

Indicator of access to medicines from the identification of the importance and satisfaction of individuals in relation to the multiple dimensions of access

Marina Morgado Garcia¹, Mariana Michel Barbosa¹, Rondineli Mendes da Silva², Edna Afonso Reis³, Juliana Alvares¹, Francisco de Assis Acurcio¹, Brian Godman^{4,5,6,7}, Augusto Afonso Guerra Junior¹

¹Department of Social Pharmacy, Federal University of Minas Gerais, Belo Horizonte, Minas Gerais, Brazil. E-mail: marinamorgarcia@gmail.com; marianamichelbarbosa@gmail.com; jualvares@gmail.com; fracurcio@gmail.com; augustoguerramg@gmail.com

²Department of Medicines Policy and Pharmaceutical Assistance - Department of Drug Policy and Pharmaceutical Assistance, Sérgio Arouca National School of Public Health of the Oswaldo Cruz Foundation, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil. Email: rondinelisilva@ensp.fiocruz.br

³Department Institute of Exact Sciences, Federal University of Minas Gerais, Belo Horizonte, Minas Gerais, Brazil. E-mail: edna@est.ufmg.br

⁴Strathclyde Institute of Pharmacy and Biomedical Sciences, University of Strathclyde, Glasgow G4 0RE, United Kingdom. Email: Brain.Godman@strath.ac.uk

⁵Health Economics Centre, University of Liverpool Management School, Liverpool, UK.

⁶Division of Clinical Pharmacology, Karolinska Institute, Karolinska University Hospital Huddinge, SE-141 86, Stockholm, Sweden. Email: Brian.Godman@ki.se

⁷School of Pharmacy, Sefako Makgatho Health Sciences University, Garankuwa, Pretoria, South Africa.

(Accepted for publication Journal of Comparative Effectiveness Research – Please keep Confidential)

Abstract

Aims: Creation of a single indicator of access to medicines. **Methods:** Data collection was performed with individuals who obtained their medication from either public and/or private pharmacies. A Likert scale was used to measure the importance and satisfaction in relation to various access dimensions. **Results:** A total of 580 individuals were interviewed. Overall, participants attributed very similar importance scores to the dimensions of access to medicines. The results of the mean score of each dimension showed a statistically significant difference according to the type of pharmacy that the participant visited. **Conclusions:** This developed indicator will enable a review of access to medicines, making comparisons possible as well as improving decision making about public policies in the field of Pharmaceutical Services.

Keywords: Access; essential medicines; indicator.

Summary points

- Access to at least essential medicines is a key indicator related to guaranteeing the right of patients to healthcare.
- To date, there has not been one comprehensive indicator capturing all 5 dimensions of access which include availability, geographic accessibility, adequacy, affordability and acceptability.
- Research was undertaken in Brazil to assess medicine availability in a dual healthcare system (private and public) which includes private and public pharmacies to provide future guidance.
- All five dimensions of access were important in Brazil, although overall greater importance was given to availability followed by affordability, geographic accessibility, accommodation and finally acceptability.
- However there were differences whether patients access just public pharmacies, private pharmacies or a mixture of both.
- There were also differences in gender as well as age, e.g. those aged 55 or older typically resort to public pharmacies to obtain their medicines with increases in healthcare spending.
- Interviewees using exclusively private pharmacies considered availability a key dimension, higher than those using both public and private pharmacies.
- This newly developed indicator enables a greater consideration with analyzing access to medicines, which is important for countries in the future where access is a concern.

1.Introduction

Access to essential medicines is one of the five indicators related to guaranteeing the right to health according to the United Nations, and one of the great challenges for public health across countries [1]. Access to medicines is currently problematic in many lower and middle income countries (LMICs), with expenditure on medicines accounting for up to 70% of total healthcare expenditure, much of which is out of pocket [2,3]. Consequently, family members becoming ill can potentially be catastrophic for the rest of the family [2-5]. Access to medicines can also vary within a country and between sectors in a country [6,7], as well as be an issue among Central and Eastern European (CEE) countries where despite typically universal healthcare there are concerns with access to higher costs medicines because of issues such as affordability and co-payments [8,9]. For instance, there has been limited utilization of biological medicines for rheumatoid arthritis and inflammatory bowel disease among many CEE countries due to differences in reimbursement criteria and high co-payments [8-10]. A similar situation was seen among a number of CEE countries with the statins and proton pump inhibitors before widespread availability of low cost generics easing prescribing restrictions [11-13]. There have also been concerns regarding access to medicines for orphan diseases and cancer across many countries enhanced by high prices [14-19]. However, limiting access to medicines can impact on morbidity, mortality and healthcare costs for patients with infectious and non-infectious diseases as well as healthcare systems [14,20-25]. Access to medicines is also seen as a central component of social inclusion as well as a component to seek equity and to strengthen health care systems. The possibility or not to have access to medicines is one of the clearest manifestations of inequality between countries, especially LMICs such as Brazil [26]. However, the legal system can be used in Brazil to enhance access to medicines that are not currently funded or available within the healthcare system [27-29].

Usually, medicines across countries are made available through a combination of public and private supply routes, and subject to regulations regarding their quality, safety and supply. A number of determinants and barriers relating to access to medicines have been identified according to the health system perspective of each country to provide future guidance [30,31]. There is also ongoing research surrounding the availability essential medicines which are part of EMLs (Essential Medicines Lists) as a starting point for appraising potential initiatives to enhance future access where concerns [27,32].

The World Health Organization defines access to medicines as the availability and the affordability, and to obtain those equitably [33]. As mentioned, affordability is a key issue in LMICs, and we are now seeing access programmes growing across countries to seek to address this [34,35]. However, such definitions do not necessarily take into account the complexity of access to medicines, which can exist in countries. Access typically involves a network of public and private actors, who play different roles taking account of the economic, political and social contexts within countries [36].

Penchansky & Thomas (1981) [37] and Aday & Andersen (1975) [38] pointed out that the mere discussion of the availability of services and resources is insufficient to determine whether or not the population has guaranteed access. For Penchansky & Thomas [37], access would be the search for health services by the population and to what extent the supply is adjusted to effectively meet their needs. As mentioned, access to medicines is a complex and multidimensional issue that must consider the structural elements of the health care system in addition to national, regional and international contexts as they can all interfere with access [39]. Consequently, access is given by the set of dimensions that contemplate not only the availability, but also includes affordability, geographical accessibility, and acceptability, as well as the convenience and adequacy of services [37].

