RAIS Journal for Social Sciences | Vol. 10, No. 1, 2026
ISSN 2574-0245 (Print) | ISSN 2574-1179 (Online) | DOI:10.5281/zenodo.19661267

Understanding the Complexities of Off-Label Prescription Drugs Prescribing in Healthcare

Darrell Norman Burrell[1*], Allison J. Huff[2], Delores Springs[3], Won Song[4]

[1]Marymount University, USA; Georgetown University Pellegrino Center for Clinical Bioethics, USA; University of Maryland School of Pharmacy, Baltimore, USA
[2]The University of Arizona College of Medicine, USA, Allison7@arizona.edu
[3]Capitol Technology University,USA, dsprings@captechu.edu
[4]Capitol Technology University, USA, wsong@captechu.edu
[*]Corresponding Author: Darrell Burrell E-mail: darrell.burrell@yahoo.com

Abstract: Off-label prescribing remains an essential yet complex component of modern clinical practice, enabling clinicians to address unmet therapeutic needs in the absence of approved treatment options. Despite its widespread use, this practice introduces significant public health, ethical, and professional challenges that are insufficiently explored in existing literature. This commentary examines off-label prescribing through a risk management and patient safety lens, emphasizing the interplay between clinical autonomy, fragmented evidence, and systemic vulnerabilities in care coordination. Drawing on interdisciplinary theoretical frameworks, including patient-centered care, interprofessional collaboration, and systems-based risk models, this analysis reframes off-label prescribing as a high-risk system behavior rather than an isolated clinical decision. The perspectives presented highlight critical gaps in pharmacovigilance, underreporting of adverse events, and inconsistencies in informed consent and documentation practices. Particular attention is given to coordination of care risks, where fragmented communication among providers may lead to duplication of therapy, inadequate monitoring, and increased patient harm. In response, this commentary advances practical, system-level strategies, including the implementation of active surveillance systems, pharmacist-integrated care models, standardized communication protocols, and enhanced patient engagement through shared decision-making and real-world data collection. Policy and regulatory implications are also examined, emphasizing the need for adaptive, evidence-responsive frameworks that balance clinical innovation with accountability. Recommendations include strengthening data interoperability, incentivizing evidence generation for off-label uses, and formalizing oversight mechanisms for high-risk prescribing. Collectively, this work contributes to a more comprehensive understanding of off-label prescribing as a multidimensional issue and proposes a structured, risk-informed approach to improving patient safety while preserving clinical flexibility.

Keywords: Off-label Prescribing, Patient Safety, Pharmacovigilance, Care Coordination, RX Drugs, Risk Management, Medication Management, Pharmacy

JEL Codes: I10, I18, D81, H51, O33

Introduction

Off-label medication use represents a pervasive and indispensable component of contemporary clinical practice, defined as the prescribing, dispensing, or administration of pharmaceutical agents in a manner that diverges from regulatory approval specifications established by the marketing authorization holder (Rusz et al., 2021). Such deviations may include alterations in dosage, route of administration, formulation, therapeutic indication, or target population, reflecting the dynamic interplay between regulatory frameworks and the realities of patient-centered care. In many clinical contexts, particularly in specialties such as oncology, psychiatry, and pediatrics, off-label prescribing is not merely an exception but a necessity, enabling clinicians to address unmet therapeutic needs where approved options are limited or nonexistent (Syed et al., 2021). For example, clinicians may prescribe antidepressants for chronic pain syndromes or utilize chemotherapeutic agents for emerging indications supported by preliminary evidence, thereby extending the boundaries of treatment beyond formally sanctioned uses (Rusz et al., 2021). These practices underscore the adaptability and innovation inherent in modern medicine.

However, the widespread utilization of off-label prescribing introduces a complex array of public health, ethical, and professional considerations that remain insufficiently examined within the existing literature. From a public health perspective, the absence of robust, large-scale clinical trial data for many off-label applications contributes to variability in treatment outcomes and limits the capacity of pharmacovigilance systems to detect and respond to adverse events in a timely and systematic manner (Rusz et al., 2021). This challenge is further compounded in vulnerable populations, such as pediatric and geriatric patients, where evidence gaps necessitate extrapolation from adult data, potentially increasing the risk of inappropriate dosing and unforeseen side effects. Concurrently, the decentralized nature of off-label prescribing can exacerbate coordination of care challenges, particularly in fragmented healthcare systems where communication between primary care providers, specialists, and pharmacists may be inconsistent. In such cases, incomplete documentation or lack of shared understanding regarding the rationale for off-label use may lead to duplication of therapy, inadequate monitoring, or conflicting treatment plans, thereby heightening the risk of adverse outcomes (Bell & Richards, 2021).

