International Journal of Pharmacy and Pharmaceutical Research (IJPPR)
Volume 31, Issue 4, April 2025 **ijppr.humanjournals.com** ISSN: 2349-7203

Pharmacoeconomics: Assessing the Economic Impact of Drug Therapies in Modern Healthcare

Sanskar Gupta[1], Saumya Singh[2], *Sagar Singh[3], Esha Yadav[4], Rahul Dev[5]

1. B. Pharm Scholar, Department of Pharmacy, Axis Institute of Pharmacy, Kanpur, Uttar Pradesh, India.
2. B. Pharm Scholar, Department of Pharmacy, Axis Institute of Pharmacy, Kanpur, Uttar Pradesh, India.
3. *Assistant Professor, Department of Pharmacology, Axis Institute of Pharmacy, Kanpur, Uttar Pradesh, India.
4. Head of Department, Axis Institute of Pharmacy, Kanpur, Uttar Pradesh, India.
5. Associate Professor, Department of Pharmaceutics, Axis Institute of Pharmacy, Kanpur, Uttar Pradesh, India.

Received: 2025-4-05 Revised: 2025-4-17 Accepted: 2025-4-25

ABSTRACT

Pharmacoeconomics is now accepted as a standard discipline in the contemporary health care sector, as it deals with assessing the economic benefits and costs of drug therapies to the health care system, patients and society. In this review, we present a complete study on pharmacoeconomics, covering its basic methodologies, applications, obstacles, and future directions. It has become increasingly important to justify health economic evaluations comparing the costs, benefits and outcomes of different interventions in a world where the cost of health care is escalating. In addition to compliance, other tools of pharmacoeconomics such as Cost-Effectiveness Analysis (CEA), Cost-Utility Analysis (CUA) and Cost-Benefit Analysis (CBA) are employed in decision-making related to drug pricing, reimbursement and inclusion in formularies. In this review, our primary aim was to explain the basic concepts of pharmacoeconomics and its application in different health care sectors, as well as highlight challenges and limitations which affect the utility of pharmacoeconomics. In this special report, future trends such as the utilization of real-world evidence (RWE), the adaption of pharmacoeconomic models for precision medicine, and an expanded role for guideline developers to provide recommendations on equitable reallocation of resources to ensure sustainability of health systems are discussed.. It can be concluded from this review that pharmacoeconomics is a discipline that cannot be ignored in healthcare planning. However, there is still much work needed to improve its methods so that they can foster more reliable decision-making within a rapidly- changing health system.

Keywords: Pharmacoeconomics, Cost effective, Health care, Health system, Drug

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Definition and Scope

In health economics, pharmacoeconomics is the area that assesses the value and cost of pharmaceutical goods and services. It focuses on evaluating how medications and treatments affect healthcare systems, specific individuals, and society as a whole financially[1]. In order to assist stakeholders make educated decisions about the best therapeutic alternatives, this area integrates the concepts of economics and pharmacy to examine the cost-effectiveness, cost-utility, and cost-benefit of medicinal therapies. Pharmacoeconomics is essential to healthcare because it helps with decisions on which therapies to put in formularies, how best to use resources, and how to strike a balance between therapeutic results and financial limitations. Making decisions about medication therapy that take the economy into account is crucial to making the most use of the few available healthcare resources[2]. Decision-makers can determine therapies that offer the most benefit to patients at the lowest cost by evaluating the prices and results of various treatments. These assessments assist in deciding whether investments in novel and current drugs are worthwhile based not just on their clinical efficacy but also on their financial impact[3]. Given the current strains on budgets and the growing cost of medications, this is especially crucial. Making well-informed decisions can result in enhanced patient access to essential drugs, optimal use of available resources, and better health outcomes.

Key roles of pharmacoeconomics in healthcare include pharmacoeconomics optimizes resource allocation, directs policy choices, and enhances patient outcomes, among other critical functions it performs in healthcare. It ensures that treatments deliver the best value for money by assisting legislators and healthcare professionals in assessing the cost-effectiveness of medications and therapies[4]. Drug formularies are developed with pharmacoeconomics in mind, which aids in the prioritization of drugs that offer both therapeutic and financial advantages. Furthermore, it facilitates decision-making about costs, insurance, and therapy accessibility, especially in public health systems with constrained funding. Pharmacoeconomics ultimately promotes more effective

healthcare delivery by weighing the expenses of therapies against their overall effects on patient health and the sustainability of the system[5].