Due to the complexity and difficulty of measurement, studies involving all of these dimensions of access to medicines are scarce, and they are often restricted to particular dimensions such as the provision of specific services and/or medicines or disease tracers. Some examples in Brazil include the study of Guerra *et al* (2004) [40], which evaluated the availability and affordability of medicines in Brazil, as well as other studies that have evaluated only one of the dimensions of access [41-43]. Other authors have used different criteria to discuss and evaluate access to medicines in Brazil such as user satisfaction and the infrastructure of the pharmaceutical care

services [44-46]. Satisfaction to healthcare services has also been researched in other LMICs as this is seen as a key area to enhance adherence to medicines and their effectiveness [47-49]. Issues of access to medicines are different to drug shortages where there are available funds to cover the cost of medicines but they are just unavailable [50]. They are also different to issues of incentives and other factors to address concerns with shortages of medicines [50,51]. The definition and measurement of access to health, especially access to medicines, has been a subject of great interest. This is because these aspects are fundamental for the development of plans and investment in health, as well as a fundamental strategy to improve the quality of health care and subsequent patient outcomes [52]. We have seen LMICs such as South Africa address issues of access to medicines especially those for chronic diseases via a number of initiatives. These include the Central Chronic Medicines Dispensing and Distribution (CCMDD) programme whereby medicines are packaged and distributed free of charge to patients' nearest pick-up point [53].

One challenge and potential contribution to public policy would be the development of a unique access to medicines indicator that simultaneously addresses the five dimensions as proposed by Penchansky & Thomas [37]. In view of this, the research topic should be 'would it be possible to simultaneously measure the score of each of the dimensions from the perspective of the individuals to whom public policies regarding medicines are destined?'

Consequently, we sought to develop a method capable of grouping the access to medicines dimensions proposed by Penchansky & Thomas [37] into a unique indicator from the user perspective. This includes the measurement of the values assigned by users to each of the five dimensions including access, geographical accessibility, availability, acceptability, accommodation/adequacy and affordability.

We believe this new indicator will make it possible to measure and compare inequalities in access to medicines in different places and in different situations. As a result, potentially become an important instrument that could be used to direct future public health policies to improve access. To date, in Brazil, the orientation of public policies has been on availability and affordability as a priority. We have started with Brazil because this country has a dual public and private healthcare system allowing simultaneous research with some patients able to can access both systems. The national healthcare system (*Sistema Único de Saúde - SUS*) provides free healthcare to patients for approved complex and/ or expensive technologies including medicines for Alzheimer's disease, biological medicines for rheumatoid arthritis as well as medicines for cancer, schizophrenia and multiple sclerosis [27,29,54-60]. In addition to this, there is also the Basic Component of Pharmaceutical Service in primary care which is available to all citizens through primary healthcare centres and outpatient facilities. In this situation medicines for chronic diseases including statins, insulins, metformin and certain sulphonylureas, are available free of charge [58].

However, some patients may well go to private pharmacies to obtain their medicines in view of the ease of access enhanced if they purchase supplemental private health insurance; otherwise 100% co-payment [57]. This though can lead to issues of affordability if patients do not have private insurance. Overall, approximately 23% of citizens in Brazil have private insurance to help with access in ambulatory care whilst still having access to public healthcare facilities [59,60]. This is very different to the situation in many LMICs where approximately 50% or more of revenues come from patient co-payments as typically no universal healthcare, appreciably higher if the shadow economy is taken into consideration [2,3,61].

Similar to many countries with universal healthcare systems, Brazil provides access to medicines with public funding but the model is dual. There is a public model, in which the government currently undertakes the entire logistic process and dispense medicines in its own pharmacies – called public pharmacies. In addition, there are private community pharmacies accredited by the government under "Aqui tem farmácia popular", introduced to improve the Brazilian population's access to medicines with associated copayments. There are also purely private pharmacies where people pay 100% the price of the medicines. Some people prefer to obtain their medicines in private pharmacies or by means of the program "Aqui tem farmácia popular" because these pharmacies typically have better geographic accessibility and extended opening times.

The dual system allows research into key issues of access to medicines among patients who have access to both systems to compare and contrast their perceptions. This is important to help further develop public health policies in Brazil to improve access to medicines in the public system where there are concerns.

2. Methods

2.1 Theoretical Framework

The study was designed by adapting methods documented in the literature to measure the importance and satisfaction of people regarding situations that impact on their life [62,63]. Access is an important and complex parameter in health policy and health services research since it is a concept that hasn't been defined or employed precisely. Some authors refer to "access" only as availability, while others include factors influencing the use of medicines including affordability [62-66]. Consequently, in this study, we used Penchansky and Thomas' concept [37] that access should be assessed using a wide scope covering all five dimensions:

- Availability: pertinent medicines are available from current pharmacy stock;
- Geographic accessibility: pharmacy with an accessible location (proximity and/or easiness to reach the place);
- Accommodation/adequacy: agility in the pharmacy service, comfortable, organized and quality service;
- Affordability: economic conditions to obtain the medicine at the pharmacy;
- Acceptability: pharmacy with a service that meets the habits, customs and expectations of users (with reference to other existing services considered acceptable).

2.2 Data Collection Instrument Design

The subsequent instrument was, as mentioned, developed from a literature review of studies in the field of psychology and health [62,63,66]. A research instrument with questions pertinent to each cited dimension was subsequently constructed and applied to the general population in order to obtain a unique access indicator.

The final version of the questionnaire contained 36 questions subdivided into: (i) questions regarding sociodemographic data (n=8); (ii) one related to importance and one to measure satisfaction for each of the five dimensions and 18 questions related to the preference of individuals. These issues were correlated with the five dimensions. Consequently for each question, two different dimensions were compared. For example, the interviewee preferred a pharmacy with employees who always treat them with respect, courtesy and privacy (acceptability) or a pharmacy that is open when you need it (affordability). Respondents could still respond: "whatever", "I don't know" and "I don't want to respond".

The instrument typically presented interviewees with 5 possible alternative answers to each of the questions depending on the degree of importance. The only exceptions were to the questions about "Where do you get your medicines" and "Where did you get your medicines in the last time", in which the interviewee could state more than one option. The mean length of time to complete the questionnaire was 15 minutes. (Supplementary Appendix). In order to measure importance and satisfaction in relation to the access dimensions, a five point Likert scale was used ranging from 'Not Important' to 'Extremely Important' or 'Very Unsatisfied' to 'Very Satisfied' for each dimension of access [67].

A pilot study was undertaken in Belo Horizonte to evaluate the average time to complete the questionnaire in order to identify possible difficulties with understanding the questions, and to address these where pertinent before undertaking the full study. Belo Horizonte is the capital of Minas Gerais, Brazil, covering 331,401 km², with more than 2.5 million inhabitants. Consequently, due to its size and population diversity, Belo Horizonte can be considered a good proxy for Brazil [68,69].