Despite these systemic and clinical complexities, the U.S. Food and Drug Administration does not regulate the practice of medicine, thereby affording physicians substantial autonomy in prescribing medications beyond their approved indications (Syed et al., 2021). While this autonomy facilitates innovation and individualized care, it also introduces significant ethical and professional challenges that are often underexplored in empirical research. Clinicians must navigate tensions between beneficence and non-maleficence when evidence is limited, balance patient autonomy with clinical judgment in the context of uncertainty, and manage potential legal liability associated with adverse outcomes. Furthermore, the absence of standardized guidelines for many off-label uses places greater reliance on individual clinician discretion, potentially leading to variability in practice and inconsistencies in the application of ethical principles. Although informed consent processes may mitigate some of these concerns, they are not uniformly implemented nor consistently structured to address the unique uncertainties associated with off-label use (Syed et al., 2021).

Notably, existing scholarship has predominantly focused on the clinical prevalence, regulatory permissibility, and therapeutic benefits of off-label prescribing, with comparatively limited attention given to the ethical and professional dimensions that underpin decision-making in this context. The intersection of clinician autonomy, patient vulnerability, evidentiary uncertainty, and system-level fragmentation creates a complex ethical landscape that is not adequately addressed through current guidelines or research

frameworks. As a result, there remains a critical gap in understanding how healthcare professionals navigate these challenges in practice and how systemic structures can better support ethically sound and professionally accountable prescribing behaviors.

Despite the widespread and clinically necessary use of off-label prescribing, there remains limited research examining the ethical and professional challenges that arise in practice. Clinicians are frequently required to make decisions under conditions of uncertainty, where evidence is incomplete and risk–benefit profiles are not well established. For example, a physician prescribing an off-label medication for chronic pain or pediatric use may rely on small studies or extrapolated data, creating variability in both clinical judgment and patient outcomes. Inconsistent informed consent practices further complicate this process, as patients may not fully understand the level of uncertainty associated with treatment. Additionally, fragmented care coordination, such as poor communication between specialists, primary care providers, and pharmacists, can result in duplicated therapies, missed monitoring, or unmanaged side effects. These gaps hinder the development of standardized, evidence-informed frameworks needed to guide clinicians in balancing innovation with ethical responsibility and patient safety.

Problem Statement

Off-label prescribing is a common yet insufficiently standardized aspect of clinical practice, involving the use of approved medications outside their designated indications, dosages, or populations. While it enables clinicians to address unmet medical needs, it is often supported by limited or inconsistent evidence, increasing the risk of ineffective treatment or adverse outcomes. For instance, prescribing an adult-approved medication to a pediatric patient without robust dosing data may lead to under- or overdosing. At the system level, underreporting of adverse events and inconsistent documentation further obscure safety signals. Variability in clinician decision-making, combined with legal and ethical uncertainty, creates an environment where patient safety may be compromised. The absence of clear, standardized guidelines reinforces inconsistency in practice and limits accountability across care settings.

Purpose Statement

The purpose of this commentary is to examine off-label prescribing as both a necessary clinical tool and a source of systemic risk. This analysis explores how physician autonomy and therapeutic innovation coexist with gaps in evidence, ethical ambiguity, and coordination challenges. It focuses on identifying where current practices fall short, particularly in pharmacovigilance, informed consent, and interdisciplinary communication. For example, the commentary considers how integrating pharmacist-led medication reviews or implementing real-time monitoring systems could reduce risk. The goal is to clarify when off-label prescribing is appropriate and to propose practical strategies that support safer, more consistent decision-making without restricting clinical flexibility.

Significance of the Inquiry

This commentary addresses a central tension in healthcare: the need to innovate while maintaining safety and accountability. Off-label prescribing is essential in areas such as oncology and pediatrics, where treatment options are often limited, but it also introduces measurable risks. These include increased adverse drug events, inconsistent care delivery, and unequal access to evidence-based treatment. For example, patients treated in well-integrated health systems may receive closer monitoring than those in fragmented settings, leading to disparities in outcomes. By focusing on these issues, this work highlights the

need for improved regulatory guidance, stronger data collection systems, and better coordination across providers. The perspectives offered aim to support clinicians, policymakers, and healthcare organizations in developing more consistent, transparent, and patient-centered approaches to off-label prescribing.

