MEDICAL LETTER

Review Article
Volume: 2
Issue: 2

Generic Medicines: Perception Versus Reality in Clinical Practice and Public Health

Dr. Amit Sachdeva[1*], Mr Nasim Ahmed[2], Mrs. Tamanna Rahman[3], Dr. Anju Sachdeva[4]

[1]Assistant Professor, Department of Community Medicine, Indira Gandhi Medical College, Shimla, Himachal Pradesh
[2]Independent Researcher, Guwahati Assam, India Email: nasim@iarcon.org
[3]MSc in Herbal Science and Technology , Anandaram Dhekial Phookan College under Guwahati University, Assam
[4]Physiotherapist, Shimla, Himachal Pradesh

Received: Jul. 03, 2025; Revised: Aug. 09, 2025; Accepted: Aug. 26, 2025; Published: Sep. 30, 2025

 Doi: 10.47310/medlet.2025.v02i02.015

Abstract: Generic medicines are intended to provide the same active ingredient, strength, dosage form, route of administration and therapeutic benefit as their reference brand-name products at substantially lower cost. Regulatory approval generally depends on pharmaceutical equivalence, compliance with manufacturing-quality standards and demonstration of bioequivalence, rather than repetition of the innovator's full clinical-development programme. Despite this framework, patients and healthcare professionals frequently perceive generic medicines as less effective, less safe or more variable than branded products. Comparative clinical evidence generally does not support the routine superiority of brand-name medicines. Large observational analyses and meta-analyses have reported broadly comparable outcomes for generic and branded medicines across several cardiovascular, metabolic, psychiatric and other chronic conditions. Nevertheless, the statement that all generic products are always clinically interchangeable requires qualification. Differences in excipients, appearance, packaging and delivery systems may affect tolerability, adherence or usability, while complex formulations and medicines with narrow therapeutic indices may require product-specific assessment and closer monitoring during substitution. Moreover, regulatory equivalence cannot compensate for manufacturing defects, weak inspection, inappropriate storage or substandard and falsified products. In India, generic medicines could substantially improve access and reduce out-of-pocket expenditure. The Pradhan Mantri Bhartiya Janaushadhi Pariyojana has expanded the availability of affordable medicines, but concerns regarding stock availability, public confidence, prescribing practices and transparent quality assurance remain. Generic-medicine policy should therefore combine price reduction with rigorous regulation, procurement quality, pharmacovigilance, prescriber and patient education, and uninterrupted medicine availability. The central public health message is not that low price guarantees quality, but that quality-assured generics should not be considered inferior merely because they cost less.

Keywords: generic medicines; bioequivalence; branded medicines; medicine affordability; Jan Aushadhi; pharmaceutical policy.

INTRODUCTION

Medicines account for a substantial component of healthcare expenditure, particularly in countries where patients purchase treatments directly from private pharmacies. High medicine prices can result in delayed initiation, incomplete treatment, dose rationing and catastrophic household spending. Generic competition is one of the most widely used strategies for reducing pharmaceutical prices without sacrificing therapeutic benefit.

A generic medicine is developed to correspond to an already authorized reference product whose patent or market-exclusivity protection has expired or otherwise permits generic entry. It ordinarily contains the same active ingredient, strength and dosage form and is administered through the same route. Regulatory authorities require evidence that it meets quality standards and performs sufficiently

similarly to the reference product. Generic manufacturers generally do not repeat the full programme of animal and large clinical efficacy trials already completed for the innovator product, which reduces development costs and permits lower prices.[1,2]

Public understanding is often less straightforward. Branded products may be associated with research, modern manufacturing and physician confidence, whereas low price may be interpreted as evidence of lower quality. Attractive packaging, long-standing brand familiarity and pharmaceutical promotion can reinforce this belief. Conversely, policy discussions sometimes overcorrect by implying that every product sold under a generic name is automatically equivalent and interchangeable. Both positions are incomplete.