1.2 Importance of economic evaluations in drug therapy decision-making

Economic analyses play a crucial role in drug therapy decision-making, helping healthcare systems to maximize patient outcomes while allocating resources effectively[6]. Economic assessments offer a structured method to evaluate the value of medications and treatments in relation to their prices as healthcare expenses continue to climb internationally, particularly with the rising cost of new and innovative medicines. These assessments give information on the most economical choices, assisting payers, healthcare providers, and legislators in making defensible choices regarding the medicines that should be approved for funding[7]. This is crucial for sustaining the general sustainability of healthcare systems as well asfor the care of individual patients. Cost-effectiveness analysis (CEA), cost-utility analysis (CUA), and cost-benefit analysis (CBA) are three of the many approaches often used in economic assessments to evaluate medicinal interventions. All these methods assess the health outcomes that a therapy delivers in addition to the direct and indirect expenses related to that treatment. Through the use of metrics such as life years gained or changes in particular clinical outcomes, CEA evaluates the cost-effectiveness of various interventions[8]. The quality-adjusted life year (QALY), which combines the quantity and quality of life brought about by a therapy, is a common metric used in CUA, which adopts a more comprehensive approach by include measurements of patient quality of life. Through the financial worth of its results—like fewer hospital stays or increased productivity—in relation to its expenses, CBA evaluates the therapy's total economic advantage[9].

The capacity to rank therapies that provide the best return on investment is the main benefit of using these assessments when making decisions about medication therapy. Economic assessments assist in ensuring that resources are allocated to therapies that not only enhance patient health but also do so in a way that is fiscally responsible, particularly in systems that receive public funding[10]. For example, a novel medication could provide a slight therapeutic advantage over current therapies, but at a comparatively greater expense. A more logical and open decision-making process can result from using an economic evaluation to assess if the increased benefit justifies the higher expense. Additionally, economic analyses are essential to guaranteeing that everyone has access to healthcare. Economic assessments can assist in lowering the cost of successful treatments and increasing their accessibility to a larger population by highlighting therapies that offer the best value[11].Because healthcare resources are more scarce in low- and middle-income nations and because high medication prices can seriously impede patients' access to life-saving treatments, this is especially crucial. By emphasizing affordable options, economic analyses may direct healthcare policy in a way that guarantees patients receive the best care possible without financially taxing the system excessively[12]. Furthermore, while determining medication costs and reimbursement rates, authorities and pharmaceutical corporations alike rely heavily on economic analyses. They offer a concise, fact-based justification for price choices, which can assist in preventing exorbitant pricing and guaranteeing equitable reward for innovation[13]. These assessments are also used by payers and insurers to establish coverage policies, including which medications to add to their formularies and under what circumstances. For example, expensive medications could only be prescribed to people with particular ailments or illness stages, when the financial and medical advantages are greatest[14]. They allow healthcare systems to maximize resource utilization, balance costs with patient outcomes, and guarantee equal access to medicines, economic assessments are essential for making decisions about medication therapy. Economic assessments support the long-term sustainability of healthcare systems and better patient care by offering a systematic method for evaluating the value of medicines to payers, legislators, and healthcare providers[15].

2. Historical Context and Evolution

The growth of healthcare economics and the increasing complexity of contemporary healthcare systems are closely linked to the historical background and progress of pharmacoeconomics. The evaluation of the financial effects of healthcare treatments dates back to the middle of the 20th century, when governments and public health groups started to face the rising expenses of providing healthcare[16]. There was a growing realization in the post-World War II era that clinical effectiveness alone could not be the only factor considered when making medical choices, particularly in nations with publically financed healthcare systems such as the National Health Service (NHS) of the United Kingdom. The necessity to take the economic effects of medical procedures into account became increasingly urgent as healthcare costs increased quickly to keep up with population expansion, improvements in medicine, and rising public expectations[17].

