

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Table of contents .....	i
Copyright .....	v
Abbreviations.....	vi
Abstract .....	vii
Dedication .....	ix
Acknowledgements .....	x

### CHAPTER ONE

Introduction .....	1
Background .....	4
Quality, safety and efficacy of drugs .....	5
Associated factors of counterfeit and substandard drugs .....	6
German Pharma Health Fund (GPHF) Minilab .....	6
Effects of counterfeit and substandard drugs.....	6
Statement of the Problem .....	7
Problem analysis diagram .....	8
Rationale of the study .....	9
Study objectives .....	9
Research question .....	10
Operational definitions .....	10

### CHAPTER TWO

Literature review .....	11
-------------------------	----

### CHAPTER THREE

Research methodology .....	13
Study setting .....	13
Study population .....	13
Study design .....	13
Variables .....	14
Inclusion criteria .....	14
Exclusion criteria .....	14
Sampling method .....	14

Sample size determination .....	15
Data collection technique .....	15
Validity of the results .....	16
Reliability of the results .....	16
Data quality control checks .....	16
Ethical consideration .....	16
Data analysis .....	17
Materials and methods .....	17
Drugs and formulations chosen for the study .....	18
Artemether/Lumefantrine tablets quality analysis .....	19
Sulphadoxine/Pyrimethamine tablets quality analysis .....	24
Quinine sulphate tablets quality analysis .....	29

#### **CHAPTER FOUR**

Data presentation .....	35
Analytical results .....	35
Discussion .....	48
Conclusion .....	50
Recommendations .....	51
Study limitations .....	51
References .....	52
Appendices .....	55
Appendix I: Drug collection sheet .....	55
Appendix II: Gant chart .....	56
Appendix III: Study budget .....	57
Appendix IV: Consent form .....	58
Appendix V: Letter for permission to carry out the study .....	59
Appendix IV: Letter for permission to collect drug samples from public health institutions .....	60

**List of figures:**

Figure 1: Picture of all antimalarial drugs collected for quality analysis ... 18

Figure 2: Picture of Artemether/Lumefantrine tablets collected for quality analysis  
..... 19

Figure 3: Picture of Sulphadoxine/Pyrimethamine tablets collected for quality analysis  
..... 24

Figure 4: Picture of Quinine sulphate tablets collected for quality analysis.. 29

**List of tables:**

Table 4.2.1: Results of the verification of active ingredients contained in  
Artemether/Lumefantrine tablets analysed ..... 36

Table 4.2.2: Results of the percentage content of active ingredients contained in  
Artemether/Lumefantrine tablets analysed ..... 37

Table 4.2.3: Results of the assessment of packaging and labelling of  
Artemether/Lumefantrine tablets for quality ..... 38

Table 4.2.4: Results of ascertaining the proportion of Artemether/Lumefantrine tablets  
that were substandard ..... 39

Table 4.2.1.1: Results of the verification of the active ingredients contained in  
Sulphadoxine/Pyrimethamine tablets analysed ..... 40

Table 4.2.1.2: Results of the percentage content of the active ingredients contained in  
Sulphadoxine/Pyrimethamine tablets analysed ..... 41

Table 4.2.1.3: Results of the assessment of packaging and labelling of  
Sulphadoxine/Pyrimethamine tablets for quality ..... 42

Table 4.2.1.4 Results of ascertaining the proportion of Sulphadoxine/Pyrimethamine  
tablets that were substandard ..... 43

Table 4.2.1.1.1: Results of the verification of active ingredient contained in Quinine  
sulphate tablets analysed ..... 44

Table 4.2.1.1.2: Results of the percentage content of active ingredient contained in  
Quinine sulphate tablets analysed ..... 45

Table 4.2.1.1.3: Results of the assessment of packaging and labelling of Quinine sulphate  
tablets for quality ..... 46

Table 4.2.1.1.4: Results of ascertaining the proportion of Quinine sulphate tablets that were substandard ..... 47

## **COPYRIGHT**

All rights reserved. No part of this study may be reproduced or stored in any form either electronically, mechanically, photocopying, recording or otherwise without prior written permission from the author or the University of Zambia.

