Pregabalin for sciatica: a widely used drug without supporting evidence

Written by The Life Science Feed Editorial Team · Published 10 November 2026 · Edited by Mara Voss

Sciatica, a debilitating neuropathic pain condition, frequently drives patients to primary care seeking relief. Clinicians often reach for gabapentinoids like pregabalin, assuming an established efficacy for neuropathic pain translates directly to this specific presentation. But the evidence supporting this common practice is notably thin, raising questions about the clinical rationale for its continued widespread use.1

KEY TAKEAWAYS

- The Pivot: Despite common prescribing, robust evidence for pregabalin in sciatica is absent.
- The Data: No direct head-to-head studies compare pregabalin and gabapentin for sciatica.1
- The Action: Re-evaluate the routine prescription of pregabalin for sciatica, considering the lack of direct supporting evidence.

Sciatica, characterised by pain radiating along the sciatic nerve pathway, typically from the lower back down the leg, affects a significant portion of the population. It often results from nerve root compression, commonly due to a herniated disc. The pain is frequently described as shooting, burning, or tingling, and can be severely incapacitating, impacting daily activities and quality of life. Managing this condition effectively remains a challenge, with many patients experiencing chronic symptoms despite various interventions.1

Gabapentinoids, including pregabalin and gabapentin, are frequently prescribed for neuropathic pain conditions. Their mechanism of action involves binding to the alpha-2-delta subunit of voltage-gated calcium channels in the central nervous system, which modulates the release of excitatory neurotransmitters. This action aims to reduce neuronal hyperexcitability, a hallmark of neuropathic pain. Clinicians have extrapolated this general neuropathic pain efficacy to sciatica, leading to broad off-label use.2

The Scarcity of Direct Evidence

A comprehensive review by Robertson, Marshman, and Plummer, published in the Journal of Clinical Neuroscience in 2016, specifically examined the roles of pregabalin and gabapentin in treating sciatica.1 The authors sought to clarify the efficacy, side effect profiles, and cost implications of these two gabapentinoids in this particular neuropathic pain state. They conducted an extensive literature search, aiming to identify studies that directly addressed the use of pregabalin or gabapentin for sciatica.

The review identified eleven articles that met their inclusion criteria. This small pool of evidence comprised seven systematic reviews, one retrospective cross-sectional study, one placebo-controlled crossover study, one randomised placebo-controlled double-blind study, and one case report. The limited number and diverse methodologies of these

studies immediately highlighted a significant gap in the evidence base. The authors noted that while gabapentin and pregabalin appeared to demonstrate comparable efficacy and side effect profiles across various neuropathic pain states, the amount and quality of evidence specifically for sciatica were low.1

The review found no direct "head-to-head" studies comparing pregabalin and gabapentin for sciatica, which is a significant limitation for clinicians attempting to make evidence-based prescribing decisions. This absence means that any perceived equivalence in efficacy or safety for sciatica is based on indirect comparisons, often drawn from studies of other neuropathic conditions or from observational data. Such indirect evidence inherently carries a higher risk of bias and cannot provide definitive conclusions regarding the optimal choice between these two drugs for sciatica.1

Off-Label Prescribing and Regulatory Disparity

The widespread use of pregabalin for sciatica largely falls under off-label prescribing, a practice highlighted in a 2019 clinical overview by Goodman and Brett in JAMA Internal Medicine.2 This review, while broader in scope, reiterated the concerns about the evidence base for gabapentinoids in various off-label indications, including sciatica. The authors noted that the efficacy and side effect profiles of gabapentin and pregabalin appeared similar in general neuropathic pain, but again, the quality of evidence was low, and direct comparisons for specific conditions like sciatica were lacking.2

The regulatory market for gabapentinoids further complicates matters. Formulary regulator rulings across the globe show significant disparity. Many regulatory bodies have exclusively favoured one drug over the other, often the more expensive option, without clear evidence to justify this preference. For example, the UK National Institute for Health and Clinical Excellence (NICE) favoured pregabalin over gabapentin, citing minor titration advantages and definite cost advantages, despite the weak data. This decision, made in the absence of robust comparative evidence, highlights the challenges in translating limited research into consistent clinical guidelines.1

The cost implications are also substantial and unpredictable. The review by Robertson and colleagues found that global costs for pregabalin and gabapentin varied widely, by up to 31 times, and unpredictably. In some regions, pregabalin was cheaper than gabapentin, while in others, the reverse was true. This variability, combined with disparate formulary rulings, creates a complex environment for healthcare systems and patients. The lack of studies assessing pregabalin-gabapentin interchangeability means that switching between the two drugs, perhaps for cost reasons or perceived tolerability, is not supported by evidence.1

The Clinical Reality and Its Shortcomings

Clinicians often face pressure to provide immediate relief for patients presenting with acute sciatica. In the absence of strong evidence for specific interventions, and given the general efficacy of gabapentinoids in other neuropathic pain conditions, prescribing pregabalin for sciatica has become a common default. But this practice relies on an assumption of transferable efficacy that the current literature does not support. The weak evidence suggests that efficacy and side effects with gabapentin and pregabalin are probably similar, but firm conclusions remain precluded.1

The open-label nature of much of the real-world use, and the reliance on patient-reported outcomes without rigorous blinding or placebo controls, introduces significant bias. Patients often report improvement simply because they are receiving a prescribed treatment, a phenomenon well-documented in pain management. This makes it difficult to discern true pharmacological effect from placebo response or natural history of the condition. For a deeper dive into why patient-reported outcomes often fail to make it onto drug labels, one might consider our previous coverage on PROs.

