Bulletin of Pharmacy Practice

Content Available at www.lapinpress.com ISSN (O): 3139-9444
(An online peer reviewed Referred Journal)

Review Article

OPEN ACCESS

PHARMACOECONOMIC EVALUATION OF HEALTHCARE INTERVENTIONS: METHODS, OUTCOMES, AND IMPACT ON DRUG POLICY

NAGA SUBRAHMANYAM S

Departmnet of Pharmacy Practice. Vishwa Bharathi College of Pharmaceutical Sciences, Perecherla, Guntur.

***Corresponding Author**
Dr. Naga Subrahmanyam S

Article History: Received: 04 April 2026, Revised: 09 May 2026, Accepted: 03 June 2026

Abstract: Healthcare systems worldwide are increasingly challenged by escalating expenditures, demographic transitions, technological advancements, and the growing burden of chronic diseases. Limited healthcare resources necessitate efficient allocation strategies to maximize health outcomes while ensuring sustainability and equitable access to care. Pharmacoeconomics, a specialized field within health economics, provides a systematic framework for comparing the costs and outcomes of pharmaceutical products and healthcare interventions to support evidence-based decision-making. This narrative review examines the principles, methodologies, outcomes, and policy implications of pharmacoeconomic evaluations in contemporary healthcare settings. Major analytical approaches, including cost-minimization analysis, cost-effectiveness analysis, cost-utility analysis, cost-benefit analysis, and budget impact analysis, are discussed in terms of their methodological foundations, applications, strengths, and limitations. Key outcome measures such as quality-adjusted life years, disability-adjusted life years, incremental cost-effectiveness ratios, and willingness-to-pay thresholds are also explored. The review highlights the growing role of pharmacoeconomic evidence in health technology assessment, formulary management, value-based pricing, reimbursement decisions, and national drug policy development. Emerging trends, including the incorporation of real-world evidence, digital health technologies, precision medicine, and artificial intelligence, are transforming the scope and relevance of pharmacoeconomic research. Despite significant advances, challenges related to data quality, transferability, methodological heterogeneity, uncertainty, and ethical concerns remain. Strengthening methodological rigor, improving transparency, integrating patient perspectives, and promoting international harmonization of evaluation frameworks are essential for enhancing the utility of pharmacoeconomic evidence. Robust pharmacoeconomic evaluations are indispensable for optimizing healthcare resource allocation and informing sustainable, patient-centered drug policies.

Keywords: *Pharmacoeconomics; Cost-effectiveness analysis; Health technology assessment; Drug policy; Quality-adjusted life years; Healthcare resource allocation.*

This article is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-Non-commercial 4.0 International License.
Copyright © 2026 Author(s) retains the copyright of this article.

1. INTRODUCTION

Healthcare expenditures have increased substantially over recent decades due to population aging, epidemiological transitions, technological innovations, and the growing prevalence of chronic diseases [1]. Simultaneously, healthcare budgets remain constrained, compelling policymakers and healthcare providers to make difficult decisions regarding the allocation of limited resources.

Pharmaceuticals constitute a major component of healthcare spending globally. The emergence of high-cost specialty medicines, biologics, cell and gene therapies, and personalized medicine has intensified concerns regarding affordability and long-term sustainability [2]. Consequently, stakeholders increasingly require evidence not only regarding the efficacy and safety of healthcare interventions but also their economic value.

Pharmacoeconomics is defined as the identification, measurement, and comparison of the costs and consequences of pharmaceutical products and healthcare services [3]. It provides decision-makers with tools to evaluate whether the health benefits associated with an intervention justify the resources invested.

The application of pharmacoeconomic principles has expanded beyond pharmaceutical products to encompass medical devices, screening programs, digital health technologies, and public health interventions [4]. Pharmacoeconomic evaluations are now integral to health technology assessment (HTA), formulary management, pricing negotiations, reimbursement decisions, and clinical guideline development.

Organizations such as the National Institute for Health and Care Excellence, the Canadian Agency for Drugs and Technologies in Health, and the Institute for Clinical and Economic Review routinely incorporate pharmacoeconomic evidence into healthcare decision-making frameworks [5].
This narrative review examines the concepts, methods, outcome measures, applications, challenges, and future directions of pharmacoeconomic evaluations, with particular emphasis on their influence on drug policy.

