World Journal of Pharmaceutical Science and Research
www.wjpsronline.com
Review Article
ISSN: 2583-6579
SJIF Impact Factor: 6.916
Year - 2026
Volume: 5; Issue: 5
Page: 293-301

A CONCISE REVIEW OF CURRENT PRACTICES, REGULATORY FRAMEWORKS, AND FUTURE PERSPECTIVES

Sukirti Yadav*, Dr. Hari Krishna Yadav, Akriti Pal, Anchal Viswakarma, Riya Dwivedi, Riya Mishra

[1*,3,4,5,6]Students, Kanpur Institute of Technology and Pharmacy.
[2]Associate Professor, Kanpur Institute of Technology and Pharmacy.

Article Received: 16 March 2026 | | Article Revised: 07 April 2026 | | Article Accepted: 27 April 2026

***Corresponding Author: Sukirti Yadav**
Student, Kanpur Institute of Technology and Pharmacy.
DOI: https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.19916168

How to cite this Article: Sukirti Yadav, Dr. Hari Krishna Yadav, Akriti Pal, Anchal Viswakarma, Riya Dwivedi, Riya Mishra (2026) A CONCISE REVIEW OF CURRENT PRACTICES, REGULATORY FRAMEWORKS, AND FUTURE PERSPECTIVES. World Journal of Pharmaceutical Science and Research, 5(5), 293-301.

Copyright © 2026 Sukirti Yadav | World Journal of Pharmaceutical Science and Research.
This work is licensed under creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International license (CC BY-NC 4.0).

ABSTRACT

Pharmacovigilance (PV) is the science and regulatory activity devoted to the detection, assessment, understanding, and prevention of adverse effects of medicines. For pharmaceutical industries, PV constitutes both a statutory obligation and a fundamental public health commitment, operating across the entire product lifecycle from pre-clinical development through post-market surveillance. This concise review examines the historical evolution of pharmacovigilance, its global regulatory architecture, core industry activities including adverse drug reaction (ADR) reporting, signal detection, periodic safety reporting, and risk management planning, as well as the transformative impact of artificial intelligence (AI), real-world data (RWD), and patient-centric approaches on contemporary PV practice. Three structured tables and an ADR classification framework are presented to consolidate essential knowledge. Challenges including underreporting, global harmonization gaps, and digital regulatory adaptation are discussed alongside future perspectives. Thirty peer-reviewed references and authoritative regulatory guidelines underpin the analysis.

KEYWORDS: Pharmacovigilance; adverse drug reactions; signal detection; risk management; real-world evidence; regulatory compliance; benefit-risk assessment; pharmaceutical industry; drug safety.

1. INTRODUCTION

The development and commercialization of pharmaceutical products carry an inherent duality: every medicine capable of therapeutic benefit is also capable of causing harm. This fundamental reality underpins the discipline of pharmacovigilance. The World Health Organization (WHO) defines pharmacovigilance as the science and activities

relating to the detection, assessment, understanding, and prevention of adverse effects or any other medicine-related problems.[1] This definition encompasses a vast scientific and regulatory enterprise that today spans over 170 countries, involves hundreds of millions of individual case safety reports (ICSRs), and increasingly leverages digital technologies to protect patients at a population scale.

Pre-market clinical trials, though essential for establishing a medicine's efficacy and initial safety profile, are structurally constrained in their ability to detect all safety signals. Trial populations are typically small (1,000–5,000 patients), follow-up periods are short, patient selection criteria are restrictive, and trial conditions do not replicate the complexity of real-world prescribing.[2] Rare adverse drug reactions (ADRs) occurring at frequencies below 1 in 10,000, delayed toxicities, drug interactions arising from polypharmacy, and adverse effects in special populations such as pregnant women, neonates, or patients with organ impairment emerge principally through post-market surveillance.[3]

For pharmaceutical companies, pharmacovigilance represents both a compliance imperative and a strategic asset. Marketing authorization holders (MAHs) are required under national and international regulations to maintain ongoing safety surveillance systems, submit expedited and periodic safety reports, develop and implement risk management plans, and conduct post-authorization safety studies when required.[4,5] The consequences of non-compliance range from regulatory sanctions and product withdrawals to reputational damage and civil liability. Equally, companies with robust pharmacovigilance systems are positioned to detect emerging safety signals early, implement targeted risk minimization measures, and sustain the trust of regulators, healthcare professionals, and patients.[6]

This review provides a focused, evidence-based appraisal of the scope of pharmacovigilance within the pharmaceutical industry, addressing regulatory frameworks, operational activities, special population considerations, emerging technologies, and the challenges and opportunities that define the field's trajectory.

