

Original Research Article

Curbing Polypharmacy Among Primary Health Care Workers: The Impact of An Educational Intervention

Abstract

Introduction: Polypharmacy, the concurrent prescription or use of multiple numbers of drugs per patient, has been identified as a significant channel of drug wastage in the health sector. It's habitual practice has been associated with lower cadres of healthcare workers, operating mainly at the grassroots or primary health care (PHC) levels.

Objective: To assess the impact of a two-phased educational intervention on the practice of polypharmacy among rural PHC workers in Kaduna State, north-western Nigeria.

Methods: A quasi-experimental study design was employed in 2 Local Government Areas (LGAs)- one study and one control. A two-phase educational intervention was carried out in the study LGA. Pre- and post-intervention audit and analysis of the prescription records of the selected facilities was done with SPSS version 20.0. Bivariate analysis was carried out to test the relationship between the independent and outcome variables with p-value set at 0.05.

Results: Both study and control facilities had baseline (pre-intervention) evidence of polypharmacy, ranging between 1-13 drugs per patient and 1-10, respectively (mean of 4.3 ± 1.56 and 3.85 ± 1.14 , respectively). This dropped by about 43.5%, to an average of 3.26 ± 1.19 and later, to 2.43 ± 0.29 drugs per patient in the study group, following the first and second phases of the intervention, respectively ($p < 0.05$). No statistically-significant changes were observed in the control facility.

Conclusions: Following the intervention, a significant improvement was observed in the prescribing pattern of the health workers in the study area, with regards to polypharmacy. This evidence emphasises the place, priority and potential of in-service training and continuous education of healthcare workers in order to promote optimum practice and curtail unnecessary wastage of limited resources in the health sector, particularly in developing countries.

Keywords: polypharmacy, PHC, prescriptions, drugs, LGA

Introduction

The practice of modern day, orthodox Medicine relies heavily, among many other strategies and approaches, on pharmacotherapy, which is the treatment of diseases, syndromes and/or even mere symptoms through the administration of prescribed pharmaceutical drugs¹. This is as distinguished from other forms of medically acceptable treatments such as surgery, physiotherapy, radiotherapy etc. The option of pharmacotherapy in medical practice carries along with it a number of implications; two of which include side effects and financial implications. While the former refers to the occurrence, in individuals of secondary, often undesirable and inconveniencing effects of a pharmaceutical drug; the latter refers to the cost

implications for the consumer or recipient (particularly when it is “out-of-pocket” and/ or unsubsidized).

In medical practice, it is not unusual or uncommon to encounter multiple or co-morbidities occurring in individuals; thus warranting the prescription of two or more drugs. This scenario brings to light another issue of concern, which is drug interaction. This refers to complications arising from interactions between two or more drugs in one individual; the more the number of drugs prescribed per person, the more the chances of adverse drug interactions (ADEs) occurring. ADEs are “undesirable clinical manifestations that are consequent to and caused by the administration of medications, as well as events due to error”². The probability of this occurrence is heightened by polypharmacy- the concurrent prescription or use of multiple numbers of drugs per patient. The presence of co-morbidities in patients, sometimes make polypharmacy an inevitable (and even beneficial) option³ for many clinicians.

As a result of the fore-going and many other implications stemming from pharmacotherapy, it stands to reason that caution and care, based on objective information be reasonably applied by physicians as well as other healthcare workers (HCWs) when prescribing drugs to patients⁴. Furthermore, polypharmacy does not only potentially carry untoward effects on patients; it has also been identified as a significant channel of drug wastage in the health sector. This is particularly of concern in resource-constrained countries of the developing world; where the practice of polypharmacy is significantly common. The World Health Organisation (WHO) reports that huge financial expenditure and economic losses are associated with polypharmacy; and other forms of irrational drug use in developing and low-income countries^{5,6}.