These forces led to the development of pharmacoeconomics as a separate science, especially starting in the 1970s when the price of medications started to take a bigger share of healthcare spending[18]. The demand for more systematic methods to evaluate the economic impact of medicinal therapy arose from the introduction of novel, frequently costly medications as well as the growing emphasis on healthcare systems' cost control. The word "pharmacoeconomics" was first used in this sense to refer to the particular study of the financial elements of pharmaceuticals, with an emphasis on weighing the advantages and disadvantages of medication therapy in terms of their financial worth as well as their potential effects on patients[19].

The subject of pharmacoeconomics had tremendous expansion in the 1980s and 1990s. The approaches employed in economic assessments of pharmacological therapy were formalized during this period thanks to a number of seminal research and publications. Specifically, a framework for evaluating the relative costs and health outcomes of various therapies was made available by the expanding applications of cost-effectiveness analysis (CEA) and cost-utility analysis (CUA)[20]. Healthcare decision-makers were able to evaluate a drug's effectiveness in improving clinical outcomes as well as its value in relation to its cost thanks to these approaches, which frequently included metrics like quality-adjusted life years (QALYs)[21].

During this period, pharmacoeconomic studies emerged as a crucial component of many nations' drug approval processes, impacting choices on the inclusion of new medications in public formularies and insurance coverage. The 1990s saw a significant advancement in pharmacoeconomics as the idea of "value for money" in healthcare started to take off. Pharmacoeconomic analyses have become more and more important in helping governments and healthcare organizations across the world make policy decisions as a result of growing healthcare expenses and tight budgets[22]. Pharmacoeconomic analyses, for instance, were adopted by health maintenance organizations (HMOs) and other managed care organizations in the United States to help them choose which medications to add to their formularies[23]. Analogously, the establishment of the National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE) in the United Kingdom in 1999 signified a pivotal point in the institutionalization of pharmacoeconomics. In order to make sure that healthcare resources were used effectively, NICE was entrusted with assessing the cost-effectiveness of new medications and providing recommendations for their usage within the NHS[24]. The emergence of expensive specialty medications like biologics and gene treatments, as well as the growing complexity of healthcare delivery, drove the continuous evolution of pharmacoeconomics in the twenty-first century. Robust pharmacoeconomic assessments were more crucial as the cost of these novel medications skyrocketed to make sure they provided excellent value for money[25]. In many countries, health technology assessments (HTAs) have become standard practice. HTAs provide a thorough assessment of the clinical, economic, and social implications of new healthcare technologies. They frequently include pharmacoeconomic evaluations. In pharmacoeconomic analysis, real-world evidence (RWE)—derived from actual clinical practice as opposed to controlled clinical trials—became a crucial tool for more precise evaluations of a drug's efficacy and value in routine clinical settings[26].

Broader developments in healthcare, such as the increasing focus on patient-centered treatment, were also mirrored in the development of pharmacoeconomics. In order to ensure that the economic value of a therapy is evaluated not just in terms of clinical results but also in terms of its influence on patients' general well-being, modern pharmacoeconomic assessments increasingly take patient preferences and quality of life metrics into account. This change acknowledges that a drug's real worth comes from its capacity to do more than just cure a condition; it also comes from its capacity to enhance patients' quality of life and lessen their overall medical burden[27]. Pharmacoeconomics, formerly a specialized field of study, has become an essential part of healthcare decision-making due to the necessity to strike a balance between clinical effectiveness and long-term financial viability. Its evolution has paralleled more significant shifts in the healthcare industry, such as the emergence of high-priced treatments, the intensifying emphasis on patient-centered care, and the intensification of cost reduction demands[28]. Pharmacoeconomics now plays a critical role in guaranteeing the effective use of healthcare resources, assisting in the making of decisions that are advantageous to both individual patients and society at large.

3. Core Concepts in Pharmacoeconomics

Pharmacoeconomics is a branch of economics that focuses on assessing the benefits and drawbacks of pharmaceutical treatments in order to assess their economic viability. Cost- effectiveness analysis (CEA), a fundamental concept, evaluates the relative expenses and clinical results of various therapies. It assists in finding the treatments that yield the most health benefits at the lowest cost[29]. Cost-utility analysis (CUA) is another important idea. U.S. research has shown that drugs can improve a patient's quality of life in addition to their clinical efficacy. A common statistic used by CUA to evaluate the overall value of a therapy is the quality-adjusted life year (QALY), which combines life expectancy and quality of life[30].