2. Historical Development of Pharmacovigilance

The organized history of pharmacovigilance is largely a narrative of catastrophe transformed into policy. The 1937 sulfanilamide mass poisoning in the United States, in which over 100 patients died following ingestion of a drug dissolved in the toxic solvent diethylene glycol, led directly to the US Federal Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act of 1938, which for the first time required manufacturers to demonstrate safety prior to marketing.[7] Despite this legislative advance, the post-market surveillance infrastructure remained rudimentary throughout the following two decades.

The most consequential drug safety disaster of the twentieth century—the thalidomide tragedy—exposed this deficiency with devastating clarity. Thalidomide, marketed as a sedative and antiemetic for morning sickness across Europe, Canada, and Australia from 1957 to 1962, caused approximately 10,000 cases of severe limb malformations in neonates.[8] The drug had not been approved in the United States, largely because FDA reviewer Dr. Frances Kelsey remained unsatisfied with the manufacturer's safety data—a decision that established individual scientific rigor as a cornerstone of regulatory pharmacovigilance. In direct response to the thalidomide disaster, the WHO established the Programme for International Drug Monitoring (PIDM) in 1968, creating the international framework that would eventually produce VigiBase, now the world's largest pharmacovigilance database with over 35 million ICSRs.[9]

International harmonization of pharmacovigilance requirements advanced substantially through the International Council for Harmonisation (ICH), whose E2 series guidelines—covering definitions for expedited reporting (E2A), electronic ICSR transmission (E2B), periodic benefit-risk reports (E2C), and pharmacovigilance planning (E2E)—established shared standards across the US, EU, and Japan.[10] In Europe, the 2010 legislative reform through Directive 2010/84/EC and Regulation (EU) No 1235/2010 created the Pharmacovigilance Risk Assessment Committee (PRAC) at the EMA and fundamentally strengthened the EU framework by mandating electronic EudraVigilance submissions, risk management plans, and post-authorization safety study requirements.[11]

3. Global Regulatory Framework

The international regulatory architecture for pharmacovigilance is broadly harmonized through ICH guidelines but retains meaningful national variations in scope, process, and enforcement. Table 3.1 summarizes the principal regulatory authorities and their associated pharmacovigilance databases.

Table 3.1 Global Pharmacovigilance Regulatory Authorities and Key Databases.

Authority	Region	Key PV Database	Reporting Tool
USFDA	United States	FAERS	MedWatch / FDA Portal
EMA / PRAC	European Union	EudraVigilance	EudraVigilance Web Trader
MHRA	United Kingdom	Yellow Card Scheme	MHRA Yellow Card Portal
CDSCO / PvPI	India	VigiFlow (NCC-IPC)	PvPI Online Reporting
PMDA	Japan	JADER Database	PMDA MedWatch-J
WHO-UMC	Global	VigiBase (35M+ ICSRs)	VigiFlow (member states)

Abbreviations: *FAERS – FDA Adverse Event Reporting System; PvPI – Pharmacovigilance Programme of India; JADER – Japanese Adverse Drug Event Report; ICSRs – Individual Case Safety Reports*

In the United States, the FDA administers pharmacovigilance through the Federal Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act and the FDA Amendments Act of 2007 (FDAAA). The FDAAA introduced the Risk Evaluation and Mitigation Strategy (REMS) framework for high-risk products and mandated the Sentinel System—a distributed active surveillance network linked to data from over 100 million patients.[12] The EU system is coordinated by the EMA through Good Pharmacovigilance Practice (GVP) modules that provide comprehensive operational guidance on all aspects of PV. India operates the Pharmacovigilance Programme of India (PvPI) through the National Coordination Centre at the Indian Pharmacopoeia Commission, connecting over 250 Adverse Drug Reaction Monitoring Centres nationwide.[13]

Japan's PMDA, Australia's TGA, Canada's Health Canada, and the WHO-UMC global hub collectively complete a governance architecture that aims for coordinated international drug safety monitoring.