2.3 Sample and Study Population

Individuals 18 years old or older who agreed to respond to all items of the questionnaire were included in the survey. Potential interviewees were taken from areas of high circulation in the metropolitan area of Belo Horizonte, similar to previous studies that ascertained patient beliefs

in Belo Horizonte [68-69]. The exclusion criteria included individuals less than 18 years of age and people with no interest to participate. The interviews were conducted by trained interviewers.

We believed we would be able to estimate the relative importance of each of the 5 dimensions based on the fact that the respondent could give grades from 1 to 5 for the degree of importance of each of the dimensions; that the scores of the 5 dimensions would be estimated for the general population (residents in BH, older than 18 years), separately by gender (men and women), age (up to 54 and 55 years or more) and health insurance (yes or no). Based on this and with no intention to estimate scores separately in the 8 categories formed by the combination of these variables; that the distribution of probabilities of these scores was unknown at the time of the study with no information available from previous studies, and that a margin of error of estimation of the score averaged at most 1/5th of the standard deviation of scores in the population in each estimation (considering a 95% confidence level), the sample should contain at least 462 interviewees, distributed by male (n = 213) and female (n = 249); age: 18-54 (n = 362) and 55 or more (n = 100); and health insurance: yes (n = 250) and no (n = 212). The sample calculation was conducted to guarantee the statistical power to answer the research question, be representative and avoid possible bias.

2.4 Data collection

Data collection was performed with individuals who obtained their medication from public and/or private pharmacies and with the necessary sociodemographic characteristics including age, gender, education and monthly family income (stratification by value of minimum wages in Brazil - R\$ 998.00 or U\$ 1,981.03 converted by Purchasing power parities (PPP) – similar to previous studies [68,69].

As mentioned, all the interviewers were trained to conduct interviews through a course provided by the Brazilian Association of Interviewers (*Associação brasileira de empresas de pesquisa - ABEP*).

Face-to-face interviews were conducted with a semi-structured paper-based questionnaire, administered by the interviewers. Subsequently, the data were tabulated in order to identify key trends and the implications.

2.5 Data analysis

The score of each dimension was calculated by the ratio of the assigned score to the sum of the total. From the values for importance and satisfaction, in relation to each of the five dimensions, a score for the dimension was defined correlating to these two variables:

Notation:

$$\text{score of dimension} = \frac{(\text{score of importance} * \text{score of satisfaction})}{5 \text{ (number of dimensions)}}$$

For the calculation of the unique access indicator, it was proposed:

Indicator of access = $(W_b * I_b) + (W_c * I_c) + (W_d * I_d) + (W_e * I_e) + (W_f * I_f) / 5$ (number of dimensions) *The relative mean of score in the study population was calculated where:*

Dimension:

- 1) *Availability (b);*
- 2) *Geographic accessibility (c);*
- 3) *Adequacy/accommodation (d);*
- 4) *Affordability (e);*
- 5) *Acceptability (f).*
- 6) Relative mean of score in the study population: mean calculated after questionnaire application.

The calculation was stratified according to the place where the interviewees obtained their medicine (public pharmacy and/or private or exclusively private) and their gender. For the statistical analysis, absolute and relative frequencies (with 95% confidence intervals for the relative frequencies) were calculated. The proportions were compared using the chi-square

test. The linear correlations between the variables were made using the non-parametric *Spearman* test. Data analysis was performed using Minitab® software version 17.1.0 [70]. To better understand the application of the single access indicator, total access values were calculated in hypothetical scenarios with fictitious access dimensions. We proposed hypothetical scenarios A, B and C. In scenario A, we proposed one population with two dimensions of access higher than 50% (for example, geographic accessibility and acceptability with 70%). In the scenario B, we proposed one population with four of five dimensions around 90% and one dimension of 50%. In scenario C, we proposed one population with three dimensions higher than 70% and two dimensions equal or lower than 50%.

2.6 Ethics Approval and Consent to Participate

This study was submitted to the National Research Ethics Committee of Brazil, with approval registered the CAAE number: 62024016.4.0000.5149

The research was approved by the Ethics Committee in Research nº CAAE 62024016.4.0000.5149 and Process number: 1.901.611. All participants agreed to sign the Informed Consent Term (*Termo de Consentimento Livre e Esclarecido* - TCLE). However, the data was anonymized for confidentiality.

3. Results

Of the total number of people approached, only 2.1% refused to participate or did not complete the interview. A total of 580 individuals, predominantly female (56.0%), aged between 18 and 54 years (81.9%) were interviewed. 56.9% of the participants had less than twelve years of education and 45.2% had a monthly family income equal to or less than three times the minimum wage (R\$2,994.00 or U\$ 5,943.09 PPP). Just over half of the participants reported having health insurance at the time of the research. Among the participants, 33.45% reported not working and 12.76% reported they were receiving some social assistance including government grant-aids (Table 1).

Table 1: Sociodemographic characteristics of the participants

Variables	General Population		Private		Public-Private	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Gender						
Male	255	43.97	162	49.09	93	37.20
Female	325	56.03	168	50.91	157	62.80
Age						
Up to 54 years	475	81.90	293	88.79	181	72.40
55 or more	105	18.10	37	11.21	69	27.60
Health Insurance						
Yes	306	52.76	216	65.45	90	36.00
No	267	46.03	109	33.03	158	63.20
Don't know/Didn't answer	07	1.21	05	1.52	02	0.80
Education						
Incomplete primary school	66	11.38	16	4.85	50	20.00
Primary school	242	41.72	112	33.93	130	52.00
Secondary school	209	36.03	154	46.67	55	22.00
Higher education	56	9.66	43	13.03	13	5.20
Don't know/Didn't answer	07	1.21	05	1.52	02	0.80
Total household income						
Up to 1 minimum wage	32	5.52	13	3.94	19	7.60
≤ 2 minimum wages	106	18.28	37	11.21	69	27.60
2≥3 minimum wages	125	21.55	49	14.85	76	30.40
3≥5 minimum wages	122	21.03	79	23.94	43	17.20
5≥10 minimum wages	83	14.31	68	20.61	15	6.00
≥10 minimum wages	33	5.69	31	9.39	02	0.80
Don't know/Didn't answer	79	13.62	53	16.06	26	10.40
Working						
Yes	374	64.49	234	70.91	140	56.00
No	194	33.45	91	27.58	103	41.20
Don't know/Didn't answer	12	2.07	05	1.51	07	2.8

Social Security						
Retirement	60	10.34	15	4.55	43	17.20
Absence from work	01	0.17	01	0.30	00	0.00
No	519	89.48	314	95.15	207	82.80
Government grant-aid						
Yes	74	12.76	46	13.94	28	11.20
No	492	84.83	276	83.64	216	86.40
Don't know/Didn't answer	14	2.41	08	2.42	06	2.40

P value < 0.001

Regarding the places where the medicines were obtained by the individuals, 56.9% reported that they used to obtain their medicines exclusively in private establishments. In general, the search for pharmacies (public or private) was higher among women, both for those who accessed both public and private pharmacies (62.8%) and those that reported using exclusively private ones (50.9%). Individuals aged 55 or over, for the most part, reported using both public and private pharmacies. Only 14% of the participants reported being dependent on public facilities for their medicines (Table 2).