Polypharmacy has been widely reported by diverse researchers in Nigeria. While the derived standard values for the WHO prescribing indicators, as developed from a study in Nigeria, for the average number of drugs per encounter or patient is estimated at an average of 1.6- 1.8 drugs⁷, many studies have reported prescriptions of as high as 3 to 7 drugs per patient^{5,8,9}. Nigeria operates a 3-tier healthcare system corresponding with her 3-tier levels of civil governance, where Primary Health Care (PHC) is under the purview of the lowest tier of government- the Local Government Council (LGC)¹⁰. The PHC level serves as the first line of contact and point of entry into Nigeria’s healthcare system. Many PHC facilities, particularly those situated in rural areas, are often and typically manned by lower cadres of healthcare workers; mainly auxiliary healthcare workers such as community health officers, community health extension workers etc^{11,12}. There are often no physicians in such facilities, particularly in northern Nigeria. This raises curiosity as to the daily operations obtainable at such levels of healthcare in Nigeria.

This study has as it’s objective the assessment of the pattern of prescriptions issued by Primary Health Care (PHC) workers, serving in rural PHC facilities in north-western Nigeria (with particular reference to the number of drugs prescribed per visit or consultation) as well as demonstrate the potential role of educational interventions in correcting or improving these patterns or practices.

Methodology

Study Areas: The study was conducted in two Local Government Areas (LGAs) in the northern part of Kaduna State, north-western Nigeria. These served as the study and control LGAs (or “districts”). The study LGA, Giwa consists of 6 health districts (namely: Giwa, Shika, Wazata, Gangara, Kaya and Kidandan); while the control LGA, Makarfi has 5 health districts (namely: Makarfi, Gangara, Gubuchi, Mayena and Nasarawa Doya).

The study LGA has 6 PHC centres, 36 PHC clinics, 3 privately-owned PHC facilities and a mission clinic. There are about 175 health personnel in it’s employment- none is a medical doctor or pharmacist. Domiciled within the control LGA are 5 PHC centres, 31 PHC clinics and several other privately-owned health facilities. The state-owned Shehu Idris School of Health Technology, which trains diverse categories of PHC workers, is sited in Makarfi town. A total of 146 health workers are employed in this LGA; with no medical doctor or pharmacist.

Services rendered in the PHC centres of both LGAs are on out-patient basis. Admissions, which rarely occur, are usually for patient observation, lasting only a few hours.

Study design: A descriptive, interventional, quasi-experimental (non-randomised, controlled, pre-test/post-test experimental) study design was used for the study

Study population: The total number of prescriptions issued by the prescribing health workers in selected PHC centres of both LGAs over a period of three months (a total population/sample study) was reviewed. Each prescription issued per patient or encounter constituted the unit of enquiry.

Sampling technique: Each health district within each LGA constituted a “cluster”, half of these districts were selected for the study by simple random sampling technique.

Study Methods: An audit and analysis of the records of all the prescriptions issued in the PHC centres of the sampled health districts in both LGAs (study and control), before and after two phases of educational intervention in the study LGA was conducted. Educational interventions were face-to-face and interactive, lasting for three weeks and involving question-and-answer sessions to clarify ambiguities and emphasise on key points concerning prescriptions and rational drug use as a whole.

Data analysis: Data collected by the aid of a checklist at both baseline (pre-intervention) and post-intervention surveys were validated for errors and analysed electronically.

Ethical considerations: Permission and approval were obtained from the Local Government authorities, while informed consent was obtained from the PHC Co-ordinators of each LGA.

Results:

Table 1: Summary of Number of Drugs Prescribed at Different Phases of Study by Study Status of Groups

Study Status of Groups	Phase of study		
	Pre-intervention (Baseline)	Post-intervention I: (after first intervention)	Post-intervention II: (after second intervention)
STUDY	4.3 ± 1.56 (range= 1-13; N= 2,838)	3.26 ± 1.19 (range= 1-11; N= 1,744)	2.43 ± 0.29 (range= 1-5; N= 695)
CONTROL	3.85 ± 1.14 (range= 1-10; N= 1,417)	3.89 ± 1.26 (range= 1-10; N= 962)	3.82 ± 0.81 (range= 1-9; N= 545)

Figure 1: Trend of Number of Drugs per Prescription during Study Period




Table 2: Variation in Number of Drugs per Prescription (*Post-intervention I*)