2. FUNDAMENTALS OF PHARMACOECONOMIC EVALUATION

Pharmacoeconomic evaluation is based on the principle that healthcare resources are finite and should be allocated to maximize health gains [6].
The primary objectives of pharmacoeconomic evaluation include:

- Assessing the value of healthcare interventions
- Comparing alternative treatment options
- Supporting evidence-based resource allocation
- Informing reimbursement and pricing decisions
- Improving healthcare efficiency
- Enhancing patient outcomes

Unlike clinical evaluations that focus primarily on efficacy and safety, pharmacoeconomic analyses integrate economic and humanistic considerations alongside clinical outcomes [7].
A complete pharmacoeconomic evaluation requires comparison between at least two interventions and includes both cost and outcome assessments.

Table 01: Key Components of Pharmacoeconomic Evaluations

Component	Description	Examples
Perspective	Viewpoint from which costs and outcomes are assessed	Societal, payer, provider, patient
Comparator	Alternative intervention used for comparison	Standard therapy, placebo, no treatment
Costs	Resources consumed by interventions	Medication costs, hospitalization expenses
Outcomes	Consequences of interventions	Life years gained, QALYs, symptom reduction
Time horizon	Duration over which costs and outcomes are measured	One year, lifetime
Discounting	Adjustment of future costs and outcomes to present values	Annual rates of 3–5%
Sensitivity analysis	Assessment of uncertainty in model assumptions	One-way and probabilistic analyses

As shown in Table 01, multiple methodological elements influence the validity and interpretation of pharmacoeconomic evaluations.

3. TYPES OF COSTS CONSIDERED IN PHARMACOECONOMIC STUDIES

The accurate identification and measurement of costs are fundamental to economic evaluations [8].

3.1 Direct Medical Costs

Direct medical costs include expenditures directly related to healthcare delivery, such as:

- Medication acquisition costs
- Physician consultation fees
- Hospitalization costs
- Diagnostic procedures
- Laboratory tests
- Rehabilitation services

3.2 Direct Non-Medical Costs

These costs are associated with receiving healthcare but are not directly related to medical services.
Examples include:

- Transportation expenses
- Childcare costs
- Caregiver support
- Accommodation expenses

3.3 Indirect Costs

Indirect costs represent productivity losses resulting from illness or premature death.

Examples include:

- Absenteeism
- Presenteeism
- Lost income
- Reduced workforce participation

3.4 Intangible Costs

Intangible costs reflect non-monetary burdens such as:

- Pain and suffering
- Anxiety
- Emotional distress
- Reduced quality of life

Although difficult to quantify, intangible costs significantly influence patient experiences and healthcare outcomes [9].

4. OUTCOME MEASURES IN PHARMACOECONOMIC EVALUATION

The value of healthcare interventions is determined by assessing their consequences alongside associated costs.

4.1 Clinical Outcomes

Clinical outcomes are measured using disease-specific indicators, including:

- Blood pressure reduction
- Glycemic control
- Mortality rates
- Hospital readmissions

4.2 Humanistic Outcomes

Humanistic outcomes assess patient experiences and quality of life.

Examples include:

- Patient satisfaction
- Functional status
- Health-related quality of life

4.3 Economic Outcomes

Economic outcomes include:

- Cost savings
- Resource utilization
- Productivity gains

4.4 Quality-Adjusted Life Years

Quality-adjusted life years (QALYs) combine survival and quality of life into a single measure [10].

One QALY represents one year of life in perfect health.

4.5 Disability-Adjusted Life Years

Disability-adjusted life years (DALYs) estimate disease burden by combining years of life lost and years lived with disability [11].

4.6 Incremental Cost-Effectiveness Ratio

The incremental cost-effectiveness ratio (ICER) compares the additional cost of an intervention relative to its additional benefits.

ICER = (Cost of intervention – Cost of comparator) ÷ (Effect of intervention – Effect of comparator)

ICER values are compared with willingness-to-pay thresholds to determine cost-effectiveness [12].

5. METHODS OF PHARMACOECONOMIC EVALUATION

Different pharmacoeconomic methods are selected based on the nature of outcomes and decision-making requirements.