Table 2: Place where individuals usually get their medicines

Variables	N	%
Private Pharmacy	330	56.9
Exclusively out-of-pocket expenses	275	83.3
Exclusively from <i>Farmácia Popular</i>	05	1.5
Exclusively through covenant of the employing company	07	2.1
Out-of-pocket expenses + <i>Farmácia Popular</i>	24	7.3
Out-of-pocket expenses + covenant of the employing company	19	5.8
Public and private pharmacy	250	43.1
Exclusively Public Pharmacy	35	14.0
<i>Farmácia Pública</i> + out-of-pocket expenses	140	56.0
Public Pharmacy + <i>Farmácia Popular</i>	20	8.00
Public Pharmacy + out-of-pocket expenses + <i>Farmácia Popular</i>	55	22.00

Overall, participants attributed very similar scores to the five dimensions of access to medicines. However, a greater score was given to the availability dimension, followed by affordability, geographic accessibility and accommodation, and, finally, acceptability (Table 3).

Table 3: Mean relevance stratified by gender and place of obtaining medicines

Dimension	Total population			Private			Public-Private		
	General	Female	Male	General	Female	Male	General	Female	Male
Availability	4.447	4.465	4.421	4.448	4.446	4.478	4.424	4.484	4.323
Affordability	4.379	4.154	4.134	4.403	4.476	4.354	4.328	4.331	4.323
Geographic accessibility	4.147	4.083	4.059	4.115	4.089	4.168	4.184	4.223	4.118
Adequacy/ Accommodation	4.072	4.406	4.343	4.015	4.077	3.975	4.128	4.089	4.194
Acceptability	3.826	3.858	3.780	3.730	3.798	3.683	3.932	3.924	3.946

The stratification of the sample by location where the medicines were obtained showed that the interviewees who reported using exclusively private services considered availability as the most important dimension, and showed statistically significant differences between the scores attributed to the dimensions of access higher than those interviewees who reported using both public and private pharmacies. However, regardless of the place where medicines were obtained, the ranking of the importance of the scores for the various dimensions was maintained (Table 3).

In stratification by gender, there was an inversion of the ranking of scores attributed to the access dimensions. Women who reported using only private pharmacies attached greater importance to affordability than availability, while men who reported using both public and

private pharmacies attached equal importance to these two dimensions, followed by adequacy/accommodation, geographic accessibility, and acceptability (Table 3).

From the analysis of the correlations between the dimensions, some inverse relationships were identified (Table 4). These correlations, although weak, were statistically significant. For example, interviewees who placed greater emphasis on affordability placed less emphasis on accommodation/adequacy. Interviewees who placed greater emphasis on availability attributed less importance to acceptability. Interviewees who gave more importance to acceptability gave less importance to geographical accessibility.

Table 4: Spearman’s nonparametric linear correlation coefficient (p-value) of relevance weights between access realms (n=580)

Access dimension	Availability	Geographic accessibility	Adequacy	Affordability
Geographic accessibility	- 0.055 0.183			
Adequacy	-0.363 0.000	-0.146 0.000		
Affordability	0.088 0.033	-0.170 0.000	-0.335 0.000	
Acceptability	-0.407 0.000	-0.365 0.000	-0.003 0.935	-0.403 0.000

With the exception of the acceptability dimension, all other satisfaction scores were higher in interviewees who reported using only private pharmacies when compared to those who reported using public pharmacies or public and private pharmacies.

The results of the mean score of each dimension showed a statistically significant difference according to the type of pharmacy that the interviewees reported to use. The average score of affordability was 25.6% lower for interviewees who reported using only public pharmacies compared to those who reported using only private pharmacies (Table 5).

Table 5: Values of the mean weight of each dimension stratified by place of obtaining the medicines

Dimension	Location				Relative Difference	
	General	Private sector	Private and public sector	Public sector	Exclusively public x Exclusively private	Public + private x Exclusively private
Availability	0.5753	0.6238	0.5074	0.5100	-18.2%	-18.7%
Geographic accessibility	0.5761	0.6153	0.5226	0.5300	-13.9%	-15.1%
Accommodation	0.5605	0.5771	0.5356	0.4900	-15.1%	-7.2%
Affordability	0.5260	0.5891	0.4398	0.4386	-25.6%	-25.3%
Acceptability	0.5204	0.5283	0.5076	0.5771	9.2%	-3.9%
Relative Weight	0.5517	0.5867	0.5026	0.5091	-18.2%	-18.7%

Table 6 presents the hypothetical scenarios mentioned in the Methods section that showed how the access indicator would behave in three different simulations (A, B and C) to illustrate how the indicator is used in practice. In Scenario B, for example, in which the availability of medicines was only 85%, geographic accessibility was 90%, accommodation and acceptability

was 95%, and affordability was 50%, the unique access indicator proposed would be 82.8% in the private sector and 84.2% in the public sector.

Table 6: Unique access to medicines indicator from three different hypothetical scenarios

Hypothetic Scenarios	Access					General population's access	Private access	Public + private access	Public access
	Availability	Geographic/ accessibility	Accommodation/ Adequacy	Affordability	Acceptability				
A	0.40	0.70	0.50	0.50	0.70	55.9%	55.7%	56.2%	56.7%
B	0.85	0.90	0.95	0.50	0.95	83.3%	82.8%	84.1%	84.2%
C	0.35	0.70	0.80	0.70	0.50	61.0%	60.9%	61.0%	60.4%

4. Discussion

Currently, we believe there is no method capable of comparing access in different services, localities, regions or countries, simultaneously contemplating the five dimensions proposed by Penchansky & Thomas [37]. We believe this lack of this indicator leads to heterogeneity in access measures and difficulties with comparing the results of different studies, making it challenging to comprehend the reality about access to medicines [64]. As a result, we believe health service managers tend to make their decisions based on only one of the dimensions of access: availability. In this context, a tendency to encourage health policies has been observed aiming primarily at increasing the availability of medicines leaving the other dimensions in the background, which we also believe are necessary to reach effective access to medicines for all citizens in a locality [65].