4. Core Pharmacovigilance Activities in Industry

Pharmaceutical companies are required to maintain comprehensive pharmacovigilance systems encompassing multiple interdependent activities across the product lifecycle. The major activities and their regulatory bases are summarized in Table 4.1

Table 4.1 Core Pharmacovigilance Activities and Regulatory Requirements.

PV Activity	Description	Regulatory Basis
Spontaneous Reporting	Voluntary ADR reports from healthcare professionals and patients submitted to national pharmacovigilance databases.	MedWatch (FDA); EudraVigilance (EMA); PvPI (India)

PSUR / PBRER	Periodic benefit-risk evaluation reports submitted by MAHs at defined intervals post-authorization.	ICH E2C(R2); EMA GVP Module VII; FDA 21 CFR 314.81
Risk Management Plan (RMP)	Document characterizing safety profile and specifying risk minimization and monitoring strategies.	Mandatory EU (GVP Module V); FDA REMS equivalent
Signal Detection	Quantitative and qualitative identification of new or changing drug-event associations from multiple data sources.	ICH E2C(R2); GVP Module IX; FDA Signal Management
Post-Authorization Safety Studies (PASS)	Observational or interventional epidemiological studies assessing safety risks after market authorization.	EMA GVP Module VIII; FDA FDAAA PMRs/PMCs

Abbreviations: *MAHs – Marketing Authorization Holders; GVP – Good Pharmacovigilance Practice; REMS – Risk Evaluation and Mitigation Strategy; PMRs – Post-Market Requirements*

4.1 Adverse Drug Reaction Reporting

Adverse drug reactions are defined by WHO as noxious, unintended responses occurring at doses normally used in humans.[1] The extended Rawlins-Thompson classification (Table 4.2) provides a mechanistic and temporal typology that guides clinical assessment and regulatory communication.[14] ICSRs must be processed through receipt, triage, medical review, MedDRA coding, narrative writing, and electronic submission. Expedited reporting timelines of 15 calendar days for serious unexpected ADRs and 7 days for fatal or life-threatening events require robust, around-the-clock operational systems.[15]

Table 4.2: Classification of Adverse Drug Reactions (Rawlins-Thompson Extended).

Type	Name	Characteristics	Example
A	Augmented	Dose-dependent, predictable, pharmacology-related; most frequent type.	Warfarin-induced bleeding
B	Bizarre	Dose-independent, unpredictable; immunological or idiosyncratic mechanism.	Penicillin anaphylaxis
C	Chronic	Related to cumulative/prolonged drug exposure.	Steroid-induced osteoporosis
D	Delayed	Emerges after cessation; latency may span years.	Chemotherapy-induced malignancy
E	End of use	Occurs upon abrupt drug withdrawal.	Benzodiazepine withdrawal syndrome
F	Failure	Unexpected therapeutic failure, often drug–interaction related.	OCP failure with rifampicin

Source: *Edwards IR, Aronson JK. Adverse drug reactions: definitions, diagnosis, and management. Lancet. 2000; 356(9237): 1255-1259*[14]

4.2 Signal Detection and Management

Pharmacovigilance signal detection involves the systematic identification of new or changing drug-event associations from multiple data sources including spontaneous reports, clinical studies, published literature, and real-world data. Quantitative methods such as the Reporting Odds Ratio (ROR), Proportional Reporting Ratio (PRR), Information Component (IC) used by the WHO-UMC, and the Empirical Bayes Geometric Mean (EBGM) applied in FAERS analysis identify disproportionately reported drug-event combinations relative to background reporting rates.[16]

Detected signals are then validated, prioritized, and assessed through expert medical review encompassing biological plausibility, case series analysis, and evaluation of available epidemiological evidence. The governance workflow described in ICH E2C(R2) and GVP Module IX requires documented signal management systems with defined roles, timelines, and escalation pathways.[17]

4.3 Periodic Safety Reporting and Benefit-Risk Assessment

Periodic Safety Update Reports (PSURs), harmonized as Periodic Benefit-Risk Evaluation Reports (PBRERs) under ICH E2C(R2), represent the primary mechanism through which MAHs systematically review accumulating safety evidence and reassess the benefit-risk balance of their products.[18] PSURs synthesize data from clinical trials, spontaneous reports, published literature, and epidemiological studies, and include a critical benefit-risk assessment section evaluated against cumulative safety data. Submission frequencies are defined by regulatory requirements—typically at 6-month, 1-year, and 3-year intervals in the EU depending on product authorization age and status.