Table 02: Major Pharmacoeconomic Evaluation Methods

Method	Outcome Measure	Applications	Advantages	Limitations
Cost-minimization analysis (CMA)	Equivalent outcomes	Comparison of therapeutically equivalent interventions	Simple and easy to conduct	Requires proven equivalence
Cost-effectiveness analysis (CEA)	Natural units (e.g., life years gained)	Evaluation of interventions within the same disease area	Clinically intuitive	Limited comparability across conditions
Cost-utility analysis (CUA)	QALYs or DALYs	Comparison across multiple disease states	Incorporates quality of life	Utility estimation can be complex

Cost-benefit analysis (CBA)	Monetary units	Societal-level resource allocation	Facilitates broad comparisons	Ethical concerns regarding monetization of health
Budget impact analysis (BIA)	Financial implications	Assessment of affordability	Supports implementation planning	Does not measure value for money

As summarized in Table 02, each method offers unique strengths and limitations depending on the decision context.

5.1 Cost-Minimization Analysis

Cost-minimization analysis (CMA) identifies the least expensive intervention when clinical outcomes are equivalent [13].

5.2 Cost-Effectiveness Analysis

Cost-effectiveness analysis (CEA) compares interventions using natural units such as:

- Cases prevented
- Life years gained
- Hospitalizations avoided [14]

5.3 Cost-Utility Analysis

Cost-utility analysis (CUA) incorporates patient preferences and quality of life by using utility-based measures such as QALYs [15].

5.4 Cost-Benefit Analysis

Cost-benefit analysis (CBA) expresses both costs and outcomes in monetary terms to estimate net economic benefits [16].

5.5 Budget Impact Analysis

Budget impact analysis evaluates the affordability of implementing new interventions within a defined healthcare budget [17].

6. DECISION-ANALYTIC MODELING IN PHARMACOECONOMICS

Clinical trials often provide limited information regarding long-term costs and outcomes. Decision-analytic models are therefore used to extrapolate findings beyond trial periods [18].

Common modeling approaches include:

- Decision trees
- Markov models
- Discrete event simulation
- Dynamic transmission models

6.1 Decision Trees

Decision trees are suitable for acute conditions with short-term outcomes.

6.2 Markov Models

Markov models are frequently used for chronic diseases involving recurring events and transitions between health states.

Applications include:

- Diabetes mellitus
- Cardiovascular diseases
- Cancer
- Chronic kidney disease

6.3 Sensitivity Analysis

Sensitivity analyses evaluate the impact of uncertainty on study findings.

Common types include:

- One-way sensitivity analysis
- Multi-way sensitivity analysis
- Threshold analysis
- Probabilistic sensitivity analysis [19].

7. ROLE OF PHARMACOECONOMICS IN HEALTH TECHNOLOGY ASSESSMENT

Health technology assessment (HTA) is a multidisciplinary process that evaluates the clinical, economic, organizational, social, and ethical implications of healthcare interventions [20].

Pharmacoeconomic evidence is a cornerstone of HTA and informs decisions regarding:

- Reimbursement
- Pricing
- Formulary inclusion
- Clinical guideline development

Many countries require cost-effectiveness evidence before approving reimbursement for new medicines.
HTA agencies use standardized methodologies to ensure consistency and transparency in decision-making.

8. IMPACT OF PHARMACOECONOMIC EVALUATIONS ON DRUG POLICY

Pharmacoeconomic analyses have significantly influenced drug policy at national and institutional levels.

8.1 Drug Pricing and Reimbursement

Cost-effectiveness evidence supports value-based pricing strategies that align medication prices with therapeutic benefits [21].

8.2 Formulary Management

Healthcare organizations use economic evaluations to prioritize medicines offering the greatest value [22].

8.3 Essential Medicines Selection

Pharmacoeconomic evidence contributes to the development of essential medicines lists by identifying cost-effective interventions [23].

8.4 Managed Entry Agreements

Managed entry agreements enable access to high-cost therapies while addressing uncertainties related to effectiveness and budget impact [24].

8.5 Value-Based Healthcare

Value-based healthcare models emphasize outcomes achieved relative to costs incurred [25].