Our results found a small difference between the scores given by interviewees to the five access dimensions. The results suggest that for users, full access to medicines is better when all five dimensions are met. Consequently, public policies around access to medicines must not be restricted to just one or two of the five dimensions.

In addition, when analyzing the various dimensions, it was possible to conclude that the majority of the interviewees who gave less importance to geographical accessibility, gave greater importance to acceptability, justifying the need to reassess public policies that, for the most part, prioritize more the regionalization dimension to the detriment of the quality of the service and training to improve the service.

The overall measurement of access to medicines can be used as an indicator of the quality of public and private care services [66]. However, defining a single access indicator is a complex task, especially since the measurement of the five dimensions is very different, and for example, the degree of subjectivity of affordability is considerably greater than availability.

In addition, whenever an index or indicator is proposed, it is subject to limitations on the variables selected for its composition. One of the most used indicators for the classification of the level of development of a country - HDI - Human Development Index, despite being an important public policy leader in the world since 1990, still suffers from many criticisms [71,72]. The proposal to create a unique access indicator also showed that only a small proportion of individuals in Brazil currently depend exclusively on public pharmacies to obtain their medicines. This small number can be justified by the increase in self-medication in the country, which is strongly influenced by companies to enhance overall drug consumption [73]. In 2013, medicines for human use were 1.5% of gross domestic product (GDP) as a household expenditure item, and only 0.2% of GDP in public spending. This reinforces the current supremacy of the private sector as a source for citizens obtaining their medicines in Brazil [73].

However, another hypothesis for this low dependency on public pharmacies could be the difficulty in accessing medical care in SUS and the need for a prescription for medicines to be

dispensed in public pharmacies. Consequently, patients often resort to the private sector either through additional supplemental health insurance or 100% co-payment to obtain their medicines [74-76]. This scenario, in which a large proportion of medicine costs comes from patient's direct out-of-pocket payments is similar to other LMICs [76]. However, Brazil is different in that there is a public healthcare system (SUS) where patients can access treatment and medicines; however, as mentioned, there are challenges with accessing the public system including medicines. A nationwide study showed that the total availability of medicines in SUS was 45.2% whilst it was 88.5% in private pharmacies [76]. However, for chronic diseases with a high prevalence in Brazil, such as hypertension and diabetes, the public sector provides a higher proportion at 57.2% and 60.1% respectively of the essential medicines needed [76]. Bigdeli et al [39] discussed the existence of fragmentation of access to medicines among LMICs, which has harmed and isolated other significant components of health systems, sometimes providing access barriers. As an example, the constitution of segmented access, dissociating pharmaceutical care from other sectors of the health and economic systems. When analyzing the profile of the interviewees, a greater proportion of those 55 years or older resort to public pharmacies to obtain their medicines. This is expected since, with increasing age, health spending increases considerably, leading to greater use of public health services [77]. Consequently, there is a need to improve access to medicines in this age group where there are identified concerns.

As most individuals reported using private pharmacies, it becomes clear that more research is needed on access to medicines in these pharmacies. In Brazil, a possible reason for the lack of studies in this area may be due to people culturally considering private pharmacies just a commercial establishment even with the recent regulation in Brazil defining private pharmacies and drugstores as health establishments [76,77].

In addition, the results showed that individuals who accessed private pharmacies were more rigorous about the quality of care, possibly because they were more satisfied with the pharmaceutical care services when compared to individuals who accessed both private and public services or exclusively public pharmacies [78,79]. Again, this is important for planning future services in Brazil.

We are aware of a number of limitations with this study. Whilst we believe the sample is representative, there may be some peculiarities with interviewees only taken from the metropolitan area of Belo Horizonte, Minas Gerais. In addition, there may be variations concerning the types of pharmacies available in different locations. We are also aware this study was a cross-sectional study so it wasn't possible to establish the relationship of cause and effect of changes in the importance and satisfaction data. In addition, the efficiency of public pharmacy management and its influences on importance and satisfaction data were not evaluated. Despite the limitations, we believe this work is innovative being we believe the first study attempting to create a single multifaceted access indicator. The absence of similar studies makes it difficult to compare our findings with others.

Overall, we believe our findings are robust providing future direction to both public and private pharmacies in Brazil as well as the public healthcare system in Brazil.

5. Conclusion

Although there is still considerable debate about the concept of access to health, most authors agree that access is not simply equivalent to the use of services. It should cover a far wider range of considerations. We believe the unique access to medicines indicator proposed based principally on the concept proposed by Penchansky & Thomas will allow a better evaluation of the quality of pharmaceutical care services as it now encompasses all dimensions of access. Consequently, we would recommend this refined measure going forward.

Our findings showed the importance given by interviewees to the various access measures as well as similarities and differences between the various dimensions depending on issues such as gender, age and current pharmacies used. We believe these points to the need for new public policies to prioritize actions directed to all five dimensions of access. This is unlike the current situation in which the principal focus in Brazil has been on increasing the availability

and/or greater geographical accessibility. In addition, our findings makes it clear that there is a need for further studies on access to medicines in private pharmacies and drugstores in Brazil as well as different countries to help refine and compare access to medicines across countries.

Overall, we believe this indicator will enhance research and diagnoses about access to medicines in different services and countries, making possible future comparisons to help improve public policies in the field of Pharmaceutical Service. This is difficult currently without such a comprehensive measure. These are considerations for the future in further research that we and others should conduct comparing access to medicines across countries.

References

Note: (*of importance; ** of considerable importance)