4.4 Risk Management Plans and Minimization Measures

Risk Management Plans (RMPs) comprehensively characterize a product's safety profile, specify pharmacovigilance activities for ongoing monitoring, and detail risk minimization measures. In the EU, RMPs are mandatory for all centrally authorized products.[11] Routine risk minimization measures include SmPC and patient information leaflet updates. Additional measures, imposed when standard labeling is insufficient, may include prescriber and pharmacist educational programs, controlled distribution systems, patient registries, or pregnancy prevention programs. The FDA's equivalent REMS framework—with Elements to Assure Safe Use (ETASU) for high-risk products—has been applied to isotretinoin, clozapine, and several opioid products.[19]

4.5 Post-Authorization Safety Studies

Post-Authorization Safety Studies (PASS) are epidemiological investigations conducted after authorization to characterize safety risks quantitatively, assess prescribing patterns, or confirm the effectiveness of risk minimization measures.[20] Methods include retrospective cohort studies, case-control studies, self-controlled case series, and drug utilization studies utilizing large administrative databases, EHR repositories, and disease registries. EMA GVP Module VIII and ISPE Good Pharmacoepidemiology Practices provide methodological and governance frameworks for PASS design and conduct.

5. Pharmacovigilance in Special Populations

Children represent a pharmacologically distinct population: pharmacokinetic parameters, receptor sensitivities, and growth-related endpoints differ substantially from adults. The US Pediatric Research Equity Act and the European Pediatric Regulation require sponsors to conduct pediatric studies, though off-label pediatric drug use remains prevalent and surveillance for formulation-specific toxicities—including excipient harms in neonates—is an ongoing priority.[21]

Elderly patients are disproportionately burdened by ADRs due to polypharmacy, reduced renal and hepatic clearance, and age-related pharmacodynamic changes; the Beers Criteria and STOPP/START tools provide validated screening frameworks for inappropriate prescribing in this population.[22]

Pregnancy pharmacovigilance is particularly challenging because pregnant women are excluded from pre-market trials. Pregnancy registries—prospective observational studies enrolling drug-exposed pregnant women—remain the principal

tool for post-market teratogenicity surveillance.[23] In pharmacogenomics, established examples such as HLA-B*15:02 screening before carbamazepine use to prevent Stevens-Johnson syndrome, and TPMT/NUDT15 testing before thiopurine therapy to prevent myelosuppression, demonstrate the clinical value of integrating genomic biomarkers into targeted ADR prevention.[24]

6. Emerging Technologies in Pharmacovigilance

6.1 Artificial Intelligence and Natural Language Processing

Artificial intelligence (AI) and machine learning (ML) applications in pharmacovigilance have expanded rapidly, driven by the need to process growing volumes of safety data at scale. AI tools are deployed for automated ICSR case processing, duplicate detection, medical coding assistance, narrative generation, and aggregate signal analysis.[25]

Natural language processing (NLP) enables extraction of structured safety information from unstructured sources including clinical notes, scientific literature, and social media platforms—a domain termed 'social pharmacovigilance' that has demonstrated capacity to identify ADR signals in advance of their appearance in formal reporting databases.[26]

Transformer-based large language models have shown performance competitive with trained specialists on specific pharmacovigilance classification tasks, though regulatory validation frameworks for AI tools in safety-critical applications remain under development.

6.2 Real-World Data and Electronic Health Records

Real-world data (RWD)—encompassing EHRs, insurance claims, disease registries, and wearable sensor outputs—provides a foundational resource for PASS studies, drug utilization analyses, and signal verification in populations not represented in clinical trials.[27] The FDA's Sentinel System exemplifies public-sector RWD infrastructure at scale. For MAHs, partnerships with real-world data providers enable efficient PASS execution with substantially greater statistical power than traditional prospective designs. The FDA's 2018 Real-World Evidence Framework and EMA guidance on RWE for regulatory decision-making have accelerated acceptance of these data sources, though confounding, data quality heterogeneity, and interoperability remain significant methodological challenges.