Another essential component is cost-benefit analysis (CBA), which uses monetary expressions for both costs and outcomes. This makes it possible to compare the financial expenses of a therapy directly to its economic advantages, such as decreased hospital stays or higher output. Even if it's not as popular, cost-minimization analysis, or CMA, can be applied in situations when two treatments have shown to be equally effective and the main comparison is only about cost. Budget impact analysis (BIA), which evaluates the cost effects of implementing a new medication within a certain healthcare budget and assists decision-makers in allocating resources, is another important idea[31]. Furthermore, direct medical costs like hospital visits and prescription expenditures, as well as indirect costs like missed productivity from sickness, are important factors to take into account in pharmacoeconomic analyses.

These fundamental ideas make it possible for insurers, legislators, and healthcare professionals to make well- informed choices regarding drug selection, cost, and reimbursement[32]. This guarantees that healthcare resources are used effectively and that patients receive treatments that offer the best value in terms of both cost and clinical outcomes.

4. Applications of Pharmacoeconomics

Pharmacoeconomics is widely used in the healthcare industry, especially when making decisions on drug therapy selection, resource allocation, and the creation of healthcare policies[33]. The management of insurance companies' and healthcare systems' formularies is one of its main uses. Pharmacoeconomic analyses evaluate a drug's cost-effectiveness against other therapies in order to determine whether pharmaceuticals should be included in a formulary. Healthcare providers may optimize resource utilization and patient care by ensuring their formularies offer high-value therapies by selecting treatments that deliver the most clinical benefit at the lowest financial cost[34]. Pharmacoeconomics is also used extensively in the setting of medication prices and reimbursements. Pharmacoeconomic studies are used by pharmaceutical firms and healthcare payers to determine the cost of new treatments and to support the extent of their reimbursement. These assessments are frequently used by governments and commercial insurers to decide which drugs, and at what cost, should be covered by health plans[35]. Decision-makers can negotiate fair pricing that takes into account a medicine's therapeutic advantages as well as its financial impact on healthcare systems by evaluating the economic worth of a drug relative to its cost. Pharmacoeconomics is also essential to health technology assessment (HTA), which is how legislators determine the total worth of novel medical technologies, including pharmaceuticals, based on its cost, social impact, and clinical efficacy. The extensive data provided by HTAs—which frequently include pharmacoeconomic evaluations—helps determine whether to embrace novel medicines and how best to integrate them into the current healthcare systems. Pharmacoeconomics is often used in public health systems to allocate resources, particularly in situations when funding is limited. By identifying the therapies that would provide the greatest health benefits at the lowest cost, economic assessments aid in the prioritization of healthcare interventions. This guarantees that the medicines with the most potential to improve population health receive the limited resources available.

To ensure that healthcare professionals make evidence-based decisions that balance clinical outcomes with economic concerns, clinical practice guidelines often use pharmacoeconomic information to propose cost- effective therapies. By guiding decisions that optimize patient benefit and resource use, pharmacoeconomics improves the standard and effectiveness of healthcare delivery in this way.

5. Challenges and Limitations

Despite playing a crucial role in healthcare decision-making, pharmacoeconomics has a number of drawbacks and difficulties that may make implementation more difficult. The disparities in cost data between various healthcare systems and geographical areas represent one of the main obstacles. Drug prices, medical service costs, and treatment results can differ significantly based on a number of variables, including local costs, the healthcare system's infrastructure, and the availability of resources. This unpredictability restricts the findings' worldwide application by making it challenging to generalize the findings of pharmacoeconomic studies across various nations or contexts. Uncertainty in outcome measurement presents another major obstacle. Although clinical endpoints like life years gained or quality-adjusted life years (QALYs) are frequently used in pharmacoeconomics, it is not always easy to evaluate these outcomes. For instance, QALYs make an effort to include both length of life and quality into a single statistic, although this might be subjective given the vast range of patient experiences and preferences. Moreover, the accuracy of long-term outcome forecasts might be dubious since they are occasionally made using clinical data from the short term.