Challenges in Off-Label Medication Use

Off-label medication use presents a set of interconnected clinical, ethical, and system-level challenges that extend beyond individual prescribing decisions and reflect broader structural limitations in healthcare delivery. A central concern is the limited availability of high-quality evidence supporting many off-label applications, which constrains the ability to accurately assess safety and efficacy (Rusz et al., 2021). In practice, clinicians frequently rely on small-scale studies, case reports, or extrapolated data when prescribing off-label, particularly in areas such as pediatrics and oncology. For example, a pediatric patient may receive a medication approved only for adults, with dosing adjusted based on clinical judgment rather than robust pharmacokinetic data. This reliance on incomplete evidence introduces variability in outcomes and increases the likelihood of both under-treatment and adverse effects.

These challenges are compounded by systemic weaknesses in pharmacovigilance. Adverse events associated with off-label use are often underreported, limiting the ability of healthcare systems to detect safety signals and refine clinical guidance (Rusz et al., 2021). For instance, if multiple providers prescribe the same off-label therapy across different care settings without standardized reporting, patterns of harm may remain undetected at the population level. This fragmentation is further exacerbated by inconsistent documentation practices and the absence of integrated data systems capable of aggregating real-world evidence. As a result, off-label prescribing operates within a feedback-deficient system, where learning from outcomes is neither systematic nor timely.

From a systems perspective, regulatory and economic constraints also shape the landscape of off-label use. The high cost and extended timelines required to obtain formal approval for new indications discourage pharmaceutical manufacturers from pursuing label expansions, even when preliminary evidence suggests benefit (Rusz et al., 2021). Consequently, clinically valuable uses may remain perpetually "off-label," shifting the burden of evidence evaluation and risk management onto individual clinicians. This dynamic creates variability in practice, as different providers may interpret the same limited evidence in divergent ways, leading to inconsistent standards of care.

Ethical and professional challenges further complicate this environment. Clinicians must balance the principles of beneficence and non-maleficence when recommending treatments with uncertain evidence, while also ensuring that patients are adequately informed. In practice, informed consent processes for off-label use are often inconsistent, with some clinicians providing detailed explanations of uncertainty and others offering minimal disclosure. For example, a patient prescribed an off-label medication for chronic pain may not fully understand that the treatment lacks formal approval for that indication, limiting their ability to make an informed decision. At the same time, clinicians face potential legal exposure if adverse outcomes occur, particularly when documentation is incomplete or the rationale for prescribing is unclear (Rusz et al., 2021).

Collectively, these challenges highlight the need for a more coordinated and system-oriented approach to off-label prescribing. Strengthening evidence generation, improving adverse event reporting, and standardizing documentation practices are essential steps toward reducing variability and enhancing patient safety. Without such reforms, off-label prescribing will continue to function as a necessary but inadequately supported component of clinical care.

Legal Framework and Challenges in Off-Label Prescribing

The legal framework governing off-label prescribing is defined by a structural separation between drug regulation and the practice of medicine, creating both necessary flexibility and persistent ambiguity. Under the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (FDCA), regulatory oversight is directed primarily at pharmaceutical manufacturers rather than clinicians, thereby granting physicians broad discretion to prescribe medications beyond approved indications (Syed et al., 2021). This autonomy enables clinicians to respond to unmet clinical needs, particularly in areas such as oncology or rare diseases, where approved therapies may be limited. However, it also transfers substantial responsibility for evaluating risk, interpreting evidence, and ensuring patient safety to individual providers, often without standardized guidance.

A critical legal constraint within this framework is the prohibition against pharmaceutical promotion of off-label uses. While intended to prevent commercial influence from exceeding scientific evidence, this restriction contributes to an uneven information environment in which clinicians must rely on fragmented sources such as peer-reviewed studies, clinical guidelines, and informal professional networks (Syed et al., 2021). For example, a physician considering an off-label use for a neurologic condition may encounter inconsistent or incomplete evidence across studies, requiring subjective interpretation that can vary significantly across providers. This variability introduces inconsistency into clinical decision-making and complicates efforts to establish uniform standards of care.

