

경제성 측면에서의 약물사용평가

Drug Utilization Review : Economical Aspect

17

Sang - Cheol Bae, M.D.

Department of Internal Medicine, Section for Clinical Epidemiology & Economics

Hanyang University College of Medicine & the Hospital for Rheumatic Diseases

E - mail : scbae@hanyang.ac.kr

Abstract

Drug utilization review (DUR) is one of the approaches to improve quality of health care and reduce its costs. DUR programs have been defined as "structured, ongoing initiatives that interpret patterns of drug use in relation to predetermined criteria, attempting to prevent or to minimize inappropriate prescribing while maximizing the effectiveness of drug therapy to save costs." There have been a limited number of papers to evaluate the economic consequences of DUR programs, and they provide no definite evidence regarding the cost saving or cost - effectiveness of the programs. A possible explanation for this would be that DUR might not be awarded a high priority, resulting in reduced opportunities for financing to DUR including development of a good program and its evaluation study. However, despite these problems, in Korea simple descriptive studies of drug utilization and the development of effective intervention strategies must start and continue in order to optimize drug therapy and to save costs in health care. Pharmacoeconomic studies are employed to measure drug efficiencies, through comparison of the costs and effects of alternative therapies. Theses studies can uncover the economics repercussions of inappropriate prescribing and quantify the cost effectiveness of various DUR interventions. The use of DUR in conjunction with pharmacoeconomic analysis will result in more cost - effective and rational utilization of medicines. Both methods could be used in a complementary fashion. In conclusion, DUR processes will lead to the better utilization of drugs, based on improved economic and social performance.

Keywords : Drug utilization review; Cost; Effectiveness; Economics; Pharmacoeconomics

: 가; ; ; ;

가(drug utilization review, DUR)

, 가

(1, 2). , DUR

가

(, , ,)

. DUR
 : : , DUR 가
 , :
 , , , , 가.
 DUR (3~8).
 DUR , 가
 가 1) Medicaid DUR pooled cross-sectional time - series annual state (4).
 가 (1, 2). DUR per - recipient drug
 가 4.9% , 6.9%가
 spillover 가
 가 DUR
 가 ,
 DUR (5) Washington Iowa
 , , DUR
 , ,
 가 .
 DUR
 가
 DUR 가
 DUR 가 (3).
 , 가

DUR 가 (3). 가 .

DUR 가 DUR 가 .

. DUR 가 (9)

, 가

, , inten- DUR 가

tion - to - treat 가 가 (2). .

DUR 가 가

DUR .

DUR 가 .

가 가 가

가 가

. 가

. , .

, 가

“

DUR (clinical or health economics)”

. 가

(benefit)

가

. ,

IT ,

(pharmacoeconomics) .

DUR 가 가 가

DUR

COX - 2

DUR

COX - 2

DUR

COX - 2 가 가 65

(, , , 가 DUR

) DUR

DUR 가

(10).

DUR

DUR

가

COX - 2

(

COX - 2)

2002

(11)

가

COX - 2

COX - 2

가

(misoprostol proton pump inhibitor)

Acknowledgement

(01 - PJ1 - PG1 -

COX - 2

01CH10 - 0007).

가?

가

가

1. , 가

1. . 1999 ; 7 : 3 - 16
2. Hennessy S, Strom BL, Lipton HL, Soumerai SB. Drug utilization review. In : Storm BL, ed. Pharmacoeconomics. 3rd ed. Chichester : John Wiley & Sons, Ltd, 2000 : 505 - 23
3. Lee D, Bergman U. Studies of drug utilization. In : Storm BL, ed. Pharmacoeconomics. 3rd ed. Chichester : John Wiley & Sons, Ltd, 2000 : 463 - 81
4. Moore WJ, Gutermuth K, Pracht EE. Systemwide effects of Medicaid retrospective drug utilization review programs. J Health Polit Policy Law 2000 ; 25 : 653 - 88
5. Kidder D, Bae J. Evaluation results from prospective drug utilization review : Medicaid demonstrations. Health Care Financ Rev 1999 ; 20 : 107 - 18
6. Soumerai SB, Lipton HL. Computer - based drug - utilization review - risk, benefit, or boondoggle? NEJM 1995 ; 332 : 1641 - 5
7. Holm RP, Helgeland D. DEEP, South Dakota Medicaid drug use review program. Is the hassle justified? SDJ Med 1993 ; 46 : 368 - 9
8. Guo JJ, Gibson JT, Hancock GR, Barker KN. Retrospective drug utilization review and the behavior of Medicaid prescribers : an empirical marginal analysis. Clin Ther 1995 ; 17 : 1174 - 87
9. 2003 ; 64 : 145 - 50
10. Sacristan JA, Soto J. Drug utilization studies as tools in health economics. Pharmacoeconomics. 1994 ; 5 : 299 - 312
11. American Pain Society. ed. Guideline for the management of pain in osteoarthritis, rheumatoid arthritis, and juvenile chronic arthritis. Glenview 2002 : 43 - 117

1 ()

- | | |
|----|-----|
| 1. | 6. |
| 2. | 7. |
| 3. | 8. |
| 4. | 9. |
| 5. | 10. |