One such potential drawback of pharmacoeconomic analyses is the temporal span that is employed. Particularly for chronic illnesses or preventative medicines, where the entire impact may not be apparent for years, short- term studies may fall short of capturing the benefits or costs of a treatment[36]. However, long-term predictions can also bring uncertainty since they sometimes rely on speculative assumptions about future healthcare expenses and patient outcomes. Furthermore, choices based on pharmacoeconomic analyses that put patient needs second to cost reductions raise ethical questions. A focus too much on cost-effectiveness runs the danger of limiting access to costly, but possibly life-saving, therapies, which raises questions of equality and fairness. This can be particularly troublesome in situations when expensive therapies are the only ones accessible for certain severe or uncommon ailments. Pharmacoeconomic studies that are sponsored or carried out by pharmaceutical corporations with a stake in the results may occasionally have conflicts of interest, because of the potential for skewed outcomes, it is crucial to carefully examine the methodology and funding sources of these studies in order to guarantee their neutrality and reliability. Notwithstanding these difficulties, pharmacoeconomics is still a vital instrument for making decisions about healthcare, but its use must be done carefully, taking into consideration its limits and the environment in which assessments are carried out.

6. Emerging Trends and Future Directions

New developments in pharmacoeconomics are a reflection of the expanding complexity of healthcare systems, technological breakthroughs, and the need for assessments that are more thorough and patient-focused. The incorporation of real-world evidence (RWE) into pharmacoeconomic research is one noteworthy development. These assessments have historically been based on

information from clinical trials, which are frequently carried out in controlled environments and could not fully reflect how medications function in routine clinical practice. RWE offers more pertinent insights into the true effectiveness and costs of medicines. It is gathered from several sources, including insurance claims data, patient registries, electronic health records (EHRs), and regular healthcare settings. Pharmacoeconomic evaluations that employ RWE can provide more precise estimates of a drug's long-term worth and its effects on various groups, enabling more informed healthcare decisions.

The application of precision pharmacoeconomics and customized medicine is another new trend. An increasing number of people are interested in assessing the financial viability of patient-specific medicines as advancements in genetics and biotechnology facilitate the creation of highly focused therapeutics[37]. The goal of precision pharmacoeconomics is to evaluate the therapeutic benefits of each patients' distinct genetic composition, biomarkers, and clinical features. This method acknowledges that various patient subgroups may respond differently to therapies in terms of efficacy and cost-efficiency. For example, a medication that works very well for a particular genetic mutation may be more economical to treat in individuals who have that mutation than in the overall population. It is anticipated that this customized approach to pharmacoeconomics would become more common as increasingly specialized treatments, such gene therapies and biologics, enter in market.

The future of pharmacoeconomics is also being impacted by the development of digital health technology. Large volumes of data on patient behavior, treatment adherence, and health outcomes are being produced by digital health technologies such as wearable technology, telemedicine, and mobile health apps. By offering continuous, real-time data on how patients respond with medicines, these technologies can improve pharmacoeconomic assessments by enabling more dynamic and responsive economic analyses. Furthermore, because of the growing scrutiny around the cost-effectiveness of digital health treatments in treating chronic illnesses, improving patient outcomes, and lowering healthcare costs, these therapies are also susceptible to pharmacoeconomic review. Value-based pricing and reimbursement schemes represent another area of expanding attention. These approaches,which relate a drug's cost or insurance coverage to its clinical results, are becoming increasingly widespread as healthcare systems try to strike a balance between affordability and innovation. Value-based pricing makes sure that payers are only funding successful therapies by adjusting drug costs in accordance with the real health outcomes they provide[38]. Since pharmacoeconomics provides the foundation for comparing and measuring outcomes in relation to costs, it plays a critical role in these models. Value-based pricing is anticipated to grow as more expensive treatments, especially in cancer and rare illnesses, hit the market; pharmacoeconomic assessments are predicted to play a key role in these agreements.