The appropriate comparison is not "expensive medicine versus cheap medicine," but **quality-assured reference product versus quality-assured generic product**. Manufacturing quality, regulatory oversight, supply-chain integrity and appropriate prescribing remain essential for both.

What Generic Equivalence Actually Means

Three related concepts are central: pharmaceutical equivalence, bioequivalence and therapeutic equivalence.

Pharmaceutical equivalence generally means that products contain the same active ingredient in the same strength and dosage form and use the same route of administration. Inactive ingredients, colour, shape and packaging may differ.

Bioavailability describes the rate and extent at which an active ingredient becomes available in the systemic circulation. **Bioequivalence** indicates that any difference in the rate and extent of absorption between the test and reference products is not clinically meaningful under specified study conditions. Indian regulatory guidance similarly defines bioequivalence in terms of the absence of a statistically significant difference in the rate and extent of absorption when products are administered at the same molar dose.[3]

For many immediate-release oral products, bioequivalence is assessed using pharmacokinetic measures such as the area under the concentration–time curve and maximum plasma concentration. Regulators commonly evaluate whether the confidence intervals for ratios of these parameters fall within predefined acceptance limits. This does not mean that a generic may contain 20% less or 25% more active ingredient. The often-cited range relates to statistical comparison of pharmacokinetic parameters, not permissible variation in the labelled drug content.

Therapeutic equivalence is the practical expectation that approved equivalent products will have the same clinical effect and safety profile when used as labelled. The US Food and Drug Administration states that an approved generic must provide the same clinical benefit as the brand-name product and must meet comparable standards for identity, strength, purity, quality and manufacturing.[1]

The distinction between approval standards and marketplace quality is important. Bioequivalence demonstrates comparable in-vivo performance of the studied formulation. Continued quality depends on consistent commercial manufacturing, appropriate storage and effective post-marketing oversight.

Perception: Why Generics Are Often Viewed as Inferior

Price as a psychological signal

Consumers frequently use price as a substitute for information about quality. Because medicines are technically complex and their effects may not be immediately observable, a more expensive product may appear more trustworthy. This heuristic is reinforced when patients are unfamiliar with regulatory approval or believe that lower prices result from cheaper ingredients rather than reduced research, marketing and promotion costs.

The nocebo effect may also influence experience after substitution. When patients expect a generic to be weaker or more harmful, they may report more symptoms, attribute ordinary symptom fluctuation to the new product or discontinue treatment. Such experiences are real to the patient even when pharmacological equivalence is maintained.

Brand familiarity and prescribing culture

Brand names are often easier to remember than international non-proprietary names. Clinicians may become familiar with particular brands during training or through repeated promotion. Pharmacists may stock brands with higher commercial margins, while patients interpret a doctor's brand-specific prescription as an endorsement of superior quality.

Systematic reviews show that negative perceptions are not limited to patients. Some physicians and pharmacists continue to express reservations about efficacy, safety and manufacturing standards, especially for medicines perceived as clinically sensitive.[4] These concerns may reflect genuine experience with variable-quality supply chains, but they can also persist despite evidence of equivalent approved products.

Appearance and packaging

Generic substitution can alter tablet colour, shape, markings or packaging. For patients using several medicines, these changes may cause confusion, duplication or non-adherence. Differences in appearance can therefore produce clinically important consequences even when pharmacological equivalence is unaffected.

Confusion between generic name and generic product

In India, "generic medicine" may refer to several different categories: a medicine prescribed by its non-proprietary name, an unbranded generic, a branded generic marketed under a company name, or a product supplied through a Jan Aushadhi outlet. These categories are not identical. A medicine can be prescribed generically but dispensed as a branded product, while a branded generic may compete with both innovator brands and unbranded alternatives.

This terminology contributes to misunderstanding and makes price and quality comparisons difficult.

