ORIGINAL ARTICLE

Prescribing pattern of antidiabetic drugs in type II diabetes mellitus in tertiary care hospital

¹Ravin Vijay R, ²Parashivamurthy B M

¹Postgraduate cum Tutor, ²Professor and Head, Department of Pharmacology, Government Medical College Mysore,Irwin Road, Mysuru, Karnataka, India

ABSTRACT:

Aim: To assess prescribing pattern of antidiabetic drugs in type II diabetes mellitus in tertiary care hospital. **Methodology:** One hundred forty type II diabetes mellitus patients of both genders were enrolled for the study. Medical history, diabetes duration, family history, prescribed antidiabetic drugs, coexisting diseases, and concomitant medications were gathered. **Results:** Out of 140 patients, males were 80 (57.1%) and females were 60 (42.9%). Common drugs prescribed were metformin (31%), glimepiride (29%), pioglitazone (8%), miglitol (10%), pioglitazone+ metformin (3%), glimepiride+ metformin (15%) and pioglitazone+ glimepiride (4%). The difference was significant (P< 0.05). 1 drug was prescribed in 78% of prescriptions consisting of oral antidiabetic drugs only, 2 drugs were prescribed in 16% of prescriptions with 15% containing oral antidiabetic drugs and 1% containing insulin, 3 drugs were prescribed in 2% of prescriptions with all containing oral antidiabetic drugs only. **Conclusion:** Mostcommon antidiabetic drugs prescribed were metformin, glimepiride, pioglitazone+ metformin, glimepiride, pioglitazone+ metformin, glimepiride, pioglitazone+ glimepiride, pioglitazone+ glimepiride, pioglitazone+ metformin, glimepiride+ metformin and pioglitazone+ glimepiride. **Key words:** Diabetes, metformin, glimepiride, pioglitazone

Corresponding author: Ravin Vijay R, Postgraduate cum Tutor, Department of Pharmacology, Government Medical College Mysore, Irwin Road, Mysuru, Karnataka, India

This article may be cited as: R Ravin V, BM Parashivamurthy. Prescribing pattern of antidiabetic drugs in type II diabetes mellitus in tertiary care hospital. J Adv Med Dent Scie Res 2016;4(1):212-215.

INTRODUCTION

Diabetes is a chronic disease characterised by unusually high blood sugar (glucose) levels. The pancreas produces insulin, which decreases blood sugar. Diabetes is brought on by a lack of insulin or its inadequate production.¹ Diabetes symptoms include increased urination, thirst, appetite, and weariness. Testing for blood sugar (glucose) can identify diabetes. Both acute and chronic diabetes problems are the main ones.² Chronic problems are linked to illnesses of the blood vessels (both small and large), which can harm the eye, kidneys, nerves, and heart. Acute complications include dangerously raised blood sugar and unusually low blood sugar as a result of diabetic treatments.³

Type 2 diabetes develops when the body becomes resistant to the effects of insulin or doesn't produce enough insulin to maintain normal blood sugar levels. It is often associated with lifestyle factors such as obesity, physical inactivity, and poor diet. Type 2 diabetes can be managed through lifestyle modifications, such as a healthy diet, regular exercise, weight management, and, in some cases, medication or insulin therapy.⁴

There are several classes of anti-diabetic drugs used to manage diabetes, and the choice of medication depends on the type of diabetes, individual health factors, and other considerations. A clinician's prescription represents the prescriber's perspective on the disease and the drug's role in treatment.⁵ Additionally, it sheds light on the makeup of the healthcare delivery system. Drug utilisation studies' (DUS) main goal is to encourage the population's responsible drug use. Drug therapy must be optimised with the use of drug utilisation studies.⁶ We performed this study to assess prescribing pattern of antidiabetic drugs in type II diabetes mellitus in tertiary care hospital.

METHODOLOGY

After considering the utility of the study and obtaining approval from ethical review committee, we selected one hundred forty type II diabetes mellitus patients of both genders. Patients' consent was obtained before starting the study. Ethical approval for the study was also obtained from institutional review committee.

Data such as name, age, gender etc. was recorded. Demographic information, medical history, diabetes duration, family history, prescribed antidiabetic drugs, coexisting diseases, and concomitant medications were gathered. The results were compiled and subjected for statistical analysis using Mann Whitney U test. P value less than 0.05 was set significant.

RESULTS Table I Patients distribution

| Total- 140 | | | | |
|------------|------------|------------|--|--|
| Gender | Males | Females | | |
| Number (%) | 80 (57.1%) | 60 (42.9%) | | |

Table I shows that out of 140 patients, males were 80 (57.1%) and females were 60 (42.9%) (Table I).