Study Status of Groups	Average No. of Drugs per Prescription $\pm$ standard deviation		
	Pre-intervention (Baseline)	Post-intervention I (after first intervention)	p-value (z- test)
Study	4.30 $\pm$ 1.56 (N= 2,838)	3.26 $\pm$ 1.19 (N= 1,744)	P < 0.05
Control	3.85 $\pm$ 1.14 (N= 1,417)	3.89 $\pm$ 1.26 (N= 962)	P > 0.05

Table 3: Variation in Number of Drugs per Prescription (*Post-intervention II*)

Study Status of Groups	Average No. of Drugs per Prescription $\pm$ standard deviation		
	Pre-intervention (Baseline)	Post-intervention II (after second intervention)	p-value (z- test)
Study	4.30 $\pm$ 1.56 (N= 2,838)	2.43 $\pm$ 0.29 (N= 695)	P < 0.05
Control	3.85 $\pm$ 1.14 (N= 1,417)	3.82 $\pm$ 0.81 (N= 545)	P > 0.05

Discussion:

The provision or supply of essential drugs is central to the functional existence and smooth running of Primary Health Care (PHC),¹³ as it constitutes one out of the eight core components of PHC as documented in the Alma Ata Declaration¹⁴. It also contributes immensely to the confidence reposed by communities and the general public in orthodox health care; and adds credibility to the healthcare system⁷. However, many prescription medicines are often inaccessible or even out-rightly unavailable in many PHC facilities in developing countries¹⁵; particularly in rural areas. And where availability is not the challenge, some medicines are simply unaffordable to rural dwellers. In the midst of this dismal situation, the healthcare system also has to tackle issues of poor management and wastage of limited resources including prescription drugs via channels such as poor storage conditions, inadequate security,

deficient inventory control systems; pilferage, misuse and expiry of medicines as well as poor or non-compliance by patients.^{16, 17} This situation undermines the basic principles and rationale intended for the successful operation of the essential drugs concept¹⁸.

Of particular concern to many stakeholders are the irrational patterns observed among primary health care workers in the prescription and dispensing of drugs; the practice of over-prescription of drugs (polypharmacy) being one of such. The habitual practice of polypharmacy has been associated with lower cadres of healthcare workers, who constitute the majority of the health manpower operating mainly at the “grassroots” or primary health care (PHC) levels^{19, 20}. Corroborating these reports, the findings in this study, reveal baseline mean number of drugs prescribed per encounter by rural primary health care workers in both study and control areas as 4.30 and 3.85, respectively. The number of drugs prescribed per patient encounter ranged from 1-13 and 1-10 drugs in the study and control areas, respectively - clearly above the WHO-recommended reference target of an average of less than two (<2) per encounter^{7,21}. While in the control area, the value observed compares with findings over two decades ago by Hogerzeil, Bimo, Ross-Degnan *et al* in a field study of drug use indicators in 12 developing countries, including Nigeria,²² with an average number of 3.8 drugs per prescription; the observation in the study area (4.30 drugs/encounter) far supersedes it. However, similar studies by Babalola, Awolaye *et al* and Adisa *et al* obtained even higher average values of 6.11 (ranging from 5.39 to 6.82) and 5.8 ± 2.3 drugs per encounter, respectively among PHC workers in south-western Nigeria^{19, 20}. Other countries where values higher than the international average of 2.2 drugs per patient⁹ have been reported include Ghana (4.8), Cameroun (2.8), Indonesia (3.3) and Pakistan (3.5)^{9, 23}. The aforementioned findings contrast and differ significantly from lower values reported from other countries in the eastern and southern sub-regions of Africa such as Ethiopia, Zimbabwe and Sudan, which range between 1.3 to 1.9 drugs per encounter.^{22, 24-26} Nonetheless, a review of prescribing indicators across the African region, over a period of about two decades (1995–2015) by Ofori-Asenso *et al* shows a regional average of 3.1 drugs per consultation.²¹