Reality: Comparative Clinical Effectiveness

The available evidence generally supports the clinical comparability of approved generics and reference products. A systematic review of cardiovascular medicines found no evidence that brand-name products were clinically superior, including for medicines commonly regarded as sensitive to substitution.[5] Although some included studies were small or old, the consistency of findings challenged widespread assumptions favouring brands.

A large US insurance-claims study subsequently compared outcomes among more than 3.5 million patients initiating generic or brand-name formulations for diabetes, hypertension, osteoporosis, depression and anxiety. Generic use was associated with comparable clinical outcomes across the evaluated medicines.[6] The use of authorized generics—products essentially identical to the brand but marketed without the brand name—helped reduce bias arising from negative patient expectations.

A 2025 systematic review and meta-analysis of cardiovascular medicines also found comparable effectiveness and safety between generic and brand-name products overall.[7] However, such meta-analyses remain limited by heterogeneity in drugs, endpoints and follow-up periods.

Evidence regarding antibiotics is more complex. A 2023 systematic review found limited and heterogeneous clinical evidence comparing generic with originator antibiotics.[8] Bioequivalence remains the principal basis for approval, but the authors highlighted the need for stronger clinical and microbiological outcome data for selected agents. This should not be interpreted as proof of generic inferiority; rather, it identifies an evidence gap.

Generics may indirectly improve outcomes through affordability. Lower out-of-pocket expenditure can improve treatment initiation, refill adherence and persistence. A pharmacologically excellent brand is ineffective when a patient cannot afford to purchase it regularly.

Important Exceptions and Clinical Nuances

The broad equivalence of generics should not be converted into an absolute statement that switching is always clinically irrelevant.

Narrow-therapeutic-index medicines

For medicines in which small concentration changes may produce loss of efficacy or toxicity, regulators may apply tighter bioequivalence criteria or recommend closer monitoring. Examples commonly discussed include selected antiepileptics, immunosuppressants, thyroid hormones and anticoagulants. The issue is not that generics are intrinsically inferior, but that repeated switching among products may complicate stable management and patient confidence.

When substitution occurs, clinicians should consider clinical monitoring, laboratory testing where appropriate and careful documentation of the manufacturer and formulation.

Table 1. Common perceptions about generic medicines and the corresponding evidence

Common perception	Evidence-based reality	Important qualification	Recommended response
Generic medicines contain weaker active ingredients	Approved generics must contain the same active ingredient and labelled strength as the reference product	Manufacturing defects can affect either generic or branded products	Verify regulatory authorization and purchase through licensed supply chains
Lower price means lower quality	Lower prices primarily reflect reduced development, promotion and market-entry costs and increased competition	Very low price does not itself prove quality; procurement and testing remain essential	Promote quality-assured procurement rather than judging by price
Generics are allowed to be substantially less bioavailable	Bioequivalence criteria apply to statistical comparisons of pharmacokinetic exposure, not a 20–25% variation in drug content	Product-specific standards may be needed for complex or narrow-therapeutic-index medicines	Explain bioequivalence accurately to clinicians and patients
Brand-name medicines are clinically more effective	Comparative studies generally show similar outcomes for approved generics and reference products	Evidence is stronger for some drug classes than others	Prefer quality-assured generics when clinically appropriate
All products with the same generic name are interchangeable	Many conventional oral products are substitutable, but formulation, delivery system and regulatory status matter	Modified-release, inhaled, topical, injectable and other complex products require specific evaluation	Use approved therapeutic-equivalence information and product-specific guidance
Different colour or shape means a different medicine	Inactive ingredients and appearance may differ while the active medicine remains equivalent	Appearance changes can cause confusion and non-adherence	Inform patients before substitution and maintain consistent supply where possible
Adverse symptoms after switching prove pharmacological failure	Symptoms may reflect excipient intolerance, altered adherence, disease fluctuation or expectation effects	Genuine product-related problems must not be dismissed	Assess objectively, document manufacturer and batch, and report suspected quality problems
Generic prescribing automatically lowers patient costs	Generic naming enables choice but does not guarantee that the cheapest quality-assured product will be dispensed	Retail incentives, stock availability and substitution rules influence the final price	Link generic prescribing with procurement, price transparency and dispensing policy
Jan Aushadhi medicines are inherently inferior because they are inexpensive	The programme is designed to provide quality-assured generics through centralized procurement and testing	Confidence depends on transparent quality systems and reliable availability	Publish testing, recall and stock data and strengthen pharmacovigilance

