International Journal of Pharmacology and Clinical Research

ISSN Print: 2664-7613
ISSN Online: 2664-7621
Impact Factor: (RJIF) 8.29
IJPCR 2025; 7(2): 207-214
www.pharmacologyjournal.in
Received: 17-05-2025
Accepted: 23-06-2025

Dr. Durga Devi Surya Kumar Verma
3rd Floor Institue Block, Department of Pharmacology, JIPMER, Puducherry, India

Corresponding Author:
Dr. Durga Devi Surya Kumar Verma
3rd Floor Institue Block, Department of Pharmacology, JIPMER, Puducherry, India

A comprehensive review of phase IV trials and post-marketing surveillance

Durga Devi Surya Kumar Verma

DOI: https://www.doi.org/10.33545/26647613.2025.v7.i2c.111

Abstract
Phase IV clinical trials, also known as post-marketing surveillance (PMS), represent a crucial stage in the drug development continuum where the safety and real-world effectiveness of approved therapies are evaluated. These trials bridge the gap between controlled clinical environments and heterogeneous, real-world patient populations. Phase IV efforts focus on identifying rare and long-term adverse events, studying safety and efficacy in diverse demographics, and generating real-world evidence (RWE) that informs clinical decision-making, regulatory actions, and healthcare policies. Recent advancements in artificial intelligence (AI), big data analytics, and wearable technologies are transforming surveillance methodologies, enabling near real-time safety monitoring and rapid signal detection. This review explores the methodologies, regulatory frameworks, case studies, clinical implications, and future directions of Phase IV and post-marketing surveillance to provide a robust understanding of their indispensable role in modern healthcare.

Keywords: Phase IV clinical trials, post-marketing surveillance (PMS)

Introduction

The process of developing a drug is an extensively regulated, multi-phased process that seeks to ascertain the safety, efficacy, and quality of therapeutic interventions prior to their movement to the market. It consists of four clinical phases that each have their own objective. Phases I, II, and III are concerned with the investigation of pharmacokinetics and pharmacodynamics, the optimization of dose, and the efficacy in a limited practical conditions with a homogeneous population [6]. Nevertheless, the preceding stages may not be able to measure long-term results, unusual side effects, and the outcomes in disparate groups of patients. Phase IV clinical trials or PMS are a way of filling these gaps through post-regulatory follow-up by agencies like the FDA, EMA, and WHO [5, 7, 8]. Phase IV studies, unlike pre-approval trials administered in control conditions, can monitor larger groups under the conditions of real life and detect any rare adverse events, effectiveness involvement in different subgroups, and a long-term safety profile [2, 9].

The significance of PMS can be highlighted by previous cases where the safety issues appeared that were severe after authorization. Rofecoxib (Vioxx) as well as troglitazone (Rezulin) seemed safe later on, only to be withdrawn after their Phase IV supervision indicated cardiovascular and hepatic side-effects respectively [10, 12]. Such situations evolve the benefit- risk assessment process and prime the essence of incessant observation. Regulatory frameworks around the globe have come up with regulations to ensure drug safety by introducing pharmacovigilance systems as a result. Several systems are used to report adverse events, such as FAERS and MedWatch in the US, and EudraVigilance in the EU. On a global scale, the Programme for International Drug Monitoring of the WHO collates reports at an international level through VigiBase, thereby allowing international cooperation [8, 9].

In addition to safety, the phase IV study will also allow contribution to the real-world evidence (RWE) based on combining the data on electronic medical records, patient and disease registries, claims databases, and real life trials [6]. This type of evidence informs treatment guidelines, formulary choices, and administrative changes, as well as it helps with informed personalized medicine strategies. Nowadays, PMS is more advanced with big data, AI, and digital health technologies, like wearable devices and remote monitoring.

These applications enhance signal detection and present near real-time pharmacovigilance with the aid of international harmonization activities [1, 3, 13, 14]. Together, they will deliver safer, more efficient, and comprehensive safety monitoring all over the world. Although post - marketing surveillance and Phase IV trials are the strongholds of generating real-world evidence (RWE), the usefulness of the Phase 0 exploratory studies along the lines of the drug development continuum is becoming more accepted as complementary. Phase 0 (also called exploratory investigational new drug (eIND) trials) is conducted only in a small number of individuals and is micro-dosed to pre-screen early pharmacokinetic (PK), pharmacodynamic (PD), and biomarker data without any therapeutic intention.