The absence of direct comparative trials also means that specific patient subgroups who might benefit more from one gabapentinoid over another, or from a gabapentinoid versus another class of drug, remain unidentified. This lack of precision in prescribing contributes to a trial-and-error approach, potentially delaying effective treatment for some patients and exposing others to unnecessary side effects. The Oxford Handbook of Neurology provides a concise guide to evidence-based management of various neurological conditions, but even comprehensive resources struggle when primary evidence is lacking.

The safety profiles of gabapentinoids are not benign. Drowsiness, dizziness, and peripheral oedema are common side effects. There are also concerns about misuse and dependence, particularly with pregabalin. Prescribing these drugs without clear evidence of benefit for sciatica means patients may be exposed to these risks without a commensurate therapeutic gain. This is a critical consideration, especially in a condition that often resolves spontaneously or responds to conservative measures like physical therapy. The question of whether gabapentinoids actually work for sciatica has been a recurring theme in clinical discussions.

The problem extends beyond individual patient care to public health and economic considerations. The significant cost variations and disparate formulary decisions mean that healthcare resources are not being allocated efficiently or equitably. If a cheaper, equally effective, or even superior alternative exists, or if the drug offers no real benefit, then the expenditure on gabapentinoids for sciatica represents a misallocation of funds that could be directed towards evidence-based treatments. The broader implications of drug pricing tactics across Europe have been explored in our policy analysis.

The current state of evidence for pregabalin in sciatica is a stark reminder of the gap between clinical practice and data from a small number of studies (n=11) with varying methodologies and no reported confidence intervals. Despite its widespread use, the drug's efficacy for this specific condition remains largely unproven by high-quality, direct comparative trials. This situation calls for a re-evaluation of prescribing habits and a renewed focus on generating the necessary evidence to guide clinicians effectively. Without prospective "head-to-head" studies, clinicians will continue to operate in an evidence vacuum, making decisions based on indirect comparisons and anecdotal experience rather than solid scientific proof.1

> **CLINICAL IMPLICATIONS**
>
> Clinicians routinely prescribing pregabalin for sciatica must confront the uncomfortable truth: the evidence simply is not there. The assumption that efficacy in other neuropathic pain states translates directly to sciatica is a leap of faith, not an evidence-based decision. This means many patients receive a drug with known side effects and potential for misuse, without a clear, demonstrated benefit for their specific condition.
>
> The lack of head-to-head trials between pregabalin and gabapentin for sciatica is particularly glaring. Regulatory bodies, like NICE, making preferential recommendations based on minor titration advantages or perceived cost benefits, without robust comparative efficacy data, inadvertently reinforce a practice built on weak foundations. This creates a disconnect between guideline recommendations and the underlying scientific rigor.
>
> For patients, this translates to a potential merry-go-round of medications that may not work, exposing them to unnecessary adverse effects and delaying access to truly effective interventions, whether pharmacological or non-pharmacological. The pharmaceutical industry, having secured broad neuropathic pain indications, has

> little incentive to fund expensive, condition-specific trials for off-label uses. This leaves a critical evidence gap that impacts patient care and healthcare resource allocation.
> Until robust, direct comparative trials emerge, the default should be caution. Prescribing pregabalin for sciatica should be a considered decision, acknowledging the current evidence deficit, rather than a routine reflex. The onus is on the medical community to demand better data to inform such widespread clinical practice.

EDITORIAL & AI STANDARDS

AI tools are used to structure and summarise evidence from peer-reviewed primary sources. Articles that carry a signed Editor's take have been read in full by William Lopes. The others are not individually read by an editor, so check the cited source before relying on a figure.

REFERENCES

1. 1. Robertson K, Marshman LA, Plummer D. Pregabalin and gabapentin for the treatment of sciatica. J Clin Neurosci. 2016;27:1-7. doi:10.1016/j.jocn.2015.11.006
2. 2. Goodman CW, Brett AS. A Clinical Overview of Off-label Use of Gabapentinoid Drugs. JAMA Intern Med. 2019;179(5):695-701. doi:10.1001/jamainternmed.2019.0086

LICENCE & RIGHTS

© 2026 The Life Science Feed. All rights reserved. This content is produced for medical education purposes. It may not be reproduced, distributed, or transmitted without prior written permission from The Life Science Feed.

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.

FOLLOW THE LIFE SCIENCE FEED

Instagram @lifesciencefeed **LinkedIn** linkedin.com/company/thelifesciencefeed

thelifesciencefeed.com