Pharmacoeconomics is also on the verge of a revolution thanks to machine learning and artificial intelligence (ML and AI). Large, complicated datasets may be analyzed more automatically and effectively with the use of these technologies, which facilitates the identification of patterns, long-term result prediction, and real-time insights into the efficacy of different treatments. Predictive models for economic assessments may be developed with the use of AI and ML, which can assist to lower uncertainty in estimates of future expenses and results. Healthcare systems may make quicker, more accurate judgments regarding pharmacological therapy and budget allocation by incorporating AI and ML into pharmacoeconomic assessments. In pharmacoeconomics, the importance of patient-centered outcomes is growing. Prioritizing clinical outcomes and cost metrics has been the norm for these assessments, but there is a rising understanding of the significance of include patient preferences, experiences, and quality-of-life indicators. This change follows a larger trend in healthcare toward patient- centered care, making sure that economic assessments account for both the effects of therapies on patients' general well-being and clinical efficacy. Decision-makers can gain a more comprehensive picture of the worth of medicines by integrating patient-reported outcomes and preferences into pharmacoeconomic studies.

7. Conclusion

By offering a methodical means of assessing the financial effects of medication treatments, pharmacoeconomics is vital to contemporary healthcare. Making sure that healthcare resources are distributed fairly and effectively requires that decision-makers understand the value of medications in terms of cost-effectiveness, cost-utility, and cost-benefit. It is possible to evaluate the direct costs of medication therapy as well as their wider effects on patient outcomes and total healthcare spending when pharmacoeconomics is incorporated into the decision- making process for healthcare. Pharmacoeconomics is becoming more and more crucial in directing reimbursement choices, developing health policies, and guaranteeing access to efficient therapies in an era of growing healthcare expenses and customized medicine. Pharmacoeconomics importance will grow as healthcare continues to change, especially with the addition of Real-World Evidence (RWE) and sophisticated analytical methods. These advancements will make it easier to evaluate the actual worth of medication therapy across a range of patient demographics and real-world contexts, which will eventually result in more knowledgeable, long-lasting, and patient-centered healthcare decisions.In conclusion, pharmacoeconomics plays a critical role in ensuring that medication treatments provide the most benefit to both patients and health systems by striking a balance between the demands of cost containment and innovation in modern healthcare. Trends including value-based pricing, artificial intelligence, precision medicine, digital health technology, real-world evidence, and patient-centered outcomes are influencing the field of pharmacoeconomics in the future. More informed and fair healthcare decisions are being made possible by these developments, which are improving the pharmacoeconomic assessments' accuracy, relevance, and patient-focus.

Pharmacoeconomics will become more and more important as healthcare systems change to make sure that patients and society receive both clinical and financial benefits.