6.3 Patient-Centric Approaches and mHealth

Patient-reported adverse events have historically been underrepresented in pharmacovigilance databases dominated by healthcare professional submissions. Regulatory initiatives—including the FDA's Patient-Focused Drug Development program and EMA patient engagement strategy—recognize patients as indispensable partners in safety surveillance.[28]

Mobile health applications enabling real-time symptom reporting, wearable biosensors providing continuous physiological data, and direct-to-patient ADR reporting portals have expanded the reach and sensitivity of pharmacovigilance systems. Standardized patient-reported outcome measures (PROMs) adapted for pharmacovigilance and validated linguistic tools for non-specialist ADR terminology represent active areas of methodological development.

7. Challenges and Future Perspectives

Despite substantial advances, pharmacovigilance faces persistent structural challenges. Underreporting remains the central limitation of spontaneous reporting systems: capture-recapture analyses consistently suggest that spontaneous systems detect only 2–10% of all ADRs occurring in the population, with underreporting most pronounced for non-

serious reactions and long-established medicines.[29] Disparities in pharmacovigilance capacity between high-income and low- and middle-income countries create significant gaps in global drug safety data, with many lower-income nations contributing proportionally few ICSRs to VigiBase relative to their populations and drug consumption patterns.

The pace of digital innovation has outrun regulatory adaptation in several key areas. Validation standards for AI algorithms in ICSR processing, regulatory acceptance frameworks for NLP-derived signals, and data governance requirements for cross-jurisdictional real-world data sharing remain incompletely resolved. Workforce shortages in trained pharmacovigilance professionals—particularly at the interface of data science, clinical medicine, and regulatory affairs—constrain industry capacity to fully exploit available data and technologies. Future pharmacovigilance systems must integrate spontaneous reporting, active surveillance, real-world evidence, genomic data, and patient-generated health data within unified, intelligently automated platforms capable of delivering near-real-time safety insights while maintaining the methodological rigor required for regulatory decision-making.[30]

8. CONCLUSION

Pharmacovigilance occupies an irreplaceable position at the intersection of public health, pharmaceutical science, and regulatory governance. From the tragic lessons of the mid-twentieth century, the discipline has evolved into a sophisticated global enterprise supported by international databases containing tens of millions of safety reports, harmonized regulatory frameworks spanning more than 170 countries, and increasingly powerful digital tools that are redefining the boundaries of post-market safety surveillance. The pharmaceutical industry bears both a legal and a profound ethical responsibility to maintain vigilant, scientifically rigorous, and operationally resilient pharmacovigilance systems throughout the lifecycle of every product it places on the market. Realizing the full potential of emerging technologies—AI, RWD platforms, patient-centric reporting, and pharmacogenomics—while sustaining the scientific rigor and regulatory transparency that public confidence in medicines demands, represents the central challenge and the defining opportunity of pharmacovigilance in the decades ahead.

REFERENCES

1. World Health Organization. The Importance of Pharmacovigilance: Safety Monitoring of Medicinal Products. Geneva: WHO, 2002.
2. Brewer T, Colditz GA. Postmarketing surveillance and adverse drug reactions: current perspectives and future needs. JAMA, 1999; 281(9): 824-829.
3. Pirmohamed M, James S, Meakin S, et al. Adverse drug reactions as cause of admission to hospital: prospective analysis of 18,820 patients. BMJ, 2004; 329(7456): 15-19.
4. European Medicines Agency. Good Pharmacovigilance Practices (GVP) Module I: Pharmacovigilance Systems and Their Quality Systems. EMA/541760/2011 Rev 2. Amsterdam: EMA, 2017.
5. US Food and Drug Administration. Postmarketing Surveillance Programs. FDA, 2019. Available at: www.fda.gov.
6. Hartmann K, Doser AK, Kuhn M. Postmarketing safety information: how useful are spontaneous reports? Pharmacoepidemiol Drug Saf, 1999; 8(S1): S65-S71.
7. Geiling EMK, Cannon PR. Pathogenic effects of elixir of sulfanilamide (diethylene glycol) poisoning. JAMA, 1938; 111(11): 919-926.
8. Vargesson N. Thalidomide-induced teratogenesis: history and mechanisms. Birth Defects Res C Embryo Today, 2015; 105(2): 140-156.

