Why patient-reported outcomes rarely make it onto drug labels

Written by The Life Science Feed Editorial Team · Edited by Mara Voss

Patient-reported outcomes (PROs) offer a direct window into the patient experience, capturing symptoms, functional status, and quality of life in a way that objective clinical measures often cannot. Yet, for all their intuitive appeal and growing recognition in clinical research, these valuable insights frequently fail to translate into explicit claims on drug labels.

This disconnect highlights a persistent challenge in drug development and regulatory science, where the subjective nature of PROs clashes with the stringent, objective evidence requirements for marketing authorisation.

KEY TAKEAWAYS

- The Pivot: Regulatory bodies demand rigorous validation and clear clinical relevance for PRO claims, often exceeding what developers provide.
- The Data: PRO instruments must demonstrate psychometric soundness, including reliability, validity, and responsiveness to change, in the specific patient population.
- The Action: Developers must integrate PRO strategy early in trial design, ensuring endpoints are primary or co-primary and supported by robust statistical analysis.

The journey from a patient's subjective experience to a validated, regulatory-approved claim on a drug label is fraught with methodological and evidentiary obstacles. While clinicians increasingly value PROs for understanding treatment impact beyond traditional biomarkers, the path to formal recognition by regulatory agencies remains narrow. The core issue lies in demonstrating that a PRO measure is not only relevant to patients but also scientifically sound and interpretable in a clinical trial context.

Regulators, including the European Medicines Agency (EMA) and the US Food and Drug Administration (FDA), require PROs to meet the same rigorous standards of validity, reliability, and responsiveness as any other clinical endpoint. This means that the instrument used to collect PROs must be fit-for-purpose, consistently measuring what it intends to measure, and sensitive enough to detect clinically meaningful changes attributable to the intervention. Without this foundational psychometric evidence, even compelling patient narratives struggle to gain official endorsement.

The Methodological Minefield

One primary reason PRO claims falter is insufficient methodological rigor in their development and implementation within clinical trials. A PRO instrument must be developed or adapted for the specific disease and patient population under study. This involves qualitative research with patients to ensure the items are relevant and understandable, followed

by extensive psychometric validation to establish its measurement properties. If an instrument is simply borrowed from another context without proper validation in the target population, its data will be viewed with skepticism.

The choice of PRO instrument itself is critical. It must align directly with the drug's mechanism of action and the expected clinical benefit. For instance, a drug targeting pain should use a PRO instrument specifically validated for pain intensity or interference with daily activities, not a generic quality of life scale that might be too broad to capture specific treatment effects. The instrument's recall period, response options, and scoring methods also need careful consideration to minimise bias and ensure accurate data collection.

Trial design also plays a significant role. PROs are often included as secondary or exploratory endpoints, which inherently limits their power to drive label claims. Regulators prefer PROs to be designated as primary or co-primary endpoints, indicating their importance to the overall treatment effect. This requires adequate sample size calculations and statistical analysis plans specifically designed to evaluate the PRO endpoint, rather than treating it as an afterthought. Without this upfront commitment, even positive PRO data may lack the statistical robustness required for regulatory approval.

Defining Clinical Meaningfulness

Beyond statistical significance, regulatory bodies demand evidence of clinical meaningfulness. A statistically significant change in a PRO score does not automatically equate to a change that matters to a patient. Developers must establish a minimum clinically important difference (MCID) for the PRO instrument in the specific patient population. This MCID provides a threshold for what constitutes a meaningful improvement or deterioration from the patient's perspective.

Establishing an MCID is complex, often involving anchor-based methods (correlating PRO changes with external clinical indicators or patient global impressions of change) or distribution-based methods. Without a clearly defined and justified MCID, regulators may deem a statistically significant PRO change to be clinically irrelevant, thereby rejecting its inclusion on the label. This is a common pitfall, as many trials report statistical significance without adequately addressing the practical impact on patients.

The context of the disease also influences the interpretation of PRO data. In conditions with high unmet need or severe symptoms, even small improvements in PROs might be considered clinically meaningful. Conversely, in conditions with established effective treatments, a new drug's PRO benefits must be substantial to warrant a label claim. The scrutiny applied to PROMs is often intense, reflecting their direct relevance to patient quality of life.