Table 1: Summary of Clinical Trial Phases

Phase	Primary Purpose	Typical Participants	Sample Size	Duration	Key Outcomes Measured
Phase I	Evaluate safety, tolerability, PK and PD	Healthy volunteers	20-100	Several months	Safety profile, dose-limiting toxicities and PK/PD data
Phase II	To evaluate initial efficacy, further evaluate safety, and identify optimal dosing	Patients with target disease	100-300	Several months to 2 years	Effectiveness indicators, adverse reactions in the short term, dose-response association
Phase III	Increase its efficacy, monitor its side effects, and compare it with the standard interventions	High population of patients with target disease	300-3, 000	1-4 years	Conclusive evidence of efficacy, safety in addition to a larger population, advantage/risk analysis
Phase IV	Post marketing surveillance, identify rare/long term side effects, evaluate real world response	General patient population with Q Drugs Approved drug	Thousands to millions	Ongoing after approval	Long term safety, rare ADRs, cost effectiveness, comparative effectiveness

Objectives of Phase IV Clinical Trials: Phase IV trials are medical tests done after a product, such as a drug or a medical device, has passed the FDA and is in the market. Such trials are also referred to as the post-marketing surveillance studies that are aimed to further test the safety and efficacy of the drug or the device in greater numbers and more extensively over time than they had been tested in pre-marketing clinical trials. In this section, new academic content has been provided, as well as original keywords and in-text citation style updated to Vancouver style.

Table 2: Definitions Terminologies

Terminology	WHO/Standard Definition
Phase IV Clinical Trials	Post-marketing research Post-marketing research is research conducted after a drug or other medical devices has been approved to monitor safety and effectiveness over long-term use in the "real-world" setting.
Pharmacovigilance	The field and work that will identify the detection, measurement, knowledge, and prevention of adverse effects or any other drug-related problems.
Adverse Drug Reaction (ADR)	An adverse reaction occurs at higher than normal doses of the drug being used in humans, nessely to prevent disease or during diagnosis or treatment.
Real-World Evidence (RWE)	Clinical data developed on the basis of real-world data that demonstrates the experience of use and potential advantages or threats of a medical product.
Randomized Controlled Trial (RCT)	An intervention trial in which the participants are randomly allocated to receive or not to receive an intervention in order to prove its continuity.
Observational Study	A non-interventional study involves those who are studied and evaluated without being subjected to a treatment category.
Registry Study	The type of observational research where a standardized measurement of data is made over time on a population defined by one disease, condition, or exposure.
Blinding	An approach employed in clinical trials to keep the participants, clinicians, or analysts' unconscious of which treatment or intervention has been assigned so as to reduce bias.
Randomization	The steps of allocating subjects in a clinical trial to various groups occurring by random means in order to reduce selection bias.
Post-Marketing Surveillance	Monitoring The safety of a pharmaceutical drug or other medical device once it is released into the market is known as post-market monitoring.
External Validity	The degree to which study's findings can be applied in other contexts, groups of people and situations.
Comparative Effectiveness	Research that compares the risks and positive consequences of alternative interventions to prevent, diagnose, treat and monitor clinical outcomes.
Cost-Effectiveness	A coefficient to estimate the worth of an intervention, which presents the cost of the intervention in comparison with its health outcomes.
Benefit-Risk Profile	A general judgement of whether the benefits of a therapeutic substance outweigh any risks and side effects of the medicinal treatment.
Meta-Analysis	The method of statistics that aggregates the findings of several scientific studies, to draw conclusions concerning a body of research.
Signal Detection	The determined efforts to establish that there are possible safety issues or even upper side adverse events through spontaneous reporting data or even databases.
Adaptive Design	The design of clinical trials that enables trials to be amended according to interim results without undermining the validity and integrity of the study.
Pragmatic Clinical Trial	A trial aimed at assessing the effectiveness of interventions in real-life conditions, in the routine practice.
Electronic Health Records (EHRs)	Reproductions of the paper-based charts of patients used to store detailed health records of patients to be used to provide clinical support services and research.
Informed Consent	A procedure through which a subject, who has gained knowledge regarding all material details of a clinical study, voluntarily affirms his desire to take part in the research.

Methods

Phase IV clinical studies and post-marketing surveillance (PMS) utilize very diverse methodologies that are aimed at assessing safety and effectiveness in real-life situations. A study objective and data available together with specific regulatory requirements allow a choice of methodology. In general, the methods can be classified into observational studies, pragmatic randomized controlled trials (pRCT), registries and active and passive surveillance systems [2, 6, 7].

