 2 diabetes mellitus. *Am Fam Physician* 2009;79:29-36.

19. Nathan DM, Buse JB, Davidson MB, Ferrannini E, Holman RR, Sherwin R, *et al.* Management of hyperglycemia in type 2 diabetes: a consensus algorithm for the initiation and adjustment of therapy. *Diabetes Care* 2008;31:173-5.
20. Collier CA, Bruce CR, Smith AC, Lopaschuk G, Dyck DJ. Metformin counters the insulin-induced suppression of fatty acid oxidation and stimulation of triacylglycerol storage in rodents skeletal muscle. *Am J Physiol Endocrin Metab* 2006;219:182-9.
21. Nissen SE, Nicholls SJ, Wolski K, Nesto R, Kupfer S, Perez A, *et al.* Comparison of pioglitazone vs glimepiride on progression of coronary atherosclerosis in patients with type 2 diabetes: the PERISCOPE randomized controlled trial. *JAMA* 2008; 299:1561-73.
22. Ministry of Health Republic of Indonesia. Guidelines for the Application of Pharmacoeconomic Studies. Jakarta, Indonesia, Ministry of Health of the Republic of Indonesia; 2013.