Data Collection and Analysis Challenges

The practicalities of PRO data collection in clinical trials present another set of hurdles. Missing data, inconsistent administration, and patient compliance issues can all compromise the integrity of PRO endpoints. Regulators are particularly concerned about missing data, especially if it is not missing at random, which can introduce bias. For example, if patients who are not responding well to treatment are more likely to drop out or stop completing PRO questionnaires, the remaining data may falsely inflate the perceived benefit.

The mode of administration (e.g., paper-and-pencil versus electronic PROs, or ePROs) also requires careful validation. While ePROs offer advantages in data quality and real-time collection, the equivalence between paper and electronic versions must be demonstrated if both are used or if a switch occurs during a trial. Any change in administration method without proper bridging studies can invalidate the data.

Statistical analysis plans for PROs must be clearly articulated and pre-specified. This includes how missing data will be

handled, how multiple PRO endpoints will be adjusted for multiplicity, and how subgroup analyses will be conducted. Post-hoc analyses of PRO data, while sometimes informative, rarely suffice for regulatory claims. The need for robust, pre-specified analytical approaches is paramount, a point often missed in early-stage trial planning. This is part of the broader issue of why compelling health claims often fail patients at the regulatory stage.

Regulatory Expectations and the Future

Regulatory agencies have issued extensive guidance documents on the use of PROs in drug development, outlining their expectations for instrument selection, validation, data collection, and analysis. These guidelines emphasise the importance of a clear conceptual framework linking the PRO to the disease and the intervention, as well as the need for robust evidence to support every aspect of the PRO measurement process. Despite this guidance, many applications still fall short, leading to the rejection of PRO claims.

The industry is slowly adapting, with more companies integrating PRO strategy earlier into their development programs. This includes investing in the development and validation of disease-specific PRO instruments, designing trials with PROs as primary or co-primary endpoints, and implementing rigorous data collection and management protocols. But progress is slow. The complexity of PROs, combined with the high bar set by regulators, means that only the most meticulously planned and executed PRO strategies stand a chance of making it onto a drug label. For clinicians seeking comprehensive information on drug effects, including patient experience, resources like the Oxford Handbook of General Practice can offer broader clinical context, but specific PRO claims remain elusive on official labels.

The challenge is not that PROs are inherently flawed, but that their subjective nature requires an even higher degree of scientific rigor to be accepted as objective evidence of treatment benefit. Until developers consistently meet these exacting standards, the gap between what patients report and what drug labels claim will persist. The question remains whether the regulatory framework itself needs to evolve to better accommodate the unique value of patient perspectives, or if the onus lies entirely on developers to meet the existing, stringent criteria.

CLINICAL IMPLICATIONS

The scarcity of PRO claims on drug labels leaves clinicians in a difficult position. We understand that a drug's impact extends beyond objective measures like blood pressure or tumour size, but without regulatory endorsement, these patient-centric benefits are harder to communicate and integrate into prescribing decisions. This forces us to rely on secondary literature or our own clinical experience, which is not ideal for evidence-based practice.

For industry, the message is clear: PROs are not a 'nice-to-have' but a 'must-have' that demands early, strategic investment. Simply tacking on a generic quality of life questionnaire to a trial will not yield label claims. The development of fit-for-purpose instruments, rigorous validation, and primary endpoint designation are non-negotiable requirements. This means a significant shift in how clinical trials are designed and funded.

Patients, meanwhile, are the ultimate beneficiaries or victims of this regulatory bottleneck. Their lived experience of a disease and its treatment is arguably the most important outcome, yet it is often relegated to a footnote. Until PROs are consistently and robustly integrated into drug labels, patients will continue to receive treatments whose full impact on their daily lives is not formally recognised, hindering shared decision-making and potentially overlooking aspects of care that are vital for their well-being.

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

LICENCE & RIGHTS

MEDICAL DISCLAIMER

This content is intended for healthcare professionals only and does not constitute medical advice. Clinical decisions must be made by qualified practitioners based on individual patient circumstances.