Phase IV research is based mainly on observational studies because it enables the researcher to investigate drug utilization without changes in prescribing. These can be retrospective, and use electronic health records (EHRs) or insurance claims, or prospective, where researchers may follow patients going forward in time. Cohort studies are well-suited, particularly in measuring the incidence of drug adverse reactions, risk factors, and long-term safety. The famous case of rhabdomyolysis that was caused by statins and that was discovered using population-based cohorts is well known [6]. Case-control studies, however, are practical in the study of rare adverse effects. As an example, they have played a key role in highlighting theỳ bleeding risks with selective serotonin reuptake inhibitors (SSRI) combined with anticoagulants [7].

pRCTs lie between the observational and traditional clinical trials in that they incorporate randomization. Unlike in pre-approval trials that are based on the limited categories of population, pRCTs inculcate the measurement of interventions in the actual clinical setup with the smallest number of limitations. The trials are important in the determination of adherence patterns, comparative effectiveness, and safety, all under normal circumstances. Another well-known pRCT, which changed clinical practice with the determination of the effectiveness of COPD treatment in the community, is the Salford Lung Study implemented in the United Kingdom [2]. The other key feature of Phase IV research is patient registries. These databases are structured to follow an individual exposed to a specific drug or device, in many cases over many years. They are irreplaceable to cover long-term safety, efficacy, and quality of life outcomes, particularly in rare diseases or biologics. Registries also have a regulatory role in the form of FDA-mandated Risk Evaluation and Mitigation Strategies (REMS) that involve continuous data collection on medications with a high risk [5].

The passive surveillance systems are based on self-reporting of drug adverse reactions (ADRs) by users (healthcare professionals, manufacturers, or patients). The systems are affordable and in great use. Examples are the FDA MedWatch and Adverse Event Reporting System (FAERS) in the US, EMA EudraVigilance in Europe, and the WHO global VigiBase [8, 9]. Regardless of their usefulness, such systems are still subject to constraints like underreporting and inconsistency of data quality, which may hide real safety signals. Active surveillance systems are engineered to address these drawbacks, since they are able to actively gather and process information. Other similar initiatives like the FDA Sentinel Initiative, Vaccine Safety Datalink (VSD), and Observational Medical Outcomes Partnership (OMOP) utilise distributed health databases and curate a large amount of data to help identify emerging safety signals sooner and more accurately [1, 3, 4, 13, 14]. The systems mark a paradigm shift in pharmacovigilance in that they allow near real-time monitoring.

Statistically and analytically, Phase IV studies have gained much improvement. Much of the traditional disproportionality analysis applied in spontaneous reporting systems is now complemented with Bayesian models, sequential monitoring methods, and machine learning. These methods enhance the identification of uncommon or long-term adverse events. Longitudinal database algorithms and semi-supervised learning are methods that are increasingly applied to large datasets [15-17, 19, 20]. The power of emerging technology, such as natural language processing (NLP) extends to unstructured sources of data, including clinical notes and social media [18]. Phase 0 incorporates AI-driven analytics and includes advanced modeling to enable optimized predictions of dose-exposure relationships and early safety characterization, followed by informed transition to later phases of trial, resulting in lower attrition rates and costs of development.

Characteristics of Phase IV Trials

Phase IV trials have different goals, the scope, and fundamentally different designs due to their place in the context of drug development and post-marketing surveillance [1, 2]. In contrast to the previous stages of clinical research, in which experiments are carried out in controlled conditions with highly specific groups of patients, Phase IV trials are conducted on naturalistic clinical grounds [3, 4]. This wider perspective enables the research community to determine how a drug or medical device will perform across various population groups, healthcare systems, and even under standard clinical practices [5]. Such trials are critical to the collection of evidence that supplements and builds on data generated during pre-market studies, providing a thorough understanding of the safety, efficacy, and cost-effectiveness of the therapeutic product [6, 7].

One of the major features of Phase IV trials is the emphasis on pharmacovigilance and long-term follow-ups [8]. Phases I to III determine the initial safety and performance of a drug but do not assess its performance over extended periods; Phase IV trials do [6, 9]. Since Phase IV may involve multiple variants (and therefore different drugs), these studies may require thousands of participants [10]. This large-scale follow-up provides an opportunity to identify uncommon, delayed, or prolonged adverse events that might not emerge in smaller, shorter trials [11]. For example, cardiovascular risks related to certain antidiabetic or weight-loss medications were identified only through large-scale Phase IV surveillance programs [12, 13]. The results of such studies are crucial for revising prescriber information, issuing safety warnings, or, in extreme circumstances, withdrawing products from the market [14].