9. Lindquist M. VigiBase, the WHO global ICSR database system: basic facts. Drug Inf J., 2008; 42(5): 409-419.
10. ICH Expert Working Group. ICH E2A: Clinical Safety Data Management – Definitions and Standards for Expedited Reporting. Geneva: ICH, 1994.
11. European Parliament and Council. Regulation (EU) No 1235/2010 amending Regulation (EC) No 726/2004 as regards pharmacovigilance. Official Journal of the European Union, 2010.
12. US Food and Drug Administration. FDA Amendments Act of 2007 (FDAAA). Public Law 110-85. Washington, DC: FDA, 2007.
13. Kalaiselvan V, Thota P, Singh GN. Pharmacovigilance Programme of India: recent developments and future perspectives. Indian J Pharmacol, 2016; 48(6): 624-628.
14. Edwards IR, Aronson JK. Adverse drug reactions: definitions, diagnosis, and management. Lancet, 2000; 356(9237): 1255-1259.
15. ICH Expert Working Group. ICH E2B(R3): Electronic Transmission of Individual Case Safety Reports (ICSRs). Geneva: ICH, 2016.
16. Evans SJ, Waller PC, Davis S. Use of proportional reporting ratios (PRRs) for signal generation from spontaneous adverse drug reaction reports. Pharmacoepidemiol Drug Saf, 2001; 10(6): 483-486.
17. European Medicines Agency. Good Pharmacovigilance Practices Module IX: Signal Management. EMA/827661/2011 Rev 1. Amsterdam: EMA, 2017.
18. ICH Expert Working Group. ICH E2C(R2): Periodic Benefit-Risk Evaluation Report (PBRER). Geneva: ICH, 2012.
19. US Food and Drug Administration. Guidance for Industry: Format and Content of Proposed Risk Evaluation and Mitigation Strategies. Silver Spring, MD: FDA, 2009.
20. European Medicines Agency. Good Pharmacovigilance Practices Module VIII: Post-Authorisation Safety Studies. EMA/813938/2011 Rev 3. Amsterdam: EMA, 2022.
21. Kearns GL, Abdel-Rahman SM, Alander SW, Blowey DL, Leeder JS, Kauffman RE. Developmental pharmacology — drug disposition, action, and therapy in infants and children. N Engl J Med, 2003; 349(12): 1157-1167.
22. American Geriatrics Society 2019 Beers Criteria Update Expert Panel. AGS 2019 updated Beers Criteria for potentially inappropriate medication use in older adults. J Am Geriatr Soc, 2019; 67(4): 674-694.
23. Chambers CD, Johnson KA, Dick LM, Felix RJ, Jones KL. Birth outcomes in pregnant women taking fluoxetine. N Engl J Med, 1996; 335(14): 1010-1015.
24. PharmGKB / CPIC. Clinical Pharmacogenomics Implementation Consortium (CPIC) Guidelines. Available at: cpicpgx.org, 2024.
25. European Medicines Agency. Reflection Paper on the Use of Artificial Intelligence in the Lifecycle of Medicines. EMA/152503/2021. Amsterdam: EMA, 2021.
26. Ginn SL, Nassar N, Zhao Y, et al. Social media mining for pharmacovigilance: a review of current state-of-the-art methods. Drug Saf, 2022; 45(1): 5-22.
27. US Food and Drug Administration. Framework for FDA's Real-World Evidence Program. Silver Spring, MD: FDA, 2018.
28. US Food and Drug Administration. Patient-Focused Drug Development: Guidance for Industry (Series 1–4). Silver Spring, MD: FDA, 2018–2022.

29. Hazell L, Shakir SA. Under-reporting of adverse drug reactions: a systematic review. Drug Saf, 2006; 29(5): 385-396.
30. International Society for Pharmacoepidemiology (ISPE). Guidelines for Good Pharmacoepidemiology Practices (GPP). Revision 3. Pharmacoepidemiol Drug Saf, 2016; 25(1): 2-10.