Complex generics

Complex generics include products whose equivalence cannot be characterized adequately through simple plasma pharmacokinetics. Examples may include inhalers, long-acting injectables, transdermal systems, ophthalmic products, liposomal formulations and drug–device combinations. Demonstrating equivalent device performance, particle characteristics, local delivery or release behaviour can be challenging.

Regulatory science is increasingly developing product-specific guidance and advanced in-vitro, pharmacokinetic and modelling approaches for these products. Their complexity supports stronger evaluation—not a presumption that all generic versions are ineffective.

Excipients and tolerability

Inactive ingredients may differ between products. Most differences are clinically unimportant, but selected patients may react to particular dyes, preservatives, lactose, gluten-related contaminants or other excipients. A patient tolerating one product but not another should be evaluated rather than told that the experience is impossible.

Modified-release formulations

Modified-release products require careful demonstration that the timing and extent of drug release are comparable. Crushing, splitting or substituting dosage forms without understanding release characteristics can be unsafe, regardless of whether the medicine is branded or generic.

Quality Assurance Versus Generic Status

A crucial policy error is to treat "generic" and "quality" as opposing concepts. Quality is determined by the strength of regulation, manufacturing controls, testing, inspections and supply-chain integrity—not by whether the product carries a famous brand name.

Both branded and generic manufacturers can experience contamination, data-integrity failures, dissolution problems or recalls. Conversely, a well-regulated generic can consistently meet stringent standards. WHO recommends promoting **quality-assured** generics as a pharmaceutical-pricing policy because they create access to lower-priced equivalents while preserving regulatory safeguards.[2]

Substandard and falsified products represent a separate problem. A falsified product may deliberately misrepresent its identity or source; a substandard product is authorized but fails to meet quality specifications. Neither should be described simply as a generic-medicine failure. Weak regulation and illegal supply affect the pharmaceutical market more broadly.

Quality assurance should extend across the product lifecycle: approval, manufacturing, procurement, transportation, storage, dispensing, pharmacovigilance and recall.

Public Health Significance

Generic medicines can expand treatment coverage within a fixed health budget. Savings may allow health systems to procure larger quantities, include additional essential medicines and protect households from avoidable expenditure. WHO emphasizes that universal health coverage requires continuous access to safe, effective, quality-assured and affordable medicines.[9]

The benefit is especially important for chronic diseases requiring lifelong treatment. Small monthly price differences accumulate substantially for hypertension, diabetes, cardiovascular disease, epilepsy and mental illness. Poor adherence caused by cost may lead to complications that are far more expensive than the medicine itself.

Generic competition can also limit monopoly pricing after patent expiry. However, markets require sufficient competition. When only a few manufacturers supply an essential generic, shortages, quality failures or withdrawal by one company can create vulnerability. Extremely low procurement prices may also discourage sustainable manufacturing if quality-compliant production becomes commercially unattractive.

The goal is therefore affordable competition with resilient, high-quality supply—not the lowest possible price regardless of consequences.

The Indian Context

India is a major global manufacturer and exporter of generic medicines, yet its domestic pharmaceutical market remains heavily oriented towards branded generics. Patients may receive the same active ingredient under numerous brand names at widely differing prices. Prescribers and pharmacists therefore influence which manufacturer and price the patient ultimately receives.

The Code of Medical Ethics states that physicians should, as far as possible, prescribe medicines using generic names and ensure rational prescribing.[10] Generic-name prescribing can improve transparency, but it is effective only when pharmacists dispense quality-assured products and patients are protected against inappropriate substitution or price-based commercial incentives.