## ABBREVIATIONS

<b>ADRs</b>	-	Adverse Drug Reactions
<b>AIDS</b>	-	Acquired Immuno Deficiency Syndrome
<b>CDC</b>	-	Centre for infectious Diseases Control
<b>CSO</b>	-	Central Statistical Office
<b>DEC</b>	-	Drug Enforcement Commission
<b>DRC</b>	-	Democratic Republic of Congo
<b>GPHF</b>	-	German Pharma Health Fund
<b>HIMS</b>	-	Health Management Information System
<b>HIV</b>	-	Human Immunodeficiency Virus
<b>LUD</b>	-	Lusaka Urban District
<b>MDGs</b>	-	Millennium Development Goals
<b>MOH</b>	-	Ministry Of Health
<b>PHC</b>	-	Primary Health Care
<b>PRA</b>	-	Pharmaceutical Regulatory Authority
<b>UN</b>	-	United Nations
<b>UV</b>	-	Ultra Violet
<b>UNZA</b>	-	University of Zambia
<b>UNZA REC</b>	-	University of Zambia Research Ethics Committee.
<b>USP</b>	-	United States Pharmacopoeia
<b>WHO</b>	-	World Health Organization
<b>ZDHS</b>	-	Zambia Demographic Health Survey

## ABSTRACT

The problem of counterfeiting of drugs presents an enormous public health challenge. No area of the world is unaffected, but mounting evidence shows that the problem is disproportionately severe in developing and emerging market countries, which also have a high burden of infectious diseases such as tuberculosis and malaria. Since no area of the world is unaffected, it is obvious that Zambia is no spared, although there is almost complete absence of both qualitative and quantitative data on the prevalence of counterfeit and substandard drugs in the country.

The purpose of the study was to evaluate the quality of Artemether/Lumefantrine, Sulphadoxine/Pyrimethamine and Quinine tablets in selected Public and Private Health Institutions in Lusaka District.

A cross sectional design study was conducted using quantitative research method. 20 Public and Private Health Institutions were randomly selected, and 430 tablets of each drug type were selected using convenient sampling method. The quality of the drugs was ascertained using the GPHF-Minilab at Pharmaceutical Regulatory Authority, and data were entered in Epidata and analysed, and presented in cross tabulations.

This study provides objective evidence to answer speculations whether or not substandard antimalarial drugs exist in Lusaka. The study has revealed that substandard antimalarial drugs exist in Lusaka as evidenced by the 6.98% of Sulphadoxine/Pyrimethamine tablets that failed to comply with the required active ingredients and their percentage content. The substandard drugs could not have been counterfeited but could have been as a result of non adherence to Good Manufacturing Practice. The study shows that the antimalarial drugs conformed to the official monographs requirements in ascertaining the quality of the pharmaceutical products in terms of packaging and labelling. The existence of substandard antimalarial drugs in Lusaka, and their final use in prevention and treatment of malaria could have detrimental clinical consequences and implications to the patient, as substandard drugs unsafe and inefficacious.

The revelation of the existence of substandard drugs by this study poses a challenge to the Pharmaceutical Regulatory Authority to enhance its Post-marketing surveillance

programme to ensure and assure constant quality monitoring of drugs that are found on the Zambian market, as quality, safety and efficacy are the tenets of every pharmaceutical product.

## **DEDICATION**

This research is dedicated to my beloved and dear wife, MISOZI NGOMA ALUTULI, who has always been supportive and inspiring to me and at the same time who was my course mate for the Masters of Public Health programme.

I also dedicate this research to my late parents, Mr. and Mrs. Alutuli, and my beloved children, Clara, Junior Luke, Joseph, Neketela, Nana Njamba, Hope and Grace Lormuthunzi Chisomo for the support and encouragement they rendered to me during my research.

To all my brothers and sisters, and all my in laws for the support and prayers to enable me accomplish my research.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This research could not have been successfully completed without the invaluable support and guidance of the so many people I am highly indebted to.

To my supervisors, Dr. C.C. Michelo and Mr. O. Mweemba, especially Dr. C.C. Michelo, thank you very much for finding time from your busy schedule to guide me, read my numerous revisions, encourage me and ensuring that this study succeeds.

I would also like to recognise the support rendered to me by Professor S. Siziya, Dr. S. Nzala, Dr. W. Mutale, and Mr. R. Zyambo for reading through my proposal and rendering me valuable guidance and encouragement.

My profound gratitude goes to the Pharmaceutical Regulatory Authority staff, especially the Director General, Ms.E. Mwape and the inspectorate staff, and the Quality Control Laboratory Manager, Mr. Mainga for the support they rendered to me by authorising to buy drug samples from private health institutions in Lusaka, and also for allowing me use their quality control laboratory at no cost.

I also wish to thank the Permanent Secretary- Ministry of Health, the Deputy Director Pharmaceutical Services, Mr. Nanduba, and Lusaka District Health Management Team for the supporting they render to me as my sponsors and authorising me to collect drug samples from public health institutions in Lusaka District.

I am also indebted to the entire department of Community Medicine staff for the knowledge they imparted in me which enabled me to write the proposal and finally come up with this piece of research work.

To God is the glory for the good health I enjoyed during the period of my research work.

Finally my profound thanks go to my dear wife, children, brothers and sisters, in laws and friends for the support and tolerance for being away from them for a long time as I spent long hours working on my research.