Why patient-reported outcomes rarely make it onto drug labels

Written by The Life Science Feed Editorial Team · Edited by William Lopes

Patient-reported outcomes (PROs) offer a direct window into a patient's experience with a disease and its treatment, capturing symptoms, functional status, and quality of life. These subjective yet critical measures often reflect what truly matters to individuals living with chronic conditions, providing insights that objective clinical endpoints alone cannot. But for all their perceived value, PROs rarely translate into explicit claims on drug labels, leaving clinicians and patients without formal guidance on these important aspects of care.

KEY TAKEAWAYS

- The Pivot: Regulatory bodies demand rigorous validation and specific trial designs for PROs to be considered for labelling claims, a standard often unmet by industry.
- The Data: No specific numeric data can be provided without real research papers, but the general observation is a low success rate for PRO-based label claims.
- The Action: Clinicians should continue to consider PROs in their practice, understanding that their absence from a label does not negate their clinical utility, but rather reflects regulatory stringency.

Patient-reported outcomes are measures of any aspect of a patient's health status that comes directly from the patient, without interpretation by a clinician or anyone else. This includes symptoms, functional status, health-related quality of life, and treatment satisfaction. The appeal of PROs is clear: they capture the lived experience of illness and the impact of therapy in a way that objective measures, such as laboratory values or imaging results, cannot. For many chronic diseases, particularly those with significant symptomatic burden or impact on daily activities, improvements in PROs can be as meaningful, if not more so, than changes in surrogate endpoints.

The integration of PROs into clinical trials has grown steadily over the past two decades, driven by a recognition that patient perspective is vital for a holistic understanding of treatment benefit. Regulatory agencies, including the European Medicines Agency (EMA) and the US Food and Drug Administration (FDA), have issued guidance documents outlining the principles for PRO instrument development, validation, and use in clinical trials. These guidelines emphasize the need for PRO instruments to be fit-for-purpose, reliable, valid, and responsive to change, ensuring that any claims derived from them are robust and interpretable.

The Regulatory Gauntlet for PROs

The path from a PRO measure in a clinical trial to a specific claim on a drug label is fraught with challenges. One primary hurdle is the stringent requirement for the PRO instrument itself. Regulators demand that the instrument be rigorously developed and validated in the target patient population. This means demonstrating that the instrument consistently

measures what it intends to measure (reliability), accurately reflects the concept of interest (validity), and can detect clinically meaningful changes over time (responsiveness). Many PRO instruments, while widely used in research or clinical practice, may not meet these exacting psychometric standards for regulatory purposes.

The trial design also plays a critical role. For a PRO to support a label claim, it must be designated as a primary or key secondary endpoint in the clinical trial. This designation ensures that the trial is adequately powered to detect statistically significant and clinically meaningful differences in the PRO. Often, PROs are included as exploratory endpoints, meaning the trial is not designed to formally test hypotheses related to them. This limits their evidentiary weight for regulatory submissions, regardless of how compelling the raw data might appear.

The timing and method of PRO data collection are important for regulatory acceptance. Data must be collected systematically and consistently, ideally at predefined intervals, using methods that minimize bias. This often involves electronic data capture to ensure data integrity and reduce missing information. Any deviations from a pre-specified collection schedule or significant amounts of missing data can undermine the interpretability and regulatory acceptance of the PRO results. The context of the trial, including the patient population and the comparator arm, also influences the relevance and generalizability of the PRO findings.

Defining Clinical Meaningfulness

Beyond statistical significance, regulators require evidence of clinical meaningfulness for PRO claims. This means demonstrating that the observed change in a PRO score is not just statistically significant, but also represents a tangible and important improvement from the patient's perspective. Establishing clinical meaningfulness often involves anchor-based methods, where changes in PRO scores are correlated with changes in other clinically relevant measures or patient global impression of change. Distribution-based methods, which rely on statistical properties of the PRO score, can also contribute to this assessment.

The interpretation of PRO results can be complex. Unlike objective biomarkers, PROs are inherently subjective and can be influenced by a multitude of factors beyond the direct effect of the drug, including patient expectations, concomitant treatments, and psychological state. This complexity necessitates careful statistical analysis and interpretation, often requiring specialized expertise in psychometrics and health outcomes research. The need for a clear, unambiguous interpretation that can be communicated effectively on a drug label adds another layer of difficulty.

Another challenge arises when a PRO is intended to support a claim for a specific symptom or functional domain. Regulators typically expect that the PRO instrument specifically targets that domain, rather than being a generic health-related quality of life measure. For example, if a company seeks a label claim for improvement in pain, the PRO instrument used must be a validated pain-specific measure, not a general quality of life questionnaire that includes a pain item. This specificity ensures that the claim accurately reflects the evidence.

The Industry's Perspective and Practicalities

Pharmaceutical companies face considerable practical and financial pressures when incorporating PROs into their development programs. Developing and validating a new PRO instrument, or adapting an existing one for a specific population, is a time-consuming and expensive undertaking. It requires extensive qualitative research (e.g., patient interviews, focus groups) to ensure content validity, followed by large-scale quantitative studies to establish psychometric properties. This investment must be made early in the drug development process, often before the drug's efficacy is fully

established.

Companies must also weigh the potential for a PRO label claim against the resources required. If a drug demonstrates clear efficacy on objective endpoints, the additional effort and risk associated with pursuing a PRO claim might be deemed too high, especially if the primary goal is market authorization. This can lead to PROs being relegated to secondary or exploratory endpoints, diminishing their chances of making it onto the label. The challenges in translating compelling health claims into regulatory success are not unique to PROs, but they are particularly pronounced here.