The Pradhan Mantri Bhartiya Janaushadhi Pariyojana was created to provide affordable generic medicines through dedicated outlets. As of February 28, 2026, the government reported 18,646 operational Jan Aushadhi Kendras.[11] The programme represents a major access initiative, particularly for patients purchasing chronic-disease medicines.

However, outlet numbers alone do not establish public health impact. Evaluation should include medicine availability, geographical accessibility, waiting time, stock-outs, prescription acceptance, patient adherence, quality complaints and actual household savings. A patient may return to a costly brand if the prescribed generic is repeatedly unavailable or if product appearance changes with each refill.

Indian studies demonstrate persistent uncertainty among patients and clinicians. A primary-care survey found that only approximately one-third of participating patients had a favourable understanding of generic medicines, with physician advice strongly influencing acceptance.[12] A qualitative and laboratory-based Indian study found that negative perceptions persisted even when tested generic and branded samples met quality requirements, suggesting that mistrust cannot be resolved through regulation alone; credible communication and visible quality assurance are also needed.[13]

Recent Advances

Greater use of real-world evidence

Large insurance, pharmacy and electronic-health-record datasets now permit comparison of outcomes after generic initiation or switching. These studies complement bioequivalence trials by examining adherence, hospitalization and disease outcomes in routine practice. Their limitations include residual confounding and imperfect measurement of actual medicine use.

Product-specific bioequivalence standards

Regulators increasingly use formulation-specific standards rather than a single approach for every medicine. Physiologically based pharmacokinetic modelling, advanced dissolution testing and device-performance assessment are particularly important for complex generics.

Digital traceability and pharmacovigilance

Serialization, barcodes and digital supply-chain systems can support batch traceability and rapid recalls. Electronic prescribing can record manufacturer changes and help investigate adverse events following substitution. These tools require interoperable systems and protection against counterfeit coding.

Transparent procurement quality

Public procurement systems are moving beyond end-product price towards supplier qualification, manufacturing history, batch testing and performance monitoring. India can strengthen confidence by publishing anonymized testing statistics, failed batches, recalls and corrective actions for public medicine programmes.

Challenges and Limitations

Comparative-effectiveness evidence is not equally strong for all products. Many studies involve conventional oral medicines and high-income regulatory settings. Data remain more limited for complex products, paediatric formulations and some narrow-therapeutic-index medicines.

Observational comparisons may be affected by socioeconomic differences. Patients receiving brands may differ systematically from those receiving generics. Negative expectations can also influence adherence and symptom reporting, complicating outcome interpretation.

Quality variation across countries and manufacturers means that evidence about approved generics in one regulatory system cannot automatically validate every product sold globally. Trust must be earned through regulatory performance, not demanded through slogans.

Generic policies may also encounter resistance from commercial stakeholders who benefit from brand promotion. At the same time, poorly designed mandatory substitution can undermine clinician and patient confidence if introduced without product information, continuity of supply or mechanisms for reporting problems.

Future Directions and Policy Priorities

India and other countries should frame policy around **quality-assured generic medicines**, not generic medicines in isolation. Priorities include:

- strengthening harmonized bioequivalence and product-specific approval standards;
- risk-based inspections of active-ingredient and finished-product manufacturers;
- independent batch testing and transparent publication of regulatory actions;
- national electronic systems for recalls and suspected-quality reporting;
- generic-name prescribing linked with pharmacist accountability and price transparency;
- reliable public procurement and stock management;
- patient counselling before changes in manufacturer or appearance;
- targeted monitoring for narrow-therapeutic-index and complex products;
- inclusion of generic-medicine literacy in medical, pharmacy and nursing education;
- independent evaluation of Jan Aushadhi availability, adherence and health outcomes.

Public communication should avoid both extremes. It should not claim that every low-cost product is automatically trustworthy, nor suggest that a familiar brand is clinically superior merely because it is more expensive.