These observations evidently call for further exploration into the possible causes of the foregoing, with a view to addressing the status quo and reversing the trend. Although the reasons for the high prevalence of polypharmacy in many developing countries of sub-Saharan Africa (particularly Nigeria) is not captured, as part of the scope of this study, other researchers^{8,24,27-30} have cited a number of factors as being responsible. These have been identified as being largely socio-cultural in nature; and they include influences and pressure from patients, level of training and knowledge of health workers, clinicians’ workload (particularly in out-patient departments), the availability and cost of medicines, the influence of the pharmaceutical industry as well as their sales representatives and marketers etc. Other attributable factors are the increasingly occurring phenomenon of co-morbidities in certain patients as well as the chronicity of many non-communicable diseases as they continue to co-exist with communicable diseases (that is the “epidemiological transition” as reported in many developing countries³¹); the non-availability of diagnostic services for the confirmation of diagnosis, particularly in rural PHC facilities; an extreme zeal or excessive desire by some health workers to demonstrate

concern or empathy by attempting to treat all ailments simultaneously (“symptomatic treatment”)³², among many other contributing factors.

The widespread and consistent practice of polypharmacy, among other patterns of irrational drug use, has been recognised as a significant channel for the mismanagement and wastage of scarce and valuable resources such as drugs, in the healthcare systems of many low-and-medium-income countries (LMIC). This occurs against the backdrop of and within the contexts of lean health sector budgets and competing demands from other sectors³³. Furthermore, polypharmacy also has other far-reaching negative effects and impacts on the quality of healthcare, by compromising the co-operation and compliance of patients to prescribed treatment³⁴ (creating additional cost of treatment for them⁹, as out-of-pocket expenditure is the norm in many instances) as well as undermining therapeutic outcomes.³² Thus, the higher cost of healthcare incurred as a result of polypharmacy creates an additional barrier to accessing quality healthcare, further making it unaffordable and inaccessible to the largely impoverished and illiterate rural populations,³⁵ who represent about two-thirds of the population in Nigeria. In addition, there are higher risks and chances of adverse drug reactions and interactions occurring,^{3, 5} sometimes with hazardous and near fatal consequences. These potential implications of polypharmacy grossly undermine the effectiveness of the healthcare system and call for the need to urgently address them and promote rational medicines use.

A number of interventions have been recommended for improving prescription patterns among health workers. These strategies predominantly fall into at least three major categories; namely:

- i. Educational and communication methods, aimed at informing and persuading prescribers by furnishing them with relevant information and knowledge to improve on their prescribing skills and practices. It includes training of prescribers (formally and informally), the use of printed materials and literature, face-to-face approaches etc
- ii. Managerial and financial methods, aimed at guiding decision-makers as well as prescribers in diverse areas of drug management such as drug selection, quantification, financing and cost-recovery, procurement, distribution and rational use; including monitoring, supervision and feedback.
- iii. Regulatory methods, aimed at restricting the practices and professional conduct of decision-makers and prescribers via measures such as the enforcement of legal requirements and other controls eg, drug registration, limited drug lists, prescribing and dispensing restrictions etc³⁶

These measures may be used singly or in combination. However, the most commonly used and effective interventions among prescribers have been found to be educational in nature^{37,38} or a blend of same with other methods. A wide range of strategies have been proffered or advocated by various authors in developing countries. They include continuing education on rational drug use, increasing prescribers’ awareness about non-drug therapy, provision of rapid diagnostic tests especially at the side laboratory etc.^{8,24} This study employed the use of a two-phased educational intervention. Studies have shown that successful educational interventions

are often those which incorporate face-to-face contact and interaction (as opposed to the use of printed literature alone)³⁹ as well as feedbacks with recommendations for change in specific areas.