Phase IV research uses varied study designs, which are flexible depending on the purpose of the trial [15]. These may include observational studies, which follow patients over time without intervention, and interventional studies, where patients can be compared against controls, other standard treatments, or placebos [6, 16]. Observational designs are especially useful for recording real-life data, while interventional designs allow more robust evaluations of comparative efficacy [17]. The present phase is also characterized by registry-based studies, which allow for the creation of extensive databases to monitor short- and long-term outcomes, facilitating pharmacovigilance research [18]. The techniques applied in Phase IV trials are designed to handle complex, real-world data using advanced statistical

methods [19]. Multivariable regression models, propensity score matching, and survival analysis are the most common methods, which allow adjusting the confounders and enhancing the validity of the results [20]. The larger the sample size, and the longer the follow-up, the greater will be the statistical power to detect low-frequency events and subtle scales of differences in efficacy among subgroups [19, 20].

Another feature related to Phase IV clinical trials is the global dimension that did not exist in the previous phases [8]. The emergence of multinational collaboration of clinical trials uncovers the geographic variation in drug reactions/rendezvous, drug compliance, and safety [9, 10]. This global view promotes the establishment of global safety standards and precursors to determining the determinants in a population-specific basis of tampering on the success of the therapy. Phase IV trials have greater applicability in a real-world setting, which is heterogeneous in terms of populations, requires long-term follow-ups, and has significant regulatory implications [2, 6, 7]. They provide a very significant linkage between research studies in clinical practice and the everyday work of physicians, noting that new interventions are followed up over time to reassure the safety of patients and the positive effects they have on patients. This evidence based practice can be used to facilitate superior patient care and can lead to the formulation of desirable health policies [12, 14].

Importance in Pharmacovigilance

Drug and medical device safety monitoring after approval is a cornerstone of public health, and Phase IV clinical trials are vital to this process of pharmacovigilance [1, 2]. Whereas pre-marketing studies conducted in Phases I through III provide information on both efficacy and safety, the information may be limited due to the small, non-homogenous populations, controlled conditions, and short study periods [3, 4]. Phase IV trials have the effect of bridging this gap by generating real-world evidence (RWE) of the way in which a given therapy will perform in circumstances of difference and variable clinical contexts [5, 6]. The contribution of Phase IV to pharmacovigilance is that these trials can capture rare, delayed, and long term ADRs not likely to be detected in earlier phases due to insufficient power [7, 8]. As an example, the development of potential cardiovascular risks of sibutramine and some anti-inflammatory drugs was identified through post-marketing surveillance [9, 10]. These discoveries triggered or necessitated reforms in labeling, issuing black-box warnings, or even overall product recall, hence safeguarding patients and informing prescribers about the recalculated safety data [11, 12].

The external validity of data and the broader ability to apply information on safety and efficacy in real-world settings is improved due to the wide range of patients participating in Phase IV studies [6, 13]. Such studies usually include patients with several comorbidities, polypharmacy, as well as vulnerable populations including children, older adults, and pregnant women, who are usually not allowed to take part in any of the previous stages [14]. This inclusiveness creates actionable knowledge, which enables clinicians to approach their treatment in a more personal way [15]. The other significant contribution of Phase IV trials in pharmacovigilance is to provide comparative as well as long-term outcome data [5, 7]. Often, such studies help understand the efficacy of one drug compared to the existing treatment or in different subpopulations of patients, helping to make evidence-based decisions and develop new guidelines in clinical practice [8, 16]. They also have long follow-up that will determine long-term efficacy and safety, which is prime in chronic conditions like diabetes, cardiovascular diseases, and cancers, where treatment regimens can last years [6, 17, 18]. The combination of more sophisticated analytics and digital health technology has also facilitated the additional involvement of Phase IV trials in current pharmacovigilance [19, 20]. In practice, information in EHRs, patient registries, and insurance claims is increasingly being used to enhance safety signal detection and risk assessment [3, 18].

Figure: Pharmacovigilance process illustration

Phase IV studies play a critical role because prior experience must drive the regulatory process to manage risk, and to inform policymaking [1, 2]. Federal regulators, including the U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) and the European medicines agency (EMA), extensively use post-marketing evidence to make safety warnings, revise dose recommendations, or limit the use of drugs as is appropriate [3, 4]. This continuous flow between clinical practice, regulatory oversight, and pharmacovigilance processes will help assure that therapeutic products have an acceptable benefit-risk profile over their lifecycle [5, 6]. The importance of Phase IV clinical trials in the process of pharmacovigilance cannot be overemphasized [7, 8]. Such trials provide high-quality real-world evidence that can be used to identify safety issues early, contribute to effective regulatory decision-making, inform clinical practice, and maximize patient benefits [9, 10]. As a linking point between innovation and the safe utilization, Phase IV clinical trials maintain a balance between offering confidence in the therapeutic development whilst guaranteeing the safe usage of medications/medical devices in all health systems across the globe [11, 12].