Table 03: Applications of Pharmacoeconomic Evidence in Drug Policy

Policy Area	Application of Pharmacoeconomics	Impact on Healthcare Systems
Drug reimbursement	Assessment of cost-effectiveness	Efficient resource allocation
Pricing negotiations	Determination of value-based prices	Improved affordability
Formulary management	Comparison of therapeutic alternatives	Rational medicine selection
Clinical guidelines	Integration of economic evidence	Evidence-based recommendations
Health technology assessment	Comprehensive value assessment	Transparent decision-making
Essential medicines selection	Prioritization of cost-effective therapies	Improved access to medicines

As outlined in Table 03, pharmacoeconomic evaluations play a critical role in promoting sustainable and evidence-based drug policies.

9. REAL-WORLD EVIDENCE AND PHARMACOECONOMIC EVALUATION

Real-world evidence (RWE) complements randomized controlled trial data by providing information on intervention effectiveness in routine clinical practice [26].

Common sources of RWE include:

- Electronic health records
- Administrative claims databases
- Patient registries
- Mobile health applications
- Wearable devices

Advantages of RWE include:

- Enhanced generalizability
- Long-term follow-up
- Evaluation of diverse patient populations

However, observational data may be affected by confounding, selection bias, and incomplete documentation.

10. CHALLENGES AND LIMITATIONS

Despite their value, pharmacoeconomic evaluations face several challenges.

10.1 Data Quality Issues

Incomplete or inaccurate data may compromise the validity of analyses [27].

10.2 Transferability of Findings

Results from one healthcare setting may not be applicable to other regions due to differences in:

- Healthcare infrastructure
- Costs
- Clinical practice patterns
- Population characteristics

10.3 Methodological Heterogeneity

Variations in methods, assumptions, and outcome measures limit comparability across studies.

10.4 Ethical Considerations

Economic evaluations may raise concerns regarding:

- Equity
- Access to innovative therapies
- Prioritization of vulnerable populations

10.5 Uncertainty

Long-term projections often rely on assumptions regarding clinical effectiveness and costs, introducing uncertainty into results [28].

11. EMERGING TRENDS AND FUTURE DIRECTIONS

Several developments are reshaping pharmacoeconomic research.

Key trends include:

- Integration of artificial intelligence and machine learning
- Expansion of precision medicine
- Increased use of patient-reported outcomes
- Greater reliance on real-world evidence
- Adoption of dynamic pricing models
- Enhanced international collaboration
- Incorporation of environmental sustainability considerations

Future evaluations are expected to become more patient-centered by incorporating societal preferences and equity considerations [29].

Standardized reporting frameworks, such as the Consolidated Health Economic Evaluation Reporting Standards (CHEERS 2022), are expected to improve transparency and reproducibility [30].

12. CONCLUSION

Pharmacoeconomic evaluation has become an essential component of modern healthcare decision-making by providing a systematic approach to comparing the costs and outcomes of healthcare interventions. Methods such as cost-minimization analysis, cost-effectiveness analysis, cost-utility analysis, cost-benefit analysis, and budget impact analysis offer valuable insights into the value and affordability of pharmaceutical products and healthcare services. Outcome measures including QALYs, DALYs, and ICERs facilitate evidence-based comparisons across diverse interventions and inform resource allocation decisions. Pharmacoeconomic evidence increasingly influences health technology assessment, formulary management, reimbursement policies, value-based pricing, and national drug policies. The growing availability of real-world evidence, advances in digital health technologies, and integration of artificial intelligence are expanding the scope and relevance of pharmacoeconomic evaluations. Nevertheless, challenges related to data quality, methodological heterogeneity, transferability, uncertainty, and ethical considerations must be addressed to maximize their impact. Strengthening methodological standards, promoting transparency, integrating patient perspectives, and fostering international collaboration will ensure that pharmacoeconomic evaluations continue to support equitable, efficient, and sustainable healthcare systems.

13. FUNDING

Nil

14. ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

Not Declared.

15. CONFLICT OF INTEREST

Nil

16. INFORMED CONSENT

Not applicable

17. ETHICAL STATEMENT

Not Applicable.

18. REFERENCES

1. World Health Organization. Global spending on health: weathering the storm. Geneva: WHO; 2020.
2. Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. Health at a glance 2023: OECD indicators. Paris: OECD Publishing; 2023.