Following the first phase of intervention conducted in the study area, which lasted for three weeks, the number of drugs prescribed per patient encounter dropped therein from 4.30 to 3.26 ($p < 0.05$); while that in the control area slightly increased from 3.85 to 3.89 drugs per prescription ($p > 0.05$). While the range of prescribed drugs dropped from 1-13 to 1-11 drugs per encounter in the study area, that in the control area remained at 1-10 drugs/encounter. This finding is corroborated by similar studies by Isah *et al* as well as Odusanya and Oyediran in northern and south-western Nigeria, respectively.^{38, 40} In these studies, the average number of drugs per patient reduced from 6 to between 3-5 and from 7.3 ± 2.8 to 6.3 ± 2.3 , respectively. Hogerzeil, Walker *et al*⁴¹ also demonstrated a fall in the number of drugs prescribed per patient among prescribing staff working at peripheral health units in Yemen following the implementation of an essential drugs programme, which included seminars covering issues related to rational drug use. The average number of drugs given per prescription fell to 1.5 in programme areas, while it remained at 2.4 drugs/encounter in control areas. Yemeni averages generally stand at 1.4-1.5 drugs/encounter.^{9, 38} Furthermore, a control study in Uganda by Obua, Ogwai-Okeng *et al* reported a decline in polypharmacy⁴² from 3.3 to 2.8 drugs/patient. In order to further reinforce the gains obtained in the first phase of the intervention and ensure its sustenance, a second phase of educational intervention was conducted among the same health workers in the study area. Following this intervention, the index of interest clearly improved by almost half (over 40% of) its baseline value (of 4.30) to 2.43 drugs/encounter ($p < 0.05$) in the study area; while that in the control area remained relatively stable at 3.82 drugs per prescription ($p > 0.05$). This further affirms the potential of continuing training and education in positively impacting the skills of health workers and enhancing the quality of their prescribing practice. Follow-up interventions of such nature as well as other measures, as reported by other researchers, are proven means of sustaining recorded improvements.^{38, 43}

Conclusion

Findings obtained from this study reveal the existence of polypharmacy among rural PHC workers. Although the final value of 2.43 drugs/encounter obtained in this study (figure 1) is slightly above the international average of 2.2 drugs⁹ and the derived standard value for the mean number of drugs per patient encounter in Nigeria (1.6- 1.8 drugs)⁶, nonetheless, it still establishes the role of educational intervention in addressing, curbing and reversing the trend of the habitual practice of polypharmacy among this cadre of healthcare workers. Furthermore, it underscores the relevance of continuing medical education (CME) and enlightenment or awareness creation among health workers, as an effective tool in securing the gains attained from various measures of intervention and enshrining best practices.

References

1. Schmidt RF and Willis WD. Pharmacotherapy in: *Encyclopedia of Pain* 2007; by Springer Berlin Heidelberg- pg 1815 (Print ISBN: 978-3-540-43957-8; DOI:10.1007/978-3-540-29805-2_3324)
2. Armahizer MJ, Kane-Gill SL, Smithburger PL, Anthes AM and Seybert AL. Comparing drug-drug interaction severity ratings between bedside clinicians and proprietary databases. *ISRN Criti Care* 2013; 2013:1-6 pages, Article ID 347346
3. Terrie YC. Understanding and managing polypharmacy in the elderly. *Pharmacy Times* 2004 [<http://www.pharmacytimes.com/publications/issue/2004/2004-12/2004-12-9094>]
4. Anastasio GD and Little JM. Pharmaceutical marketing: implications for medical residency training. *J of Hum Pharmacol & Drug Therap* 1996; **16**:103–7 (doi:10.1002/j.1875-9114.1996.tb02922.x)
5. Holloway K and Dijk E. The World Medicines Situation 2011- Rational use of medicines 3rd Ed. Geneva, World Health Organization, 2011 (WHO/EMP/MIE/2011.2.2)
6. Adebayo ET and Hussain NA. Pattern of prescription drug use in Nigerian army hospitals. *Ann of Afri Med* 2010; **9**(3):152-8
7. Isah AO, Ross-Degnan D, Quick J, Laing R, Mabadeje AFB *et al*. The development of standard values for the WHO drug use prescribing indicators. INRUD - Nigeria1, Support Group2 (DAP - WHO3) Geneva: World Health Organization International Conferences on Improving Use of Medicines (ICIUM), 1997
8. Odusanya OO. Drug use indicators at a secondary health care facility in Lagos, Nigeria. *J of Comm Med & PHC* 2004; **16**(1):21-4
9. Pavin M, Nurgozhin T, Hafner G, Yusufy F and Laing R. Prescribing practices of rural primary health care physicians in Uzbekistan. *Trop Med & Int'l Health* 2003; **8**: 182–190
10. Omole VN, Mora AT, Yunusa IU, Audu O, Jatau AI and Gobir AA. Knowledge, attitude and perception of the referral system among tertiary healthcare workers in Kaduna metropolis, Nigeria. *Int'l J of Med Sci and Pub Health* 2017; **6**(10):1481-88
11. Ebuehi OM and Campbell PC. Attraction and retention of qualified health workers to rural areas in Nigeria: a case study of four LGAs in Ogun State, Nigeria. *Int'l Elec J of Rural & Remote Health, Res, Educ, Pract & Pol* (Internet) 2011; **11**:1515