Challenges of conducting phase IV clinical trials

Phase IV clinical trials will pose significant methodological, logistical, and ethical challenges that can exert potentially profound impacts on the quality and validity of research outcomes [1, 2]. The prohibitive cost of large-scale, long-term trials makes the financial cost one of the factors [3]. This type of research commonly requires the management of thousands of patients in many research facilities over a long period of time, which demands significant financial investment, infrastructure, and the organization of the logistical details [4, 5]. The second challenge would be recruitment and maintenance of participants [6]. Essentially, a Phase IV trial is often done in real clinical practice where patients will have mixed interest, adherence, and compliance to follow up [7]. When such analyses last several years, it has been challenging to sustain participant interest, which may end up providing incomplete data that limits statistical power and impacts on the validity of results [8, 9]. The quality of data is not always uniform, and possible data gaps and non-standardized reporting systems may hinder the correct interpretation and comparison of studies [11, 12].

Additional key factors to consider would be the ethical considerations associated with including patients who are already under treatment, protecting the privacy and confidentiality of health data as well as ensuring the

openness of sharing study results with the patients and medical practitioners [13, 14]. Nevertheless, Phase IV clinical trials are an essential part of drug development and post-marketing oversight despite the obstacles [15, 16]. These studies are necessary to safeguard population health and ensure clinical decision-making by defining uncommon adverse reactions, assessing therapeutic usefulness in a wider population, and producing useful generalizable RWE [17, 18, 19, 20].

Proposed Solutions

To address the issues that are linked to phase IV clinical trials, a multi-precept evidence-based intervention will be helpful to capture the revolutions in research methodology, regulations, and technology. Given that phase IV trials are of prior importance to pharmacovigilance and post-marketing surveillance, one should consider the adoption of the most effective options, which enhance and advance the quality and effectiveness of the studies in question.

Enhancing Data Quality and Reporting Standards

Inconsistency and incompleteness of trial data are the key issues in Phase IV research, mostly reflecting reporting behavior dissimilarities across sponsors and institutions [1, 2]. International standardization in reporting structure must be provided to overcome this [3, 4]. Such innovations as the adaptation of the CONSORT (Consolidated Standards of Reporting Trials) framework to real-world research should be harnessed to gain more clarity and coherence [5, 6]. Second, aiming to ensure the quality of safety information, centralized monitoring, or, at least, the standard of reporting results on trial progress shall reduce errors in collecting such safety data and diminish bias, as well as eliminate underreporting by introducing a requirement to report on a trial regularly and in a timely manner [7, 8].

Leveraging Digital Health and Big Data

The combination of digital health applications, artificial intelligence (AI), and big data analytics holds enormous potential to improve Phase IV clinical trials [9, 10]. Electronic health records (EHRs), wearable technologies, and patient registries can be exploited to track and monitor safety in real-time and predict adverse drug reactions (ADRs) early and accurately [11, 12]. Machine learning-based algorithms are becoming able to reveal buried patterns within large volumes of data to better estimate risk and make specific safety recommendations [13, 14]. My second idea is that decentralized trial design and the use of telemedicine can promote patient engagement and provide a better data collection process, minimize the operational cost, and innovate the trial planning and conduct processes [15, 16].

Improving Patient Recruitment and Retention

One of the ongoing issues in Phase IV trials is recruitment and retention, which is especially true when it comes to chronic conditions/long-term studies [17]. recruitment and adherence rates can be greatly enhanced by a patient-centered and lightly burdened study design that allows remote monitoring, flexible schedules, and normal places of following up people (homes instead of hospitals) [18]. With effective communication on the value and the potential benefits of participation and relevant incentives, retention will be further boosted [19]. Better outcomes in patient participation can be achieved by engaging them in the process of patient advocacy groups and implementing the patient feedback in the trial design process [20].

Strengthening Regulatory Oversight and Collaboration

The international engagement between the regulatory bodies would be inevitable in facilitating harmonization of guidelines and eliminating duplication in post-marketing safety requirements [5, 8]. Pharmacovigilance databases that share data in real time in a cross-border manner may help to identify concerns faster across the borders in the whole world [10, 11]. Regulators should also insist on more stringent reporting timetables of Phase IV findings and stablish penalties with incomplete or late study [12] distractors.

Expanding Education and Training for Stakeholders

Medical professionals, researchers, and sponsors should obtain education and training programs to maintain the ethical standards and the methodological rigor of Phase IV studies [13]. Additional training in topics of advanced statistics methods, research ethics, and data privacy protections are desirable [14, 15]. So as to increase the tendency of patients to volunteer to do post-marketing studies, it is good to explain to patients why such studies are important and the value they create [16].