1. Hogerzeil HV, Mirza Z. The world medicines situation 2011: access to essential medicines as part of the right to health. Geneva: World Health Organization; 2011. Available at URL: <http://apps.who.int/medicinedocs/documents/s20054en/s20054en.pdf?ua=1>
2. Cameron A, Ewen M, Ross-Degnan D, Ball D, Laing R. Medicine prices, availability, and affordability in 36 developing and middle-income countries: a secondary analysis. *Lancet*. 373(9659):240-9 (2009)
- *Key reference outlining the importance of medicine costs especially in LMICs
3. Ofori-Asenso R, Agyeman AA. Irrational Use of Medicines—A Summary of Key Concepts. *Pharmacy* 2016;4,35.
4. Abiye Z, Tesfaye A, Hawaze S. Barriers to access: availability and affordability of essential drugs in a retail outlet of a public health center in south western Ethiopia. *Journal of Applied Pharmaceutical Science* 2013; 3 (10): 101-105.
5. Alsairi R. Access to Medicine in Developing Countries. *American Journal of Medicine and Medical Sciences*. 2017;7(6):271-6.
6. Guan X, Hu H, Man C, Shi L. A survey of availability, price and affordability of essential medicines from 2011 to 2016 in Chinese secondary and tertiary hospitals. *Int J Equity Health*. 2018;17(1):158.
- *Interesting paper discussing the availability of essential medicines in different regions in China
7. Alefan Q, Amairi R, Tawalbeh S. Availability, prices and affordability of selected essential medicines in Jordan: a national survey. *BMC health services research*. 2018;18(1):787.
8. Putrik P, Ramiro S, Kvien TK, Sokka T, Pavlova M, Uhlig T, et al. Inequities in access to biologic and synthetic DMARDs across 46 European countries. *Annals of the rheumatic diseases*. 2014;73(1):198-206.
9. Baumgart DC, Misery L, Naeyaert S, Taylor PC. Biological Therapies in Immune-Mediated Inflammatory Diseases: Can Biosimilars Reduce Access Inequities? *Frontiers in pharmacology*. 2019;10:279.
- **Good paper discussing the differences in the availability of biological medicines among European countries depending on issues of affordability and co-payments
10. Kostic M, Djakovic L, Sujic R, Godman B, Jankovic SM. Inflammatory Bowel Diseases (Crohn`s Disease and Ulcerative Colitis): Cost of Treatment in Serbia and the Implications. *Applied health economics and health policy*. 2017;15(1):85-93.
11. Godman B, Shrank W, Andersen M, Berg C, Bishop I, Burkhardt T, et al. Policies to enhance prescribing efficiency in Europe: findings and future implications. *Frontiers in pharmacology*. 2010;1:141.
12. Garuoliene K, Godman B, Gulbinovic J, Schiffrers K, Wettermark B. Differences in utilization rates between commercial and administrative databases: implications for future health-economic and cross-national studies. *Expert review of pharmacoeconomics & outcomes research*. 2016;16(2):149-52.
13. Markovic-Pekovic V, Skrbic R, Godman B, Gustafsson LL. Ongoing initiatives in the Republic of Srpska to enhance prescribing efficiency: influence and future directions. *Expert review of pharmacoeconomics & outcomes research*. 2012;12(5):661-71.
14. Gammie T, Lu CY, Babar ZU. Access to Orphan Drugs: A Comprehensive Review of Legislations, Regulations and Policies in 35 Countries. *PLoS one*. 2015;10(10):e0140002.
15. EURODIS. Breaking the Access Deadlock to Leave No One Behind. A contribution by EURODIS and its Members on possibilities for patients' full and equitable access to rare disease therapies in Europe. 2018. Available at URL:

http://download2.eurordis.org.s3.amazonaws.com/positionpapers/eurordis_access_position_paper_final_4122017.pdf

16. Kwon H-Y, Kim H, Godman B. Availability and Affordability of Drugs With a Conditional Approval by the European Medicines Agency; Comparison of Korea With Other Countries and the Implications. *Frontiers in pharmacology*. 2018;9(938).
17. Chivukula MV, Tisocki K. Approaches to improving access to essential cancer medicines in the WHO South-East Asia Region. *WHO South East Asia J Public Health*. 2018;7(2):62-6.
18. Saqib A, Iftikhar S, Sarwar MR. Availability and affordability of biologic versus non-biologic anticancer medicines: a cross-sectional study in Punjab, Pakistan. *BMJ open*. 2018;8(6):e019015.
19. Sarnola K, Ahonen R, Martikainen JE, Timonen J. Policies and availability of orphan medicines in outpatient care in 24 European countries. *European journal of clinical pharmacology*. 2018;74(7):895-902.
20. Laxminarayan R, Matsoso P, Pant S, Brower C, Rottingen JA, Klugman K, et al. Access to effective antimicrobials: a worldwide challenge. *Lancet*. 2016;387(10014):168-
21. Simoens S, Sinnaeve PR. Patient co-payment and adherence to statins: a review and case studies. *Cardiovascular drugs and therapy*. 2014;28(1):99-109.
22. Nielsen JO, Shrestha AD, Neupane D, Kallestrup P. Non-adherence to anti-hypertensive medication in low- and middle-income countries: a systematic review and meta-analysis of 92443 subjects. *Journal of human hypertension*. 2017;31(1):14-21.
23. Chipwaza B, Mugasa JP, Mayumana I, Amuri M, Makungu C, Gwakisa PS. Self-medication with anti-malarials is a common practice in rural communities of Kilosa district in Tanzania despite the reported decline of malaria. *Malaria Journal*. 2014;13(1):252.
24. Wirtz VJ, Kaplan WA, Kwan GF, Laing RO. Access to Medications for Cardiovascular Diseases in Low- and Middle-Income Countries. *Circulation*. 2016;133(21):2076-85.
- *Interesting paper discussing ways to enhance access to CV medicines in LMICs
25. Vasheghani Farahani A, Salamzadeh J, Rasekh HR, Najafi S, Mosadegh V. The Availability and Affordability of Cardiovascular Medicines for Secondary Prevention in Tehran Province (Iran). *Iran J Pharm Res*. 2018;17(Suppl):64-72.
26. The Pan American Health Organization (PAHO). Access to high-cost medicines in the Americas: situation, challenges and perspectives. The Pan American Health Organization, Ministry of Health; Ministry of External Relations, 2010. Available at URL: <http://apps.who.int/medicinedocs/documents/s19112en/s19112en.pdf>
27. Caires de Souza AL, de Assis Acurcio F, Guerra Junior AA, Rezende Macedo do Nascimento RC, Godman B, Diniz LM. Insulin glargine in a Brazilian state: should the government disinvest? An assessment based on a systematic review. *Applied health economics and health policy*. 2014;12(1):19-32.
28. Teodoro C, Caetano R, Godman B, Dos Reis ALA, Maia AA, Ramos MCB, et al. Federal procurement of unlicensed medicines in Brazil; findings and implications. *Expert review of pharmacoeconomics & outcomes research*. 2017;17(6):607-13.
29. De Oliveira GL, Guerra Junior AA, Godman B, Acurcio FA. Cost-effectiveness of vildagliptin for people with type 2 diabetes mellitus in Brazil; findings and implications. *Expert review of pharmacoeconomics & outcomes research*. 2017;17(2):109-19.
30. Spivey P, Goodman B. Health system perspectives. In: Monique Elseviers et al. (Eds.) *Assessment of medication adherence in field research*. Wiley, *Drug Utilization Research: Methods and Applications*. Chichester: 2016.
31. Elseviers M, Vrijens B. Elseviers M, Wettermark B, Almarsdóttir AB, et al., editors. *Assessment of medication adherence in field research*. Wiley, *Drug Utilization Research: Methods and Applications*. Chichester: 2016.
32. Wirtz VJ, Hogerzeil HV, Gray AL, Bigdeli M, de Joncheere CP, Ewen MA, et al. Essential medicines for universal health coverage. *Lancet*. 2017; 389(10067):403-76.
- **Landmark paper discussing essential medicines for UHC
33. WORLD HEALTH ORGANIZATION (WHO). Equitable access to essential medicines: a framework for collective action [internet]. WHO: Geneva; 2004. Available from: http://whqlibdoc.who.int/hq/2004/WHO_EDM_2004.4.pdf.
34. Mbui JM, Oluka MN, Guantai EM, Sinei KA, Achieng L, Baker A, et al. Prescription patterns and adequacy of blood pressure control among adult hypertensive patients in Kenya; findings and implications. *Expert review of clinical pharmacology*. 2017;10(11):1263-71.
35. Sandoz - A Novartis Division. Kenya is first country to launch 'Novartis Access', expanding affordable treatment options against chronic diseases. 2015. Available at URL:

<https://www.sandoz.com/news/media-releases/kenya-first-country-launch-novartis-access-expanding-affordable-treatment>.

36. Alvares, J. et al. Are we really measuring access? Systematic review of access measures to medicines in Brazil. *Revista Brasileira de Pesquisa em Saúde*, Vitória, 17(4): 138-155, out-dez, 2015.

**Good review discussing access to medicines in Brazil

37. Penchansky R, Thomas JW. The concept of access: definition and relationship to consumer satisfaction. *MedCare*. 1981; 19(2):127-140.

38. Aday, L.A.; Andersen R. Development of Indices of Access to Medical Care; Health Administration Press, *Ann Arbor*, 1975.

39. Bigdeli et al., 2013. *Health Policy Plan*. 2013 Oct;28(7):692-704. doi: 10.1093/heapol/czs108. Epub 2012 Nov 22.

40. Guerra JR AA, Acúrcio F DE A, Gomes CAP, Miralles M, Girardi SN, Werneck GAF, et al. Availability of essential medicines in two regions of Minas Gerais, Brazil. *Rev Panam Salud Publica*. 2004;15(3):168–75.

41. Nascimento RCRM, Álvares J, Guerra Junior AA, Gomes IC, Costa EA, Leite SN, et al. Availability of essential medicines in primary health care of the Brazilian Unified Health System. *Rev Saude Publica*. 2017;51 Supl 2:10s. <https://doi.org/10.1590/S1518-8787.2017051007062>

**Good paper discussing current access to medicines in ambulatory care in Brazil

42. Helfer AP, Camargo AL, Tavares NUL, Kanavos P & Bertoldi AD. Affordability and availability of drugs for treatment of chronic diseases in the public health care system. *Revista Panamericana de Salud Pública*, 31(3), 225-232. 2012. Disponível em:

<http://www.scielo.org/scielo.php?script=sci_arttext&pid=S1020-49892012000300007&lng=en&tng=pt. Acesso em 23 fev 2016.

43. Barreto MNSC, Cesse EAP, Lima RF, Marinho MGS, Specht YS, Carvalho EMF, Fonfonbonne A. Analysis of access to hypertensive and diabetic drugs in the Family Health Strategy, State of Pernambuco, Brazil. *Revista Brasileira de Epidemiologia*, 18(2), 413-424. 2015.

<https://dx.doi.org/10.1590/1980-5497201500020010>

44. Barreto JL & Guimarães M.C.L. Evaluation of decentralized management of basic pharmaceutical care in Bahia State, Brazil. *Cad. Saúde Pública*, Rio de Janeiro, 26(6):1207-1220, jun, 2010.

45. Barbosa M.M; Garcia, M.M; Nascimento, R.C.R.M; Reis, E.A; Guerra Junior, A.A; Acurcio, FA; Alvares, J. Infrastructure evaluation of Pharmaceutical Services in the National Health System of Minas Gerais. *Revista Ciência e Saúde Coletiva*, Rio de Janeiro, Vol.22 (8): 2475-2486 ago, 2017. DOI: 10.1590/1413-81232017228.10952017.

*Interesting paper discussing the infrastructure of pharmaceutical services in Brazil

46. Minas Gerais. SECRETARIA DE ESTADO DE SAÚDE. SUPERINTENDÊNCIA DE ASSISTÊNCIA FARMACÊUTICA. Rede farmácia de Minas: plano estadual de estruturação da rede de assistência farmacêutica: uma estratégia para ampliar o acesso e o uso racional de medicamentos no SUS – Belo Horizonte: SES-MG, 2008.112 p.

47. Nezenega ZS, Gacho YHM, Tafere TE. Patient satisfaction on tuberculosis treatment service and adherence to treatment in public health facilities of Sidama zone, South Ethiopia. *BMC health services research*. 2013;13(1):110.

48. Doyle C, Lennox L, Bell D. A systematic review of evidence on the links between patient experience and clinical safety and effectiveness. *BMJ open*. 2013;3(1).

49. Farhat R, Assaf J, Jabbour H, Licha H, Hajj A, Hallit S, et al. Adherence to oral glucose lowering drugs, quality of life, treatment satisfaction and illness perception: A cross-sectional study in patients with type 2 diabetes. *Saudi pharmaceutical journal*. 2019;27(1):126-32.

50. Bochenek T, Abilova V, Alkan A, Asanin B, de Miguel Beriain I, Besovic Z, et al. Systemic Measures and Legislative and Organizational Frameworks Aimed at Preventing or Mitigating Drug Shortages in 28 European and Western Asian Countries. *Frontiers in pharmacology*. 2017;8:942.

51. Access to Medicine Foundation. Shortages, stockouts and scarcity. 2018. Available from: https://accesstomedicinefoundation.org/media/atmf/Antibiotic-Shortages-Stockouts-and-Scarcity_Access-to-Medicine-Foundation_31-May-2018.pdf.

52. Sanchez RM, Ciconelli RM. The concepts of health access. *Rev Panam Salud Publica*. 2012; 31(3):260–8.

53. Meyer JC, Schellack N, Stokes J, Lancaster R, Zeeman H, Defty D, et al. Ongoing Initiatives to Improve the Quality and Efficiency of Medicine Use within the Public Healthcare System in South Africa; A Preliminary Study. *Frontiers in pharmacology*. 2017;8:751.