Legal exposure for clinicians is most pronounced when adverse outcomes occur. Liability risks arise when off-label prescribing deviates from accepted standards of care or lacks sufficient documentation of clinical reasoning (Syed et al., 2021). For instance, prescribing an off-label medication without clearly documenting the supporting evidence, anticipated benefits, and monitoring strategy may increase vulnerability to negligence claims if complications develop. Informed consent practices further compound this issue. Although explicit disclosure of off-label status is not uniformly required, failure to communicate the degree of uncertainty, potential risks, and available alternatives can undermine both patient trust and legal defensibility. This is particularly relevant in high-risk scenarios, such as prescribing off-label treatments for chronic pain or psychiatric conditions, where long-term outcomes may be uncertain.

These legal risks are amplified within fragmented healthcare systems, where accountability for off-label prescribing is often diffuse. When multiple providers are involved, responsibility for monitoring treatment effectiveness and adverse effects may be unclear. For example, a specialist may initiate an off-label therapy, while a primary care provider continues the prescription without full visibility into the original rationale or evidence base. In the absence of shared documentation and coordinated follow-up, critical safety information may be lost, increasing the likelihood of adverse events and compounding legal risk across providers.

Addressing these challenges requires a shift toward more structured and system-supported approaches to accountability. Clinicians should adopt standardized documentation practices that explicitly capture the rationale for off-label use, the quality of supporting evidence, and a defined monitoring plan. Healthcare organizations can operationalize this by embedding clinical decision-support tools and required documentation fields within electronic health records, ensuring that off-label prescribing decisions are both transparent and reviewable. Additionally, implementing structured informed consent processes that clearly communicate uncertainty and risk can strengthen ethical practice while reducing legal ambiguity. At a systems level, these interventions

create a more consistent and defensible framework for off-label prescribing, aligning clinical autonomy with patient safety and organizational accountability.

Application of Theoretical Frameworks to Off-Label Prescribing

Patient-Centered Care Model

The Patient-Centered Care Model provides a critical ethical and operational foundation for off-label prescribing by emphasizing that patients must be active participants in decisions characterized by clinical uncertainty and variable evidence (Huh & Shin, 2021; Hwang et al., 2019). This model is grounded in five core elements: respect for patient preferences, provision of clear information, emotional support, inclusion of family or caregivers, and continuity of care (Huh & Shin, 2021; Hwang et al., 2019). In off-label prescribing, these elements are particularly salient because treatment decisions often rely on incomplete or evolving evidence, requiring patients to weigh risks and benefits in a context of uncertainty.

Applying this model to contemporary prescribing practices strengthens the shift from passive consent to active engagement. Shared decision-making tools, such as digital decision aids, operationalize respect for patient preferences by allowing individuals to align treatment choices with their values and risk tolerance. Enhanced post-market surveillance systems that incorporate patient-reported outcomes extend this model beyond the initial decision point, enabling patients to actively shape ongoing treatment adjustments. Emotional support and education become especially critical in high-risk or experimental off-label use, where uncertainty may generate anxiety or decisional conflict. Furthermore, continuity of care, supported through shared care plans and telehealth follow-ups, ensures that patient input remains central across the treatment trajectory rather than being confined to a single consent interaction.

In practice, healthcare systems should implement several structured interventions.

1. Healthcare organizations should establish standardized shared decision-making protocols for all off-label prescribing scenarios that exceed defined risk thresholds.
2. Systems should integrate patient-reported outcome dashboards directly into electronic health records to allow real-time incorporation of patient feedback into clinical decision-making.
3. Clinicians should be required to schedule structured follow-up encounters, whether virtual or in-person, to reassess safety, adherence, and treatment effectiveness.
4. Providers should actively involve caregivers and family members in treatment discussions for vulnerable populations, such as pediatric and geriatric patients, to strengthen decision quality and adherence.

Interprofessional Collaborative Practice (ICP) Framework

The Interprofessional Collaborative Practice Framework establishes the structural and relational conditions necessary for safe and effective off-label prescribing by distributing responsibility across a coordinated care team. The framework is defined by shared goals, role clarity, interprofessional communication, mutual respect, and collaborative leadership (Sexton & Baessler, 2016). These elements are essential in complex clinical scenarios where no single provider possesses complete expertise, such as off-label prescribing, which often involves nuanced pharmacologic, clinical, and ethical considerations.

Integrating this framework with system-level prescribing improvements highlights the necessity of pharmacist-centered medication management and structured communication systems. Shared goals align all providers around patient safety and therapeutic effectiveness, while role clarity ensures that pharmacists lead medication safety reviews, physicians guide diagnostic and treatment decisions, and specialists contribute evidence-based insights.