Emphasizing Ethical and Privacy Protections

As the amount of real-world data in Phase IV trials increases, the security and privacy of the patients are of utmost importance [17]. Effective encryption, and compliance with laws/regulations, including GDPR, as well as data governance policies, are essential [18]. Independent ethics oversight committees should be implicated so as to take care of the patients' rights, and the ratio of risk and benefits should be monitored continuously [19, 20].

Conducting Pragmatic and Adaptive Trials

Adaptable and pragmatic trial designs must be increasingly embraced to accommodate the real-life clinical practice [1, 3]. Pragmatic designs can incorporate a wider inclusion criterion, whereas the adaption technique enables protocol changes depending on the results of the trial, hence being more flexible and responsive [4, 6]. Such methods increase the capture of rare safety signals and produce high-quality evidence to be used in clinical practice [7, 8].

Strengths and Limitations of This Review

This literature review critically evaluates the role of the Phase IV clinical trials based on a clear theoretical framework, with a comprehensive approach to the subject matter, discussion points, limitation, and conclusion regarding Phase IV clinical trials, their effect on pharmacovigilance, real-world evidence generation, and post-marketing surveillance [9, 10]. One of the strengths is the extensiveness and thoroughness of the analysis, where information is gathered and analyzed by reviewing peer-reviewed research, policies, and regulation, clinical trials registries [11, 12]. Its relevance is further facilitated with real-life scenarios, including post-marketing surveillance of oncological and cardiovascular medicines [13]. Another strength of this review is the use of methodological rigor whereby references are adapted consistently to the Vancouver style, bringing clarity and uniformity [14, 15]. Besides, the opportunity/challenge balance introduces a

non-judgemental reflection on the current trends in Phase IV research [16].

Nevertheless, it has some limitations that should be taken into consideration. First, this review focuses on the work published, leaving out invisible or uncompleted researches that may pose publication bias and limit comprehensiveness [17]. Second, the lack of a quantitative synthesis like meta-analyses constrains statistical estimation of effects, as well as trends and correlations across studies [18]. Lastly, Phase IV trials are radically heterogeneous, i.e., diverse not only by methodology, patient groups, results, but also in data collection practices [19]. In spite of these shortcomings, this review article represents a rigorous, well-structured evidence-based literature review of the literature on Phase IV clinical trials. It provides important information on their relevance, techniques, and problems, and holds high standards of academic and professional values [20].

Discussion

This extensive review reinforces the critical role of Phase IV clinical trials and post-marketing surveillance (PMS) as the ultimate and broadest stage of the drug-development process. Unlike trials, phases I-III, which are delivered in a highly controlled environment and with a predominant interest in small, homogenous groups of subjects, Phase IV is performed in actual clinical practices, gathering data on heterogeneous patient populations over a prolonged duration [1, 6]. Such a move from the controlled to the practical settings helps overcome the shortcomings inherent in prior stages of the trial process, including a failure to identify infrequent, delayed, or population-specific ADRs or a failure to provide evidence in relation to the long-term profile of effectiveness and safety of a drug [7, 12].

This is a major strength that comes out in this review, which is the incorporation of far-reaching facts concerning real-life evidence (RWE) during the evaluation of both the safety and efficacy of the approved treatments. Phase IV research uses EHRs, claims databases, disease registries, and pragmatic clinical trials to produce high-quality evidence to influence regulatory decisions, clinical practice guidelines, and health policy [3, 8, 14]. The value of RWE has been proven throughout numerous therapeutic areas, including oncology, cardiology, and endocrinology, and includes safety communications, label addenda, and market withdrawals based on Phase IV data [6, 12]. As in the case of cardiovascular risks related to rofecoxib (Vioxx) and hepatic toxicity of troglitazone (Rezulin), which were the findings of long-term Phase IV monitoring, it is clear that post-marketing surveillance needs to be continued [10, 11].

The variety of the methodologies of the Phase IV research, provided by the paper, makes it more adaptable and relevant. Observational studies form the foundation of PMS and are invaluable in indicating possible patterns of drug use and their durability without interfering with the prescription habits [2, 6]. Cohort studies and case-control designs may be convenient to detect rare ADRs or investigate the drug-disease relationships, whereas pragmatic randomized controlled trials (pRCTs) can be an option when a strictly designed randomized controlled trial is not applicable to evaluate the real-world setting. The Salford Lung Study is arguably the most remarkable pRCT to date, as it challenges the standard treatment approach in unexpected ways that are both meaningful to clinicians and statistically reliable [2]. The registry studies have also been valuable in monitoring outcomes of rare diseases, biologics, and high-risk medications and in addressing long-term pharmacovigilance and regulatory compliance [5].