But the absence of a PRO claim on a label does not mean the data is without value. Clinicians often consider PROs when making treatment decisions, even if those outcomes are not explicitly listed on the prescribing information. For example, a patient's self-reported improvement in fatigue or daily functioning can be a powerful indicator of treatment success, complementing objective measures. The broader context of public health outcomes often relies on self-reported data, highlighting its utility outside of strict regulatory confines.

Where the Gap Remains

The disconnect between the clinical utility of PROs and their regulatory acceptance for labelling claims highlights a persistent gap. While regulatory bodies have provided guidance, the bar for inclusion remains high, demanding a level of evidence that often exceeds what companies are willing or able to generate for every potential PRO. This is particularly true for conditions where objective endpoints are well-established and accepted, making the additional investment in PROs seem less critical for market entry.

The lack of specific PRO claims on labels can create a communication challenge for clinicians. Without formal endorsement, discussing PRO benefits with patients might feel less authoritative, even when supported by published trial data. This can impact shared decision-making, as patients may not fully appreciate the potential for improvements in their quality of life or symptom burden if these are not explicitly acknowledged in official drug information. The broader policy implications for healthcare management often hinge on such detailed understandings of patient benefit.

Still, the trend towards greater patient centricity in drug development continues. As healthcare systems increasingly focus on value-based care, the importance of outcomes that matter to patients will only grow. This may eventually lead to a re-evaluation of the evidentiary requirements for PRO label claims, or at least a greater willingness from industry to invest in the rigorous studies needed to meet current standards. For now, clinicians must continue to rely on their own interpretation of published PRO data, often found in the supplementary materials of journal articles, to inform their discussions with patients. The Oxford Handbook of General Practice remains a valuable resource for integrating such evidence into daily practice.

The Path Forward for Patient-Centric Claims

To increase the likelihood of PROs making it onto drug labels, several areas require continued focus. First, early engagement with regulatory agencies during drug development is paramount. Companies should seek scientific advice on their PRO strategy, including instrument selection, trial design, and statistical analysis plan, to ensure alignment with regulatory expectations. This proactive approach can help identify and address potential issues before they become insurmountable hurdles.

Second, there is a need for greater standardization in PRO instrument development and validation. While some disease-specific instruments are well-established, many areas still lack PROs that meet the stringent psychometric

requirements for regulatory use. Collaborative efforts between academia, industry, and patient advocacy groups could facilitate the development of high-quality, universally accepted PRO instruments. This would reduce the burden on individual companies and provide a more consistent basis for PRO claims.

Finally, education and awareness are essential. Clinicians, patients, and even regulators need a deeper understanding of the value and limitations of PROs. Highlighting successful examples of PRO-based label claims, and explaining the rigorous process behind them, can foster greater appreciation for these measures. This ongoing dialogue can help bridge the gap between the scientific rigor required for regulatory approval and the practical utility of PROs in patient care.

CLINICAL IMPLICATIONS

The scarcity of patient-reported outcome claims on drug labels presents a persistent challenge for clinicians. While we understand the regulatory imperative for robust evidence, the current situation means that many clinically meaningful benefits, directly experienced by patients, are not formally acknowledged in prescribing information. This forces clinicians to sift through trial publications for PRO data, adding an unnecessary layer of effort to evidence-based practice.

For pharmaceutical companies, the message is clear: if PROs are genuinely important for a drug's value proposition, they must be treated as primary or key secondary endpoints from the outset. Relegating them to exploratory status, or using inadequately validated instruments, is a guaranteed path to exclusion from the label. The investment in rigorous PRO development and trial design needs to match the ambition for patient-centric claims.

Patients, meanwhile, are often left unaware of potential quality-of-life improvements that a drug might offer, simply because these benefits do not appear on the label. This can hinder informed decision-making and may lead to underappreciation of a therapy's full impact. This highlights the need for clinicians to proactively discuss these 'unlabelled' benefits, drawing on published literature and their own clinical experience, to provide a complete picture of treatment.

EDITORIAL & AI STANDARDS

AI tools are used solely to structure and summarise evidence from peer-reviewed primary sources. No AI-generated conclusions appear in The Life Science Feed without editor verification against the primary source.

REFERENCES

1. 1. de Wit M, van Luik S, Marrero D, Barnard-Kelly K, Snoek FJ. Person-reported outcomes in registered randomised diabetes trials: A mapping review of constructs. Diabet Med. 2024;41(9):e15385. doi:10.1111/dme.15385
2. 2. Wilt TJ, Howe RW, Rutks IR, MacDonald R. Terazosin for benign prostatic hyperplasia. Cochrane Database Syst Rev. 2002:CD003851. doi:10.1002/14651858.CD003851
3. 3. Wilt TJ, Howe RW, Rutks I, Macdonald R. WITHDRAWN: Terazosin for benign prostatic hyperplasia. Cochrane Database Syst Rev. 2011;2011(9):CD003851. doi:10.1002/14651858.CD003851.pub2
4. 4. Wilt TJ, Howe W, MacDonald R. Terazosin for treating symptomatic benign prostatic obstruction: a systematic review of efficacy and adverse effects. BJU Int. 2002;89(3):214-25. doi:10.1046/j.1464-4096.2001.02537.x-i1
5.

5. Cella D, Eton D, Hensing TA, Masters GA, Parasuraman B. Relationship between symptom change, objective tumor measurements, and performance status during chemotherapy for advanced lung cancer. Clin Lung Cancer. 2008;9(1):51-8. doi:10.3816/CLC.2008.n.009