[Available: <http://www.rrh.org.au/articles/subviewnew.asp?ArticleID=1515>]

12. Ayuba IGU and Wash PM. An assessment of the provision and Distribution of health facilities in Bukuru town, Plateau State, Nigeria. *J of Health, Med and Nurs* 2016; **24**:99-110
13. Azeredo TB, Luiza VL, Oliveira MA, Emmerick ICM and Bigdeli M. Stakeholders' perspectives on access-to-medicines policy and research priorities in Latin America and the Caribbean: face-to-face and web-based interviews. *Health Res Policy Sys* 2014; **12**: 31 [<https://doi.org/10.1186/1478-4505-12-31>]
14. World Health Organisation (WHO). who.int [internet] Declaration of Alma-Ata. 1978. http://www.who.int/hpr/NPH/docs/declaration_almaata.pdf
15. Dixit R, Vinay M, Jayasree T, Ubedulla S, Manohar VS and Chandrasekhar N. Availability of essential medicines: A primary health care perspective. *Ind J Pharmacol* 2011; **43**(5): 599–600.
16. Foster SD. Improving the supply and use of essential drugs in sub-Saharan Africa. *Policy, Research and External Affairs working papers* 1990; no. WPS 456. Population, health, and nutrition. Washington, DC: World Bank. [<http://documents.worldbank.org/curated/en/256231468767655523/Improving-the-supply-and-use-of-essential-drugs-in-sub-Saharan-Africa>]
17. Nakyanzi JK, Kitutu FE, Oria H and Kambaa PF. Lessons from the field: expiry of medicines in supply outlets in Uganda. *Bull World Health Organ* 2010; **88**:154–58 (doi:10.2471/BLT.08.057471)
18. World Health Organisation (WHO). Promoting rational use of medicines: Core components. [<http://apps.who.int/medicinedocs/en/d/Jh3011e/2.html>]
19. Adisa R, Fakeye TO and Aindero VO. Evaluation of prescription pattern and patients' opinion on healthcare practices in selected primary healthcare facilities in Ibadan, south-western Nigeria. *Afric Health Sci* 2015; **15**(4):1318-29
20. Babalola CP, Awolaye SA, Akinyemi JO and Kotila OA. Evaluation of prescription pattern in Osun State (south-west) Nigeria. *J of Pub Health and Epid* 2011; **3**(3):94-8 [<http://www.academicjournals.org/jphe>]
21. Ofori-Asenso R, Brhlikova P and Pollock AM. Prescribing indicators at primary health care centers within the WHO African region: a systematic analysis (1995–2015). *BMC Pub Health* 2016; 16:724 [<https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-016-3428-8>]