3. Townsend RJ. Postmarketing drug research and development. Drug Intell Clin Pharm. 1987;21(2):134–6.
4. Drummond MF, Sculpher MJ, Claxton K, Stoddart GL, Torrance GW. *Methods for the economic evaluation of health care programmes*. 4th ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press; 2015.
5. O'Rourke B, Oortwijn W, Schuller T. The new definition of health technology assessment. Int J Technol Assess Health Care. 2020;36(3):187–90.
6. Rascati KL. *Essentials of pharmacoeconomics*. 3rd ed. Philadelphia: Wolters Kluwer; 2022.
7. Neumann PJ, Sanders GD, Russell LB, Siegel JE, Ganiats TG, editors. *Cost-effectiveness in health and medicine*. 2nd ed. New York: Oxford University Press; 2017.
8. Gold MR, Siegel JE, Russell LB, Weinstein MC, editors. *Cost-effectiveness in health and medicine*. New York: Oxford University Press; 1996.
9. Brazier J, Ratcliffe J, Salomon JA, Tsuchiya A. *Measuring and valuing health benefits for economic evaluation*. 2nd ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press; 2017.
10. Whitehead SJ, Ali S. Health outcomes in economic evaluation: the QALY and utilities. Br Med Bull. 2010;96(1):5–21.
11. Murray CJL, Lopez AD. *The global burden of disease*. Boston: Harvard University Press; 1996.
12. Sanders GD, Neumann PJ, Basu A, Brock DW, Feeny D, Krahn M, et al. Recommendations for conduct, methodological practices, and reporting of cost-effectiveness analyses. JAMA. 2016;316(10):1093–103.
13. Robinson R. Cost-minimization analysis. BMJ. 1993;307(6909):726–8.
14. Drummond MF, McGuire A, editors. *Economic evaluation in health care: merging theory with practice*. Oxford: Oxford University Press; 2001.
15. Torrance GW, Feeny D. Utilities and quality-adjusted life years. Int J Technol Assess Health Care. 1989;5(4):559–75.
16. Robinson R. Cost-benefit analysis. BMJ. 1993;307(6909):924–6.
17. Sullivan SD, Mauskopf JA, Augustovski F, Caro JJ, Lee KM, Minchin M, et al. Budget impact analysis principles. Value Health. 2014;17(1):5–14.
18. Briggs A, Claxton K, Sculpher M. *Decision modelling for health economic evaluation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press; 2006.
19. Briggs AH, Weinstein MC, Fenwick EAL, Karnon J, Sculpher MJ, Paltiel AD. Model parameter estimation and uncertainty analysis. Med Decis Making. 2012;32(5):722–32.
20. Facey KM, Hansen HP, Single ANV, editors. *Patient involvement in health technology assessment*. Singapore: Springer; 2017.
21. Garrison LP, Towse A. Value-based pricing and reimbursement. Pharmacoeconomics. 2017;35(1):1–5.
22. Vogler S, Paris V, Ferrario A, Wirtz VJ, de Joncheere K, Schneider P, et al. How can pricing and reimbursement policies improve affordable access to medicines? Appl Health Econ Health Policy. 2017;15(3):307–21.
23. World Health Organization. WHO model list of essential medicines. 23rd list. Geneva: WHO; 2023.
24. Ferrario A, Kanavos P. Managed entry agreements for pharmaceuticals. Health Policy. 2013;111(3):198–206.
25. Porter ME. What is value in health care? N Engl J Med. 2010;363(26):2477–81.
26. Sherman RE, Anderson SA, Dal Pan GJ, Gray GW, Gross T, Hunter NL, et al. Real-world evidence-what is it and what can it tell us? N Engl J Med. 2016;375(23):2293–7.
27. Weiskopf NG, Weng C. Methods and dimensions of electronic health record data quality assessment. J Am Med Inform Assoc. 2013;20(1):144-51.
28. Fenwick E, Claxton K, Sculpher M. Representing uncertainty. Health Econ. 2001;10(8):779–87.
29. Facey KM, Bedlington N, Berglas S, Bertelsen N, Single ANV. Putting patients at the centre of HTA. Int J Technol Assess Health Care. 2018;34(3):244-51.
30. Husereau D, Drummond M, Augustovski F, de Bekker-Grob E, Briggs AH, Carswell C, et al. Consolidated Health Economic Evaluation Reporting Standards 2022 (CHEERS 2022). BMJ. 2022;376:e067975.