Table II Percentage of drugs prescribed

| Drugs | Percentage | P value |
|---------------------------|------------|---------|
| Metformin | 31% | 0.05 |
| Glimepiride | 29% | |
| Pioglitazone | 8% | |
| Miglitol | 10% | |
| Pioglitazone+ Metformin | 3% | |
| Glimepiride+ Metformin | 15% | |
| Pioglitazone+ Glimepiride | 4% | |

Table II, graph I shows that common drugs prescribed were metformin (31%), glimepiride (29%), pioglitazone (8%), miglitol (10%), pioglitazone+ metformin (3%), glimepiride+ metformin (15%) and pioglitazone+ glimepiride (4%). The difference was significant (P < 0.05) (Table II, graph I).

Graph I Percentage of drugs prescribed



Table III Description of drugs present in each prescription

| No. of drugs per prescription | No of prescriptions (%) | No of prescriptions containing oral antidiabetic drugs (%) | No of prescription containing insulin (%) |
|----------------------------------|----------------------------|---|--|
| 1 | 78 | 78 | 0 |
| 2 | 16 | 15 | 1 |
| 3 | 4 | 3 | 1 |
| 4 | 2 | 2 | 0 |

1 drug was prescribed in 78% of prescriptions consisting of oral antidiabetic drugs only, 2 drugs were prescribed in 16% of prescriptions with 15% containing oral antidiabetic drugs and 1% containing insulin, 3 drugs were prescribedin 4% of prescriptions with3% containing oral antidiabetic drugs and 1% containing insulin, 4 drugs were prescribed in 2% of prescriptions with all containing oral antidiabetic drugs only (Table III).

DISCUSSION

When weight loss, a diabetic diet, and exercise fail to manage the increased blood sugar levels, oral medicines are used to treat type 2diabetes. Insulin medicines are taken into consideration if oral treatments are still insufficient.⁷ One of the main causes of kidney failure is diabetes, however the prevalence of the condition varies between populations and is also correlated with the severity and prognosis of the illness. According to estimates, 135 million individuals had diabetes worldwide in 1995, and by 2025, at least 30 million more people are anticipated to have the disease.^{8,9} Studies on drug use are effective exploratory methods for determining the place of drugs in society. These studies provide a solid sociomedical and health economic foundation for making decisions about healthcare.^{10,11} We performed this study to assess prescribing pattern of antidiabetic drugs in type II diabetes mellitus in tertiary care hospital.

Metformin is a drug that is frequently recommended for type 2 diabetes. It functions by lowering liver glucose synthesis, raising insulin sensitivity, and enhancing muscle glucose absorption. Typically taken orally, metformin can also be used with other medications.¹² A hormone called insulin aids in controlling blood sugar levels. Insulin is usually necessary for those with type 1 diabetes, and it may also be administered for some people with type 2 diabetes when other drugs are insufficient. Typically, a syringe, insulin pen, or insulin pump are used to inject insulin under the skin.¹³

We found that out of 140 patients, males were 80 (57.1%) and females were 60 (42.9%). Alex et al¹⁴analysed the anti-diabetic drug use patterns in diabetic outpatients and kept track of any adverse drug reactions (ADRs) brought on by anti-diabetic therapy. Of the 197 diabetic patients, 99 (50.3%) were men. Most patients (36.5%) had a history of diabetes for less than five years, and the majority of patients (39.6%) fell into the 51–60 age range. Metformin was the medication that was most frequently administered (68%), and then the sulfonylurea class of medications (49.7%). Patient usage of insulin preparations was almost 42%, with 30.4% of patients using biphasic isophane human insulin. The majority of the patients (58.4%) were receiving multidrug therapy, and approximately 40% were receiving two medication regimens. The most frequently prescribed single medication was metformin (18.8%), and the most frequently prescribed dual medication (13.2%) was glimepiride plus metformin.

In our study common drugs prescribed were metformin (31%), glimepiride (29%), pioglitazone (8%), miglitol (10%), pioglitazone+ metformin (3%), glimepiride+ metformin (15%) and pioglitazone+ glimepiride (4%). Agarwal et al¹⁵ found that an average of 1.4 anti-diabetic medications were prescribed each prescription. The most frequently given class of oral hypoglycemic agents (OHA) was sulfonylureas, whereas the most frequently prescribed individual medicine was metformin (biguanide). It was customary to give a fixed-dose combination of biguanide and sulfonylurea. Monotherapy outperformed polytherapy, and Type 2 diabetes used insulin at a higher rate. Among patients on antidiabetic medication, only 41% had ideal glycemic control. A statistically significant relationship existed between anti-diabetic medication and lifestyle changes for glycemic management.