54. Costa JO, Almeida-Brasil CC, Godman B, Fischer MA, Dartnell J, Heaney A, Santos CGB, Acurcio FA, Álvares J, Guerra Jr AA. Implementation of clinical guidelines in Brazil: Should academic detailing be used? *Jn Pharm Health Services Res.* 2016;7:105-15.
55. Do Nascimento R, Guerra AA, Jr., Alvares J, Gomes IC, Godman B, Bennie M, et al. Statin use in Brazil: findings and implications. *Current medical research and opinion.* 2018;34(10):180917.
- *Good paper discussing current statin use in ambulatory care in Brazil including issues of availability
56. Agência Nacional de Saúde Complementar (ANS). Caderno de Informação da Saúde Suplementar: beneficiários, Operadoras e Planos [Supplementary Health Information Booklet: beneficiaries, Operators and Plans]. Rio de Janeiro: ANS; 2017; (2)
57. Flawed but fair: Brazil's health system reaches out to the poor [internet]. World Health Organization (WHO). April 2008 [cited: 2018 Mar 09]. Available from: <http://www.who.int/bulletin/volumes/86/4/08-030408/en/>.
58. da Silva WC, de Araujo VE, Lima E, Dos Santos JBR, Silva M, Almeida P, et al. Comparative Effectiveness and Safety of Monoclonal Antibodies (Bevacizumab, Cetuximab, and Panitumumab) in Combination with Chemotherapy for Metastatic Colorectal Cancer: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *BioDrugs: clinical immunotherapeutics, biopharmaceuticals and gene therapy.* 2018;32(6):585-606.
59. Dos Santos JB, Almeida AM, Acurcio FA, de Oliveira Junior HA, Kakehasi AM, Guerra Junior AA, et al. Comparative effectiveness of adalimumab and etanercept for rheumatoid arthritis in the Brazilian Public Health System. *Journal of comparative effectiveness research.* 2016;5(6):539-49.
60. Barbosa WB, Costa JO, de Lemos LLP, Gomes RM, de Oliveira HN, Ruas CM, et al. Costs in the Treatment of Schizophrenia in Adults Receiving Atypical Antipsychotics: An 11-Year Cohort in Brazil. *Applied health economics and health policy.* 2018;16(5):697-709.
61. Roberts Marc J. William Hsiao. Peter Berman. Michael R. Reich. *Getting Health Reform. Right.* Oxford University Press. Print ISBN-13: 9780195371505. DOI:10.1093/acprof:oso/9780195371505.001.0001.
62. Fegg, M. J.; Kramer, M.; L'HOSTE, S.; Borasio, G. D. - The Schedule for Meaning in Life Evaluation (SMiLE): Validation of a New Instrument for Meaning-in-Life Research. *Journal of Pain and Symptom Management.* vol. 35, nº 4, p. 356-364, 2008.
63. Moimaz, Suzely adas saliba, Marques, Jeidson antônio morais, Saliba, orlando, garbin, cléa adas saliba, zina, lívia guimarães, & saliba, nemre adas. (2010). Satisfaction and perception of SUS's users about public health care. *Physis: Revista de Saúde Coletiva*, 20(4), 1419-1440.
64. Frenk, J. Concept and measurement of accessibility. *Salud Publica Mex*, 27(5), p. 438, 1985.
65. UNITED NATIONS DEVELOPMENT GROUP. Indicators for Monitoring the Millennium Development Goals (United Nations, New York, 2003).
66. WORLD HEALTH ORGANIZATION [Internet]. How to develop and implement a national drug policy. 2. ed. Geneva: World Health Organization; 1988 [access 04 nov 2016]. Available from URL:<<http://apps.who.int/medicinedocs/pdf/s2283e/s2283e.pdf>>
67. Likert R. "A Technique for the Measurement of Attitudes", *Archives of Psychology*, 1932: 140: pp. 1-55.
68. Godoi IP, Santos AS, Reis EA, Lemos LL, Brandao CM, Alvares J, et al. Consumer Willingness to Pay for Dengue Vaccine (CYD-TDV, Dengvaxia(R)) in Brazil; Implications for Future Pricing Considerations. *Frontiers in pharmacology.* 2017;8:41.
69. Muniz Júnior RL, Godói IP, Reis EA, Garcia MM, Guerra-Júnior AA, Godman B, et al. Consumer willingness to pay for a hypothetical Zika vaccine in Brazil and the implications. *Expert review of pharmacoeconomics & outcomes research.* 2018:1-10.
70. MINITAB 17 STATISTICAL SOFTWARE. State College, PA: Minitab; 2010.
71. *HUMAN DEVELOPMENT REPORT 1990. Published for the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) New York Oxford Oxford University Press 1990.*
72. IBGE- INSTITUTO BRASILEIRO DE GEOGRAFIA E ESTATÍSTICA, 2015. Available from <https://ww2.ibge.gov.br/home/>.
73. Nascimento, M. C. Medicamentos: ameaça ou apoio à saúde? Rio de Janeiro: Vieira & Lent, 2003. 200 p.
74. Bortolon, P. C.; Karnikowski, M.G e Assis, M. Self-medication versus Pharmaceutical indication: the pharmacy professional in the Primary Care Health of elderly. Disponível em <http://www.ufff.br/nates/files/2009/12/12automedicacao1.pdf>. [access 25 may 2017].

75. Cameron A, Roubos, I, Ewen M, Mantel-Teewisse AK, Leufkens, HGM, Lainkg RO. Differences in the availability of medicines for chronic and acute conditions in the public and private sectors of developing countries. *Bulletin of the World Health Organization* 2011; 89:412-421. DOI: 10.2471/BLT.10.084327.
76. Oliveira MA, Luiza VL, Tavares NUL, Memgue SS, Arrais PSD, Farias MR, et al. Access to medicines for chronic diseases in Brazil: a multidimensional approach. *Rev Saúde Publica*. 2016;50(suppl 2):6s.
- **Key paper discussing access to medicines for chronic diseases in Brazil
77. Zucchi, P; Nero, Carlos; Malik, Ana. Health expenditures: demand and supply factors in health services. *Saúde e Sociedade* 9(1/2):127-150, 2000. Available from: http://www.mpggo.mp.br/portalweb/hp/2/docs/gastos_saude_fatores_demanda.pdf
78. Brasil. MINISTÉRIO DA SAÚDE. Lei nº 13.021, de 8 de agosto de 2014.
79. Brasil. MINISTÉRIO DA SAÚDE. ORGANIZAÇÃO PAN-AMERICANA DA SAÚDE. ORGANIZAÇÃO MUNDIAL DA SAÚDE. Avaliação da assistência farmacêutica no Brasil: estrutura, processo e resultados. Brasília: MS; 2005. [access 4 may 2017]. Available from: http://www.paho.org/bra/index.php?option=com_docman&task=doc_view&gid=744&Itemid=965