22. Hogerzeil HV, Bimo, Ross-Degnan D, Laing RO, Ofori-Adjei D, Santoso B, Azad Chowdhury AK, Das AM, Kafle KK, Mabadeje AFB and Massele AY. Field tests for rational drug use in twelve developing countries. *Lancet* 1993; 342:1408-10
23. Bosu WK and Ofori-Adjei D. An audit of prescribing practices in health care facilities of the Wassa West district of Ghana. *West Afr J Med* 2000; 19(4):298-303
24. Desalegn AA. Assessment of drug use pattern using WHO prescribing indicators at Hawassa University teaching and referral hospital, south Ethiopia: a cross-sectional study. *BMC Health Serv Res* 2013; 13:170 [<https://doi.org/10.1186/1472-6963-13-170>]
25. Ministry of Health/Zimbabwe Essential Drugs Action Programme: Essential Drugs Survey. How to investigate drug use in health facilities. 1993, WHO: Geneva, 74(WHO/DAP/93.1)
26. Bannenberg WJ, Forshaw CJ, Fresle D, Salami AO and Wahab HA: Evaluation of the Nile province essential drug project. 1991, WHO: Geneva, WHO/DAP/91.10. In: How to investigate drug use in health facilities. Geneva, WHO, 1993: 74(WHO/DAP/93.1)
27. Erah PO, Olumide GO and Okhamafe AO. Prescribing practices in two health care facilities in Warri, southern Nigeria: A comparative study. *Trop J of Pharmaceut Res* 2003; 2(1): 175-82
28. Somerekun R and Omitiran B. Factors affecting physicians' prescription and pattern of prescription in the management of secondary infertility. *Afr J of Pharm & Pharmacol* 2014; 8(48):1205-12
29. O'Dwyer M, Peklar J, McCallion P, McCarron M and Henman MC. Factors associated with polypharmacy and excessive polypharmacy in older people with intellectual disability differ from the general population: a cross-sectional observational nationwide study. *BMJ Open* 2016; 6:e010505. doi:10.1136/bmjopen-2015-010505
30. van der Geest S, Whyte SR and Haradon A. The anthropology of pharmaceuticals: a biographical approach. *Ann Review of Anthropol* 1996; 25:153-78
31. de-Graft Aikins A, Unwin N, Agyemang C, Allotey P, Campbell C and Arhinful D. Tackling Africa's chronic disease burden: from the local to the global. *Glob and Health* 2010; 6:5 [<https://doi.org/10.1186/1744-8603-6-5>]

32. Isah H. Prescription pattern among primary care providers in Catholic-church-owned primary health care facilities in the Northern Ecclesiastical provinces of Abuja, Jos and Kaduna, Nigeria: Preliminary findings. *J Pharm Allied Sci* 2008; 5(2).
33. World Health Organization. WHO medicines strategy 2004–2007: countries at the core. Geneva: World Health Organization; 2004. WHO/EDM.2004.2
34. Holloway KA, Gautam BR and Reeves B. The effects of different kinds of user fee on prescribing quality in rural Nepal. *J of Clin Epid* 2001; 54(10):1065-71.
35. Abdulraheem IS, Oladipo AR and Amodu MO. Primary health care services in Nigeria: critical issues and strategies for enhancing the use by the rural communities. *J of Pub Health and Epid* 2012; 4(1):5–13
36. Chalker J. Promoting rational prescribing in “MDS-3: Managing access to medicines and health technologies”. Management Sciences for Health 2012, Arlington, VA, USA.
37. le Grand A, Hogerzeil HV and Haaijer-Ruskamp FM. Interventional research in rational use of drugs: a review. *Health Pol and Plann* 1999; 14(2):89-102
38. Isah HO, Olorunsaiye C and Ebisike MC. Improving rational drug prescription practice: Outcome of a training intervention program on rational drug prescription among care providers in Catholic Church PHC facilities in northern Nigeria. *Sahel Med J* 2011; 14(2):85-93
39. Anderson GM and Lexchin J. Strategies for improving prescribing practice. *Can Med Assoc J* 1996; 154(7):1013-17
40. Odusanya O and Oyediran MA. The effect of an educational intervention on improving rational drug use. *Nig Post-grad Med J* 2004; 11(2):126-31
41. Hogerzeil HV, Walker GJA, Sallami AO and Fernando G: Impact of an essential drugs program on availability and rational use of drugs. *Lancet* 1989; 1 (8630): 141-2
42. Obua C, Ogwal-Okeng JW, Waako P, Aupont O and Ross-Degnan D. Impact of an educational intervention to improve prescribing by private physicians in Uganda. *East Afr Med J* 2004; 81(2):S17-24.

459 43. Ajemigbitse AA, Omole MK and Erhun WO. Effect of providing feedback and prescribing
460 education on prescription writing: An intervention study. *Ann Afr Med* 2016; 15(1):1–6.
461
462

463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473