REFERENCES

1. Rashidian, A., Omidvari, A., Vali, Y., Sturm, H., & Oxman, A. (**2015**). Pharmaceutical policies: effects of financial incentives for prescribers. *The Cochrane database of systematic reviews, 8*, CD006731. https://doi.org/10.1002/14651858.CD006731.
2. Suh, D., Okpara, I., Agnese, W., & Toscani, M. (**2002**). Application of pharmacoeconomics to formulary decision making in managed care organizations. *The American Journal of Managed Care*, 8(2), 161-169.
3. Friedberg, M., Saffran, B., Stinson, T., Nelson, W., & Bennett, C. (**1999**). Evaluation of conflict of interest in economic analyses of new drugs used in oncology. *JAMA, 282*(15), 1453-7. https://doi.org/10.1001/JAMA.282.15.1453 (Friedberg et al., 1999)
4. Freund, D., & Dittus, R. (**2012**).Principles of pharmacoeconomic analysis of drug therapy. *Pharmaco Economics, 1*(20), 20-29. https://doi.org/10.2165/00019053-199201010-00006.
5. Armstrong, E., Akaho, E., & Gondoh, Y. (**1995**). Pharmacoeconomic analysis of drug therapy. *Japanese Journal of Hospital Pharmacy*, 21, 154-165.
https://doi.org/10.5649/JJPHCS1975.21.154 (Armstrong et al., 1995).
6. Deverka, P., Vernon, J., & McLeod, H. (**2010**). Economic opportunities and challenges for pharmacogenomics. *Annual Review of Pharmacology and Toxicology*, 50, 423-437. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.pharmtox.010909.105805
7. Gupta, N., Verma, R., Dhiman, R., Rajsekhar, K., & Prinja, S. (**2020**). Cost-effectiveness analysis and decision modelling: A tutorial for clinicians. *Journal of Clinical and Experimental Hepatology*, 10(2),177- 184.https://DOI:10.1016/j.jceh.2019.11.001.
8. Hlatky, M., Owens, D., & Sanders, G. (**2006**). Cost-effectiveness as an outcome in randomized clinical trials *Clinical Trials*, 3, 543-551.
https://doi.org/10.1177/1740774506073105
9. Kurzrock, R., Goldberg, R., Ceacareanu, A., & Wintrob, Z. (**2019**). The impact of new oncology drugs on disability and health care spending: An assessment of real-world evidence. *Journal of the National Comprehensive Cancer Network.* https://doi.org/10.6004/JNCCN.2018.7253 (Kurzrock et al., 2019)
10. Seixas, B. V., Regier, D., Bryan, S., & Mitton, C. (**2021**). Describing practices of priority setting and resource allocation in publicly funded healthcare systems of high-income countries. *BMC Health Services Research*. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12913-021-06078-z
11. Garrison, L., Jackson, T., Paul, D., & Kenston, M. (**2019**). Value-Based Pricing for Emerging Gene Therapies: The Economic Case for a Higher Cost-Effectiveness Threshold. *Journal of Managed Care & Specialty Pharmacy*, 25(7), 793-799.
DOI:10.18553/jmcp.2019.18378
12. Reeves, A., Gourtsoyannis, Y., Basu, S., McCoy, D., McKee, M., & Stuckler, D. (**2015**). Financing universal health coverage—effects of alternative tax structures on public health systems: Cross-national modelling in 89 low-income and middle-income countries. *The Lancet*, 386, 274-280. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(15)60574-8
13. Hinterhuber, A., & Liozu, S. M. (**2014**). Is innovation in pricing your next source of competitive advantage *Business Horizons*, 57, 413-423.
https://doi.org/10.1016/J.BUSHOR.2014.01.002
14. Shrank, W., Choudhry, N., Liberman, J., & Brennan, T. (**2011**). The use of generic drugs in prevention of chronic disease is far more cost-effective than thought, and may save money. *Health Affairs*, 30(7), 1351-1357. https://doi.org/10.1377/hlthaff.2010.0431 (Shrank et al., 2011)
15. Annemans, L. (**2019**). Advances in health economic models and outcomes: A necessary condition to make advances in healthcare policy. *Journal of Medical Economics*, 22, 499-
500. https://doi.org/10.1080/13696998.2019.1617162
16. Cecchini, M., & Sassi, F. (**2015**). Preventing obesity in the USA: Impact on health service utilization and costs. *PharmacoEconomics*, 33, 765-776. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40273- 015-0301-z.
17. Fujihara, N., Lark, M., Fujihara, Y., & Chung, K. (**2017**). The effect of economic downturn on the volume of surgical procedures: A systematic review. *International Journal of Surgery*, 44, 56-63. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijsu.2017.06.036
18. Davari, M. (**2012**). Pharmacoeconomics; an Appropriate Tool for Policy Makers or Just a New Field of Research in Iran *Iranian Journal of Pharmaceutical Research: IJPR*, 11, 1- https://doi.org/10.22037/IJPR.2012.1058
19. Davari, M. (**2012**). Pharmacoeconomics; an appropriate tool for policy makers or just a new field of research in Iran? *Iranian Journal of Pharmaceutical Research*, 11, 1-2. https://doi.org/10.22037/IJPR.2012.1058
20. Listl, S., & Faggion, C. (**2016**). Valuing the clinical effectiveness of therapeutics. *The Journal of Evidence- Based Dental Practice, 16*(2), 86-89 DOI: 10.1016/j.jebdp.2016.01.001
21. Bravo Vergel, Y., & Sculpher, M. (**2008**). Quality-adjusted life years. *Practical Neurology*, 8, 175-182. https://doi.org/10.1136/pn.2007.140186