Interprofessional communication, facilitated through shared electronic health record care plans and real-time messaging, reduces fragmentation and ensures that all providers operate with consistent information. Mutual respect and collaborative leadership further enable dynamic decision-making, where authority shifts to the provider with the most relevant expertise, particularly in high-risk prescribing scenarios. This approach directly supports pharmacist-led consult services and multidisciplinary case reviews.

Operationalizing this framework requires several coordinated system changes.

1. Health systems should implement mandatory pharmacist review triggers for off-label prescriptions that meet predefined clinical risk criteria.
2. Organizations should establish collaborative practice agreements that formally authorize pharmacists to monitor therapy, adjust dosages, and recommend discontinuation when appropriate.
3. Institutions should conduct routine interdisciplinary case conferences for complex or high-risk off-label prescribing scenarios to ensure shared accountability and decision quality.
4. Electronic health record systems should incorporate structured communication tools, including shared care plans and automated consultation prompts, to facilitate consistent and timely collaboration among providers.

Swiss Cheese Model of Error

The Swiss Cheese Model of Error provides a systems-based explanation for how adverse events in off-label prescribing arise from the alignment of multiple failures rather than isolated mistakes, underscoring the need for layered safety mechanisms. This model identifies four key elements: multiple defensive layers, latent conditions, active failures, and alignment of failures (Burrell, 2024; Wiegmann et al., 2022). In healthcare, these layers include clinical protocols, decision-support systems, provider expertise, and patient engagement processes, all of which may contain vulnerabilities (Wiegmann et al., 2022).

Applying this model to off-label prescribing reveals that risks are rarely attributable to a single decision but instead emerge when system weaknesses converge. Latent conditions, such as limited clinical evidence, inadequate guidelines, and fragmented communication, create a foundation of vulnerability. Active failures, including inappropriate prescribing or insufficient monitoring, then occur within this context. When these weaknesses align, such as poor documentation combined with lack of pharmacist oversight and absent follow-up, the likelihood of adverse outcomes increases significantly. The previously outlined recommendations directly address these vulnerabilities by introducing overlapping safeguards, including clinical decision support tools, pharmacist-led medication reviews, standardized informed consent, and real-time surveillance systems. This layered approach reflects a shift from reactive error management to proactive risk prevention.

Healthcare systems should implement multiple coordinated safety mechanisms to reduce risk.

1. Organizations should deploy electronic health record-integrated alerts that automatically flag off-label prescribing and prompt additional review.
2. Systems should require mandatory documentation fields that capture clinical rationale, supporting evidence, and risk-benefit justification for off-label use.
3. Pharmacists should serve as verification checkpoints prior to medication dispensing to ensure safety and appropriateness.
4. Healthcare providers should implement automated follow-up scheduling and monitoring systems to ensure continuous evaluation of patient outcomes.
5. Institutions should adopt risk stratification frameworks that categorize off-label use by risk level and apply enhanced safeguards to higher-risk categories.

Enhanced and Actionable Recommendations for Off-Label Prescribing Practices

Advancing the safety and effectiveness of off-label prescribing requires a transition from fragmented, clinician-dependent practices toward a coordinated, data-driven, and system-level framework. Although existing approaches emphasize individual clinician responsibility, persistent gaps in safety monitoring, evidence generation, and care coordination necessitate structural reform (Rusz et al., 2021; Syed et al., 2021).

1. Transforming Post-Market Surveillance Through Active and Real-Time Monitoring

Current pharmacovigilance systems remain predominantly passive and dependent on voluntary reporting, resulting in significant underreporting of adverse events and delayed identification of safety concerns (Rusz et al., 2021). To address this limitation, healthcare systems should implement active surveillance models that integrate electronic health records (EHRs), pharmacy dispensing data, and insurance claims into unified monitoring platforms.

Practical implementation strategies include:

- Embedding automated adverse event detection algorithms within EHR systems to flag abnormal clinical patterns (e.g., unexpected hospitalizations, lab abnormalities) following off-label prescribing.
- Establishing institution-level off-label prescribing dashboards that track utilization trends, outcomes, and safety signals in real time.
- Developing mandatory reporting triggers for high-risk off-label uses (e.g., pediatric, oncology, investigational indications), reducing reliance on voluntary reporting.
- Expanding patient-reported outcome (PRO) tools via mobile applications and patient portals to capture real-world safety and efficacy data (Shojaei & Salari, 2020).