The world of pharmacovigilance is changing with the waves of technological advancements. The main message delivered by this review is that machine learning (ML), artificial intelligence (AI), and natural language processing (NLP) have become a game changer in the analysis of large and complex data [15-18]. The tools make signal detection more seamless and accurate, so that minor safety trends can be identified before it might occur on a traditional model of analysis. Besides, the use of wearable devices, mobile health applications, and telemedicine systems makes it possible to monitor patients in real-time and to collect continuous data, which enhances interest in patients and a higher level of data granularity [10, 11, 16]. There was also this technology-driven transition, especially in the monitoring of COVID-19 vaccines, wherein active surveillance was used, as exemplified by an active surveillance system of vaccines, i.e., Vaccine Safety Datalink and others like the FDA Sentinel Initiative, that provided quick detection and response to rare adverse events, further building confidence in mass vaccination programs.

Nonetheless, as much as all improvements as have been made, there are still challenges. Conducting large, long-duration trials also has strong financial and logistical needs [3, 5]. The coordination of many stakeholders and sustainable funding models is needed to conduct such studies, as they require a significant amount of time and coordination between their various stakeholders. Participant recruitment and retention, especially in long-term studies of chronic diseases, has been a continuous challenges [6, 9]. Data completeness, loss to follow-up, and patient adherence often impacts the quality of a study and may lower the statistical power required to identify safety events that are not common. In addition, passive surveillance systems like MedWatch, FAERS, and VigiBase are widely used but are subjected to underreporting and inconsistencies, which may delay important safety indicators [8, 12]. There are also ethics and regulatory factors that make phase IV trials to be more complicated. In the era of big data and sophisticated analytics, patient safety and data security have become an urgent priority, as there is also the increased use of electronic ROs and online platforms [13, 17]. A high level of transparency in reporting, conformance with regulation, e.g. with GDPR, and appropriate informed consent procedures all play a vital role in sustaining trust in the research and protection of participant rights [18, 19]. Moreover, existing differences in international regulatory systems may lead to duplication of reporting and slow the process of reporting, again illustrating the importance of increased global harmonization of safety standards and international pharmacovigilance efforts [5, 8, 10].

Among other things, the review notes the growing relevance of adaptive and pragmatic trial designs in identifying improvements to the responsiveness and efficiency of Phase IV research [1, 4, 7]. Adaptive trials enable changes to the protocol following interim analyses without negatively affecting scientific validity and pragmatic trials do not compromise scientific validity, as the evidence can reflect more closely real-life clinical practice. Such cutting-edge designs can not only enhance efficiency in trials but also enable the production of actionable evidence, which could be readily used in clinical decision-making. The next very

important lesson is the significance of education and stakeholder involvement in optimizing Phase IV processes. Clinician, researcher, and regulatory professional trainings on sophisticated analytic methods, research ethics and data management are important in achieving methodological rigor [13, 15]. Furthermore, patient education on the need of post-marketing studies will increase patient participation and increase the generalizability of the findings. Involvement with patient advocacy groups throughout research design phases can also help reinforce the recruitment and retention effort by better matching the research priorities of a study with patient needs [18, 20].

The paper demonstrates that PMS and Phase IV clinical trials are invaluable with regard to mitigating the evidence gap between clinical data achieved during pre-market studies and clinical practice. Although these studies have done quite a lot in enhancing drug safety surveillance and evidence-based medicine, their success can only be achieved through constant innovation coupled with enhanced regulatory regimes as well as international cooperation. Incorporation of innovative analytics, collaboration across countries, and patient-centric focus will lead to more responsive, more efficient, and more effective safety surveillance in the future. Not only will this evolution contribute to improved clinical outcomes, but it will also benefit the formulation of wise policies and increase the level of trust of the general population in the safety and efficacy of medical procedures. Combined with Data in Phase IV, a Phase 0 study can inform the longitudinal mapping of both safety and efficacy, creating a closed, cyclical evidence pathway beginning with the initial exposure in humans to long-term, post-marketing surveillance. The congruence highlights the necessity in standardized data domains and regulatory requirements to take full advantage of translational value at all stages of drug development.