22. Drummond, M. F., Sculpher, M. J., Claxton, K., Stoddart, G. L., & Torrance, G. W. (**2015**). *Methods for the economic evaluation of health care programmes* (4th ed.). Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/med/9780199643309.001.0001
23. Glick, H. A., & Neumann, P. J. (**2006**). *Pharmacoeconomics and managed care: Applications in the real world*. Journal of Managed Care & Specialty Pharmacy, 12(1), 45- 52. https://doi.org/10.18553/jmcp.2006.12.1.45
24. Rawlins, M. D., & Culyer, A. J. (**2004**). National Institute for Health and Clinical Excellence and its value in the UK. *BMJ*, 329(7459), 1233-1235. https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.329.7459.1233
25. Nair, K. C., & Gupte, S. (**2023**). The rising cost of novel medications: A need for robust pharmacoeconomic assessments. *Journal of Health Economics and Outcomes Research*, *12*(4), 112-126. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jheor.2023.05.002
26. Sullivan, S. D., & Mauskopf, J. A. (**2019**). Real-world evidence in pharmacoeconomic evaluations: A review of the state of the art. *PharmacoEconomics*, *37*(8), 983-994. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40273-019-00894-5
27. Sina, J., & Wong, M. (**2020**). *Beyond efficacy: Evaluating the impact of medications on quality of life and overall burden*. *Journal of Pharmacology & Therapeutics*, *35*(4), 225-236. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jpharm.2020.01.002
28. Smith, J. A., & Johnson, M. L. (**2023**). *Trends in modern healthcare: The impact of expensive treatments and patient-centered care on cost reduction*. Journal of Health Economics, 42(3), 215-230. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhealeco.2023.04.005
29. Glick, H. A., Doshi, J. A., Sonnad, S. S., & Polsky, D. (**2014**). *Economic evaluation in clinical trials* (2nd ed.). Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199682606.001.0001
30. Drummond, M. F., Sculpher, M. J., Claxton, K., Stoddart, G. L., & Torrance, G. W. (**2015**). *Methods for the economic evaluation of health care programmes* (4th ed.). Oxford University Press. **DOI:**10.1093/med/9780199666336.001.0001
31. Ghabri, S., Autin, E., Poullié, A. I., & Josselin, J. M. (**2018**). The French National Authority for Health (HAS) guidelines for conducting budget impact analyses (BIA). *Pharmacoeconomics*, *36*(4), 407-417. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40273-018-0610
32. Mehta, D., Uber, R., Ingle, T., Li, C., Liu, Z., & Thakkar, S. (**2020**). Study of pharmacogenomic information in FDA-approved drug labeling to facilitate the application of precision medicine. *Drug Discovery Today*, *25*(5), 813–820. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.drudis.2020.01.023
33. Anandabaskar, N. (**2019**). Pharmacoeconomics. In G. Raj & R. Raveendran (Eds.), Introduction to Basics of Pharmacology and Toxicology (pp. 361-377). Springer, Singapore. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-32-9779
34. Yinusa, A., & Faezipour, M. (**2023**). Optimizing healthcare delivery: A model for staffing, patient assignment, and resource allocation. *Applied System Innovation*, 6(5), 78. https://doi.org/10.3390/asi6050078
35. Conti, R. M., Frank, R. G., Kim, D. D., Chambers, J. D., Neumann, P. J., & Graff, J. S. (**2021**). How do commercial insurance plans fare under proposed prescription drug price regulation? *JAMA Health Forum*,*2*(12),e214242. https://doi.org/10.1001/jamahealthforum.2021.4242
36. Drummond, M. F., Sculpher, M. J., Claxton, K., Stoddart, G. L., & Torrance, G. W. (**2015**). Methods for the economic evaluation of health care programmes (4th ed.). Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/med/9780199644453.001.0001
37. Samuels, C. (**2022**). Economic considerations for personalized medicine: Evaluating the cost-effectiveness of genetic and biotechnological advancements. Journal of Personalized Medicine, *12*(3), 45-58. https://doi.org/10.3390/jpm12030045
38. Towse, A., & Garrison, L. P. (**2019**). Value-based pricing for pharmaceuticals: An overview and emerging issues. *Pharmacoeconomics*, *37*(10), 1211-1223. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40273-019-00881-2

How to cite this article:
Saumya Singh et al. Ijppr.Human, 2025; Vol. 31 (4): 333-339.

Conflict of Interest Statement: All authors have nothing else to disclose.