Additionally, regulatory agencies should collaborate with health systems to create centralized national registries for off-label use, enabling large-scale aggregation of real-world evidence and accelerating signal detection and policy response.

2. Strengthening Medication Management Through Pharmacist-Integrated Care Models

Off-label prescribing frequently occurs without sufficient multidisciplinary oversight, increasing the risk of dosing errors, drug interactions, and inappropriate use (Syed et al., 2021). Pharmacists must be repositioned from a supportive role to a co-manager of off-label therapies.

Actionable strategies include:

- Implementing mandatory pharmacist review protocols for all off-label prescriptions above defined risk thresholds.
- Embedding clinical decision support tools that automatically alert pharmacists when off-label prescribing occurs, prompting real-time review.
- Expanding collaborative practice agreements (CPAs) that authorize pharmacists to adjust therapy, monitor outcomes, and discontinue ineffective or harmful treatments.
- Conducting targeted medication therapy management (MTM) sessions for patients receiving off-label treatments, particularly those with polypharmacy or chronic conditions.

Health systems should also establish off-label prescribing consult services, similar to antimicrobial stewardship programs, where pharmacists and specialists provide evidence-based guidance for complex cases.

3. Enhancing Coordination of Care Through Structured Interprofessional Communication

Fragmented communication between primary care physicians, specialists, and pharmacists contributes to inconsistent monitoring and increased patient risk. Effective off-label prescribing requires formalized coordination mechanisms, not informal communication.

Key implementation steps include:

- Developing standardized documentation templates within EHRs that require clinicians to record the rationale, supporting evidence, and monitoring plan for off-label use (Syed et al., 2021).
- Creating shared care plans accessible across care teams, ensuring continuity and accountability in treatment decisions.
- Integrating clinical decision support alerts that prompt interdisciplinary consultation when prescribing falls outside established evidence thresholds.
- Utilizing secure, real-time communication platforms (e.g., integrated messaging within EHRs) to facilitate rapid collaboration among providers.

Routine case review conferences for high-risk off-label use (e.g., tumor boards, pharmacotherapy rounds) should also be institutionalized to support collective decision-making.

4. Standardizing Ethical Practices and Strengthening Informed Consent

Ethical ambiguity remains a defining challenge of off-label prescribing, particularly regarding informed consent and patient autonomy (Shojaei & Salari, 2020). Current practices are inconsistent and often insufficiently transparent.

To address this, healthcare systems should:

- Require standardized informed consent protocols for off-label use, particularly when evidence is limited or risks are significant.
- Develop decision aids that clearly communicate uncertainty, potential benefits, and known risks in accessible formats.
- Incorporate documentation of shared decision-making into clinical workflows, ensuring that patient preferences are explicitly considered.
- Provide clinician training in risk communication, particularly for complex or emergent treatment scenarios.

These measures strengthen trust, reduce legal exposure, and align clinical practice with ethical principles of autonomy and beneficence.

5. Expanding Evidence Generation Through Incentivized and Embedded Research

A major limitation of off-label prescribing is the persistent lack of high-quality evidence supporting many uses (Rusz et al., 2021). Addressing this gap requires integrating research directly into clinical practice.

Actionable approaches include:

- Embedding pragmatic clinical trials within health systems, allowing routine care data to contribute to evidence generation.
- Providing financial and regulatory incentives for pharmaceutical companies to pursue supplemental indications.
- Supporting public–private partnerships to fund research on commonly used off-label therapies lacking commercial incentives.
- Leveraging real-world evidence (RWE) from registries and EHR systems to inform adaptive regulatory decisions.

Regulatory bodies should also consider conditional approval pathways that allow provisional endorsement of off-label uses supported by strong observational data, with ongoing evidence requirements.

6. Implementing Risk Stratification Frameworks for Off-Label Prescribing

Not all off-label uses carry equal risk, yet current practices often treat them uniformly. Introducing risk stratification models can improve oversight and resource allocation.

Practical steps include:

- Categorizing off-label use into low-, moderate-, and high-risk tiers based on evidence strength, patient population, and drug profile.
- Applying graduated oversight requirements, such as mandatory specialist consultation or enhanced monitoring for high-risk categories.
- Integrating risk scoring tools into EHR systems to guide clinician decision-making at the point of care.