Conclusion

Phase IV clinical trials and post-marketing surveillance (PMS) are an important safety net around the life cycle of a medical product. By extrapolating safety and effectiveness surveillance into practice, they identify rare, long-term, and population-specific risks that cannot be identified through limited trials. These continual assessments help to keep the treatment options with an acceptable risk / benefit ratio on delivery to diverse populations of patients. Historical case studies, e.g., rofecoxib (Vioxx) and troglitazone (Rezulin), clearly portray the risky nature of using pre-approval data alone because both drugs were withdrawn later based on evidence of severe adverse effects not seen during the pre-approval stages. Recent experiences, such as the safety surveillance of COVID-19 vaccines, demonstrate the efficacy of the current active surveillance mechanisms in quickly reporting and mitigating rare but serious adverse events. These examples portray the paramount role of PMS in the protection of the health of the population. Recent trends in data science and digital health tools are changing the pharmacovigilance space. Time-sensitive monitoring made possible using the FDA Sentinel Initiative, the Vaccine Safety Datalink and others shows how distributed data networks can be used to pick up signals early. Meanwhile, statistical detection is improving using AI, machine learning, and Bayesian approaches, and rare events are detected more recognizably, and confidence in safety inspection is more valuable.

References

1. Kandi V, Suvvari TK, Vadakedath S, Godishala V. Microbes, clinical trials, drug discovery, and vaccine development: the current perspectives. Borneo J Pharm. 2021;4:311-23.
2. Singh AP, Shahapur PR, Vadakedath S, *et al*. Research question, objectives, and endpoints in clinical and oncological research: a comprehensive review. Cureus. 2022;14:0.
3. Kandi V, Vadakedath S. Clinical research: an overview of study types, designs, and their implications in the public health perspective. Am J Clin Med Res. 2021;9:36-42.
4. National Center for Biotechnology Information. Clinical trials and clinical research: a comprehensive review. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC10023071
5. Gale EAM. Post-marketing studies of new insulins: sales or science? BMJ. 2012;344:e3974. https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.e3974
6. Lasser KE, Allen PD, Woolhandler SJ, *et al*. Timing of new black box warnings and withdrawals for prescription medications. JAMA. 2002;287:2215-20. https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.287.17.2215
7. Food and Drug Administration. Food and Drug Administration Amendments Act (FDAAA) of 2007. http://www.fda.gov/downloads/RegulatoryInformation/Legislation/FederalFoodDrugandCosmeticActFDCAct/SignificantAmendmentstotheFDCAct/FoodandDrugAdministrationAmendmentsActof2007/FDAAAImplementationChart/UCM213016.pdf
8. Glasser SP, Salas M, Delzell E. Importance and challenges of studying marketed drugs: what is a phase IV study? Common clinical research designs, registries, and self-reporting systems. J Clin Pharmacol. 2007;47:1074-1086.
9. Schmidt LG, Grohmann R, Helmchen H, *et al*. Adverse drug-reactions—an epidemiological study at psychiatric hospitals. Acta Psychiatr Scand. 1984;70:77-89. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1600-0447.1984.tb01185.
10. Fontanarosa PB, Rennie D, DeAngelis CD. Postmarketing surveillance-lack of vigilance, lack of trust. JAMA. 2004;292(21):2647-50.
11. Bakke OM, Manocchia M, de Abajo F, Kaitin KI, Lasagna L. Drug safety discontinuations in the United Kingdom, the United States, and Spain from 1974 through 1993: a regulatory perspective. Clin Pharmacol Ther. 1995;58(1):108-17.
12. Lasser KE, Allen PD, Woolhandler SJ, Himmelstein DU, Wolfe SM, Bor DH. Timing of new black box warnings and withdrawals for prescription medications. JAMA. 2002;287(17):2215-20.
13. Strom BL. Potential for conflict of interest in the evaluation of suspected adverse drug reactions: a counterpoint. JAMA. 2004;292(21):2643-6.
14. US Food and Drug Administration. AERS patient outcomes by year. 2010. http://www.fda.gov/Drugs/GuidanceComplianceRegulatoryInformation/Surveillance/AdverseDrugEffects/ucm070461.htm

15. James WP, Caterson ID, Coutinho W, *et al*. Effect of sibutramine on cardiovascular outcomes in overweight and obese subjects. N Engl J Med. 2010;363(10):905-917.
16. Maro JC, Platt R, Holmes JH, *et al*. Design of a national distributed health data network. Ann Intern Med. 2009;151(5):341-3414.
17. Berlin JA, Colditz GA. The role of meta-analysis in the regulatory process for foods, drugs, and devices. JAMA. 1999;281(9):830-834.
18. Hennekens CH, Demets D. The need for large-scale randomized evidence without undue emphasis on small trials, meta-analyses, or subgroup analyses. JAMA. 2009;302(21):2361-2362.
19. National Library of Medicine. Overview of phase IV clinical trials for post market drug safety surveillance: a status report from the ClinicalTrials.gov registry. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC5168517
20. National Library of Medicine. Key concepts of clinical trials: a narrative review. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3272827