CONCLUSION

The debate over generic medicines is often presented as a conflict between affordability and quality. For properly approved and quality-assured products, this is a false choice. Generic medicines are required to meet pharmaceutical and bioequivalence standards intended to ensure the same therapeutic benefit as reference products, and comparative evidence generally shows similar clinical outcomes.

Persisting mistrust arises from psychological responses to price, brand familiarity, differences in appearance, commercial promotion and genuine concerns about regulatory enforcement. These concerns should be addressed through evidence and transparent quality systems rather than dismissal.

Clinical nuance remains necessary. Excipients, modified-release technology, complex delivery systems and narrow therapeutic indices may justify product-specific precautions and monitoring. These exceptions do not invalidate generic substitution as a general policy.

For India, generic medicines offer a major opportunity to reduce out-of-pocket expenditure and expand access to long-term treatment. The Jan Aushadhi network and generic-prescribing policies provide an important foundation, but their credibility depends on consistent availability, rigorous quality assurance, pharmacovigilance and clear communication.

The appropriate public health position is therefore straightforward: price is not a reliable measure of therapeutic quality, and a brand name is not proof of superiority. Patients should receive medicines selected on the basis of evidence, regulatory quality, clinical suitability and affordability.

REFERENCES

1. US Food and Drug Administration. *Generic drug facts* [Internet]. Silver Spring (MD): US Food and Drug Administration; 2021 [cited 2026 Aug 6]. Available from: https://www.fda.gov/drugs/generic-drugs/generic-drug-facts
2. World Health Organization. *WHO guideline on country pharmaceutical pricing policies*. 2nd ed. [Internet]. Geneva: World Health Organization; 2020 [cited 2026 Aug 6]. Available from: https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/9789240011878
3. Central Drugs Standard Control Organization. *Guidance document for bioavailability and bioequivalence studies* [Internet]. New Delhi: Directorate General of Health Services, Ministry of Health and Family Welfare, Government of India; 2018 [cited 2026 Aug 6]. Available from: https://cdsco.gov.in/
4. Colgan S, Faasse K, Martin LR, Stephens MH, Grey A, Petrie KJ. Perceptions of generic medication in the general population, doctors and pharmacists: a systematic review. BMJ Open. 2015;5(12):e008915. doi:10.1136/bmjopen-2015-008915.
5. Kesselheim AS, Misono AS, Lee JL, Stedman MR, Brookhart MA, Choudhry NK, et al. Clinical equivalence of generic and brand-name drugs used in cardiovascular disease: a systematic review and meta-analysis. JAMA. 2008;300(21):2514-2526. doi:10.1001/jama.2008.758.
6. Desai RJ, Sarpatwari A, Dejene S, Khan NF, Lii J, Rogers JR, et al. Comparative effectiveness of generic and brand-name medication use: a database study of US health insurance claims. PLoS Med. 2019;16(3):e1002763. doi:10.1371/journal.pmed.1002763.

7. Luo B, Yu F. Can generic medications be a safe and effective alternative to brand-name drugs for cardiovascular disease treatment? A systematic review and meta-analysis. Rev Cardiovasc Med. 2025;26(3):26116. doi:10.31083/RCM26116.
8. Cotia A, Oliveira M, Silva M, et al. Clinical equivalence between generic versus branded antibiotics: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Antibiotics (Basel). 2023;12(5):870. doi:10.3390/antibiotics12050870.
9. World Health Organization. *Selection of essential medicines at country level: using the WHO Model List of Essential Medicines to update a national essential medicines list* [Internet]. Geneva: World Health Organization; 2020 [cited 2026 Aug 6]. Available from: https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/9789240017900
10. Medical Council of India. *Indian Medical Council (Professional Conduct, Etiquette and Ethics) Regulations, 2002* [Internet]. New Delhi: Medical Council of India; 2002 [cited 2026 Aug 6]. Available from: https://www.nmc.org.in/rules-regulations/