This approach allows for targeted intervention without unnecessarily restricting low-risk, evidence-supported practices.

7. Leveraging Digital Health and Telehealth for Ongoing Monitoring

Continuity of care is often compromised after initiating off-label therapy, particularly in outpatient settings. Digital health tools offer a scalable solution.

Implementation strategies include:

- Utilizing remote patient monitoring (RPM) devices to track relevant clinical parameters in real time.
- Scheduling telehealth follow-ups specifically for patients receiving off-label treatments to ensure timely reassessment.
- Integrating automated symptom tracking systems that alert clinicians to early signs of adverse effects.

These tools enhance early detection of complications and support more responsive, patient-centered care.

Original Contribution to Knowledge

This commentary contributes to the existing body of literature by shifting the discourse on off-label prescribing from a predominantly clinical and regulatory focus toward a more integrated examination of ethical, professional, and systems-level risk management challenges. Prior scholarship has largely emphasized prevalence, legal permissibility, and therapeutic utility; however, this analysis reframes off-label prescribing as a complex, high-risk system behavior shaped by fragmented evidence, decentralized decision-making, and variability in care coordination.

A central contribution of this commentary is the synthesis of interdisciplinary theoretical frameworks, including patient-centered care, interprofessional collaboration, and systems-based risk models, to provide a structured lens through which off-label prescribing can be understood and improved. Through this integration, the analysis illustrates that risks associated with off-label use are not solely attributable to individual clinician decisions but are embedded within broader systemic vulnerabilities, including gaps in pharmacovigilance, inconsistent communication across providers, and the absence of standardized ethical protocols. This perspective advances the discourse beyond individual accountability toward organizational and system-level responsibility for patient safety.

This commentary further contributes by explicitly linking off-label prescribing to broader public health risk dynamics, particularly the underreporting of adverse events and the limited aggregation of real-world evidence. The identification of coordination of care

failures, such as incomplete documentation, lack of shared treatment rationale, and insufficient follow-up, expands current understanding of how off-label prescribing may compromise continuity and safety across care settings. Importantly, the commentary advances practical insight by outlining actionable strategies, including pharmacist-integrated care models, real-time surveillance systems, and structured informed consent processes, thereby bridging conceptual analysis with implementation. Collectively, this contribution supports the development of a risk-informed, ethically grounded, and system-oriented framework that places patient safety at the center of off-label prescribing practices.

Policy Implications

The perspectives presented in this commentary have significant implications for healthcare policy, particularly in strengthening patient safety infrastructure and reducing variability in off-label prescribing practices. Existing policy frameworks largely permit off-label use under physician discretion but provide limited structured guidance for managing associated risks. This gap underscores the need to transition from permissive oversight toward safety-oriented policy interventions that enhance accountability while preserving necessary clinical flexibility.

One critical policy implication involves modernizing pharmacovigilance systems through the implementation of active surveillance models. Policymakers should prioritize the integration of electronic health record data, pharmacy dispensing data, and claims information into unified monitoring systems capable of detecting adverse events in real time. For example, healthcare systems could implement automated reporting triggers for high-risk off-label uses, such as those involving pediatric populations or investigational therapies, thereby reducing reliance on voluntary reporting mechanisms.

Another important policy direction is the formal expansion of pharmacist roles in medication management. Policies should support collaborative practice agreements and require pharmacist involvement in reviewing high-risk off-label prescriptions. This approach enhances medication safety while distributing responsibility across the care team. Practical policy mechanisms may include reimbursement models that incentivize pharmacist-led medication therapy management and consultation services for complex prescribing scenarios.

Policy efforts must also address coordination of care by establishing standardized documentation and communication requirements. Healthcare organizations should be required to document the rationale, supporting evidence, and monitoring strategies for off-label use within shared electronic health records accessible to all relevant providers. Additionally, policies may mandate structured follow-up intervals and interdisciplinary consultation for higher-risk prescribing, thereby reducing fragmentation and improving continuity of care.

Finally, policy frameworks should promote equitable evidence generation by incentivizing research on commonly used off-label therapies, particularly those lacking commercial interest. Public funding initiatives and public–private partnerships can support pragmatic clinical trials and real-world evidence studies, ensuring that prescribing practices are increasingly informed by robust data and aligned with patient safety priorities.