It was found in our study that 1 drug was prescribed in 78% of prescriptions consisting of oral antidiabetic drugs only, 2 drugs were prescribed in 16% of prescriptions with 15% containing oral antidiabetic drugs and 1% containing insulin, 3 drugs were prescribed in 4% of prescriptions with 3% containing oral antidiabetic drugs and 1% containing insulin, 4 drugs were prescribed in 2% of prescriptions with all containing oral antidiabetic drugs only. Vengurlekar et al¹⁶ found that the highest prescription rates for the various available anti-diabetic medications were found to be for metformin (27%) and glimepiride (22.60%).Glimepride (22.60%)sulfonvlurea category), metformin (27%, biguanide category), and pioglitazones (13.90%, glitazone category) are the most commonly prescribed medications in terms of category. Prescriptions for insulin were found to be extremely low (4.5%). The most frequent prescription (20.86%) was for a metformin and glimepiride combination. Hypertension was shown to be the condition most frequently linked to diabetes mellitus (35%). The age range of 51 to 60 was shown to have the highest prevalence of disease, followed by the age group of 41 to 50. It was discovered that male patients (66.36%) outnumbered female patients (33.64%).

CONCLUSION

Mostcommon antidiabetic drugs prescribed were metformin, glimepiride, pioglitazone, miglitol, pioglitazone+ metformin, glimepiride+ metformin and pioglitazone+ glimepiride.

REFERENCES

- 1. Patel B, Oza B, Patel KP, Malhotra SD, Patel VJ. Pattern of antidiabetic drugs use in type 2 diabetic patients in a medicine outpatient clinic of a tertiary care teaching hospital. Int J Basic Clin Pharmacol2013;2:485-91.
- Sivasankari V, Manivannan E, Priyadarsini SP. Drug utilization pattern of anti- diabetic drugs in a rural area of Tamil Nadu, South India - A prospective, observational study. Int J Pharm Bio Sci 2013;4:514-9.
- Alam MS, Aqil M, Qadry SA, Kapur P, Pillai KK. Utilization pattern of oral hypoglycemic agents for diabetes mellitus type 2 patients attending out-patient department at a university hospital in New Delhi. Pharmacol Pharm 2014;5:636-45.
- 4. Mendes AB, Fittipaldi JA, Neves RC, Chacra AR, Moreira ED., Jr Prevalence and correlates of inadequate glycaemic control: Results from a nationwide survey in 6,671 adults with diabetes in Brazil. Acta Diabetol. 2010;47:137–45.
- Raheja BS, Kapur A, Bhoraskar A, Sathe SR, Jorgensen LN, Moorthi SR, et al. Diab Care Asia – India Study: Diabetes care in India – current status. J Assoc Physicians India. 2001;49:717–22.
- Nagpal J, Bhartia A. Quality of diabetes care in the middle- and high-income group populace: The Delhi Diabetes Community (DEDICOM) survey. Diabetes Care. 2006;29:2341–8.
- 7. Dave DJ, Dikshit RK, Gandhi AM. Utilization of some newer oral antidiabetic agents in a tertiary care

hospital. Nat J Physiol Pharm Pharmacol. 2012;2(2):146-51.

- Kumar KS, Sreeramya G, Krishna KM, Nalini K, Kiranmai N, Vasavi P. Drug use pattern study of antidiabetics in type 2 diabetes mellitus at a tertiary care hospital in Tenali, Andhra Pradesh. Int J Inv Pharm Sci. 2013;1:162-6.
- Sivasankari V, Manivannan E, Priyadarsini SP. Drug utilization pattern of anti-diabetic drugs in a rural area of Tamil Nadu, South India- a prospective, observational study. Int J Pharm Bio Sci. 2013;4:514-9.
- Meneilly GS, Elliott T, Tessier D, Hards L, Tildesley H. NIDDM in the elderly. Diabetes Care. 1996;19(12):1320-5.
- Adibe MO, Aguwa CN, Ukwe CV, Okonta JM, Udeogaranya PO. Outpatient utilization of anti-diabetic drugs in the South Eastern Nigeria. Int J Drug Dev Res. 2009;1:27–36.
- 12. Hasamnis A, Patil S. Prescription pattern study in type 2 diabetes mellitus in an Indian referral hospital. Internet J Pharmacol. 2009;7:1.

- Lafata JE, Dobie EA, Divine GW, Ulcickas Yood ME, McCarthy BD. Sustained hyperglycemia among patients with diabetes: What matters when action is needed? Diabetes Care. 2009;32:1447–52.
- Alex SM, Sreelekshmi BS, Smitha S, Jiji KN, Menon AS, Uma Devi P. Drug utilization pattern of antidiabetic drugs among diabetic outpatients in a tertiary care hospital. Asian Journal of Pharmaceutical and Clinical Research. 2015;8(2):144-6.
- 15. Agarwal AA, Jadhav PR, Deshmukh YA. Prescribing pattern and efficacy of anti-diabetic drugs in maintaining optimal glycemic levels in diabetic patients. Journal of basic and clinical pharmacy. 2014 Jun;5(3):79.
- Vengurlekar S, Shukla P, Patidar P, Bafna R, Jain S. Prescribing pattern of antidiabetic drugs in Indore city hospital. Indian journal of pharmaceutical sciences. 2008 Sep;70(5):637.