Conclusion and Regulatory Implications

A meaningful improvement in off-label prescribing practices requires more than adherence to traditional best practices; it demands systemic transformation. By integrating active surveillance, pharmacist-led care models, structured communication, ethical standardization, and embedded research, healthcare systems can mitigate the inherent risks of off-label use while preserving its clinical advantages. Importantly, these strategies shift

off-label prescribing from an individualized, variable practice to a learning, accountable, and continuously improving system, better aligned with the principles of patient safety, evidence-based medicine, and equitable care (Rusz et al., 2021; Syed et al., 2021; Shojaei & Salari, 2020).

The perspectives advanced in this commentary highlight the need for a more adaptive and risk-sensitive regulatory approach to off-label prescribing. Current regulatory paradigms maintain a distinction between drug approval and the practice of medicine, thereby preserving physician autonomy while simultaneously creating gaps in oversight that may affect patient safety when evidence is limited or inconsistent.

A key regulatory implication is the need to develop adaptive frameworks that respond to evolving evidence. Regulatory bodies could implement conditional recognition pathways for off-label uses supported by strong real-world evidence, coupled with requirements for ongoing data collection and evaluation. For example, provisional endorsement of certain off-label applications could allow systematic monitoring while facilitating timely access to potentially beneficial therapies.

Regulatory approaches should also strengthen expectations related to transparency and informed consent, particularly in scenarios involving higher risk or limited evidence. Establishing clearer guidance for clinician-patient communication can enhance patient autonomy, reduce ambiguity in clinical decision-making, and support more consistent ethical practice. Practical implementation may include standardized consent processes and documentation protocols embedded within clinical systems.

In addition, regulatory agencies should facilitate greater data interoperability and information sharing across healthcare systems. Supporting centralized registries and coordinated data-sharing initiatives can enable more comprehensive monitoring of off-label use and improve the detection of safety signals at the population level. These efforts are essential for informing future regulatory decisions and clinical guidelines.

From an operational perspective, healthcare organizations must translate these regulatory priorities into practice by embedding risk management strategies within clinical workflows. This includes implementing decision-support tools, strengthening interdisciplinary oversight, and ensuring continuous monitoring of patient outcomes. The objective is not to restrict off-label prescribing but to position it within a more accountable, transparent, and continuously learning system.

In conclusion, managing the risks associated with off-label prescribing requires coordinated alignment across clinical practice, policy development, and regulatory oversight. By integrating structured safeguards, enhancing evidence generation, and prioritizing patient-centered protections, healthcare systems can preserve the clinical benefits of off-label use while minimizing potential harm. This balanced approach is essential for advancing patient safety and reinforcing the ethical and professional integrity of modern healthcare.

References

Bell, J. S., & Richards, G. C. (2021). Off-label medicine use: ethics, practice and future directions. *Australian Journal of General Practice*, *50*(5), 329-331.

Burrell, D.N. (2024). Understanding Healthcare Cybersecurity Risk Management Complexity. *Land Forces Academy Review*, *29*(1), 38-49. https://doi.org/10.2478/raft-2024-0004

Huh, A., & Shin, J. H. (2021). Person-centered care practice, patient safety competence, and patient safety nursing activities of nurses working in geriatric hospitals. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, *18*(10), 5169.

Hwang, J. I., Kim, S. W., & Chin, H. J. (2019). Patient participation in patient safety and its relationships with nurses' patient-centered care competency, teamwork, and safety climate. *Asian Nursing Research*, *13*(2), 130-136.

Rusz, C. M., Ősz, B. E., Jîtcă, G., Miklos, A., Bătrînu, M. G., & Imre, S. (2021). Off-label medication: from a simple concept to complex practical aspects. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, *18*(19), 10447.

Shojaei, A., & Salari, P. (2020). COVID-19 and off-label use of drugs: an ethical viewpoint. *DARU Journal of Pharmaceutical Sciences*, *28*, 789-793.

Syed, S. A., Dixson, B. A., Constantino, E., & Regan, J. (2021). The law and practice of off-label prescribing and physician promotion. *J Am Acad Psychiatry Law*, *49*(1), 53-59.

Sexton, M., & Baessler, M. (2016). Interprofessional collaborative practice. *The Journal of Continuing Education in Nursing*, *47*(4), 156-157.

Wiegmann, D. A., Wood, L. J., Cohen, T. N., & Shappell, S. A. (2022). Understanding the "Swiss Cheese Model" and Its Application to Patient Safety. *Journal of Patient Safety*, *18*(2), 119–123. https://doi.org/10.1097/PTS.0000000000000810