



Efficacy vs Effectiveness: What Truly Matters to the Practicing Clinician?

Abhijit Anil Trailokya*¹

Received: 13 April 2026; Accepted: 19 June 2026

Keywords: Effectiveness, Efficacy, Real-world evidence.

Journal of The Association of Physicians of India (2026); 10.59556/japi.74.1642

In clinical practice, very few decisions are made in ideal circumstances. The patients we treat rarely resemble the precisely selected participants enrolled in randomized controlled trials (RCTs), although RCTs are the gold standard in evaluating the effects of treatments.¹

As clinicians, we frequently depend on data from RCTs to guide prescribing decisions. These trials typically evaluate efficacy and safety to determine whether a drug works under ideal, highly controlled conditions with strict inclusion and exclusion criteria. However, the patient sitting in front of us rarely represents those ideal conditions. This is where effectiveness becomes critically important.²

UNDERSTANDING THE DIFFERENCE

Efficacy trials (often RCTs) are designed to determine whether an intervention works under ideal circumstances. They use strict inclusion and exclusion criteria, closely monitor adherence, control co-interventions, and aim to maximize internal validity. The goal is to determine if the drug produces the intended effect.³⁻⁷

Clinical trials move step by step, with each phase answering a different clinical question. Phase I studies are small and focus mainly on safety, helping researchers understand the safe dose range and identify important adverse effects. Phase II trials involve more patients and look at whether the drug actually works while continuing to monitor safety and refine the dose. Phase III trials expand to larger populations to confirm efficacy, compare the new treatment with standard therapy or placebo, and generate the robust data needed for regulatory approval. Once approved, phase IV or postmarketing studies track long-term safety and real-world effectiveness, often identifying rare adverse events and assessing use in broader patient groups.⁸

In contrast, effectiveness trials evaluate how an intervention performs in real-world settings. These studies often include broader patient populations, allow variations in practice, and reflect everyday clinical

behavior. Their strength lies in external validity. They answer a different but equally important question: does the drug work in routine clinical care?³⁻⁷

Real-world data refer to health information collected outside traditional randomized trials, including electronic health records, insurance claims, registries, and even wearable devices. When analyzed systematically, it generates real-world evidence (RWE) that shows how treatments actually perform in routine clinical practice. Unlike controlled trial settings, this approach reflects diverse patient populations, comorbidities, and everyday prescribing patterns. It helps clinicians and researchers understand effectiveness, long-term safety, outcomes in specific subgroups, and even cost implications. Because it is often faster and more economical than large trials, it has become an important complement to randomized studies. Regulatory bodies such as the US Food and Drug Administration also use RWE for postmarketing safety surveillance and selected regulatory decisions.⁹

WHY EFFICACY MATTERS

For clinicians, efficacy data provide assurance. They confirm that the intervention has intrinsic therapeutic value. Regulatory approvals depend on such evidence. Guidelines are often constructed upon it. Without efficacy trials, clinical medicine would lack a scientific foundation.³⁻⁸ For example, when evaluating a new antidiabetic drug, tightly controlled glycated hemoglobin (HbA1c) reductions under standardized conditions confirm that the molecule works. In early decision-making, efficacy is essential. It establishes biological plausibility and therapeutic potential. It gives us confidence that the intervention has intrinsic value. However, efficacy alone is not enough.

THE CLINICAL REALITY

The patients we see daily often differ substantially from those enrolled in efficacy trials. They are older. They have multiple

comorbidities. They take several concomitant medications. Their adherence varies. Social determinants influence outcomes. Renal and hepatic functions are not always ideal. Follow-up is inconsistent. In such settings, the controlled environment of efficacy trials begins to feel distant.³⁻⁸

An antidiabetic drug that lowers HbA1c by 0.7% in a tightly selected trial population may show a smaller effect in real-world patients with variable adherence. This is where effectiveness evidence becomes more relevant.

EFFECTIVENESS SPEAKS TO CLINICIANS^{7,8,10}

Effectiveness trials reflect routine care. They include heterogeneous populations, typical adherence patterns, and pragmatic outcomes. Their findings often align more closely with what clinicians actually observe.

From a clinician's standpoint, effectiveness answers practical questions:

- Will this drug work in my patient population?
- How will it perform alongside multiple comorbidities?
- What is the true magnitude of benefit outside research settings?
- Does it remain beneficial when adherence is imperfect?

These questions shape real prescribing decisions. While efficacy demonstrates that a drug can work, effectiveness demonstrates whether it does work in usual practice.

As clinicians, we should avoid viewing efficacy and effectiveness as competing concepts. They are complementary. Efficacy establishes the foundation. Effectiveness determines applicability.¹⁰ Evidence-based medicine requires integrating both. In chronic diseases such as diabetes, cardiovascular disease, or inflammatory conditions,

Head, Department of Medical Affairs, Indoco Remedies Limited, Mumbai, Maharashtra, India;
*Corresponding Author

How to cite this article: Trailokya AA. Efficacy vs Effectiveness: What Truly Matters to the Practicing Clinician? *J Assoc Physicians India* 2026;74(8):87-88.

effectiveness evidence often better informs long-term management strategies.

WHICH IS MORE RELEVANT FOR CLINICIANS?^{8,10}

If forced to choose, effectiveness may be more directly relevant for day-to-day clinical practice. It mirrors the reality in which clinicians operate.

However, the ideal approach is sequential interpretation:

1. First, confirm the drug works under controlled conditions.
2. Then, evaluate how it performs in real-world settings.
3. Finally, individualize the decision for the patient in front of you.

Efficacy provides scientific assurance. Effectiveness provides clinical confidence.

THE WAY FORWARD

With increasing emphasis on pragmatic trials, RWE, and large observational datasets,

modern research is moving toward bridging this gap. Clinicians should welcome this shift. It aligns evidence generation more closely with clinical realities. At the bedside, decisions are rarely binary. They involve patient preferences, comorbidities, costs, and system factors. In such complexity, effectiveness evidence often carries greater practical weight. Yet without efficacy trials, there would be no foundation to build upon.

CONCLUSION

Efficacy demonstrates potential. Effectiveness determines practice. For clinicians, both forms of evidence are essential. Efficacy tells us whether a drug can work. Effectiveness tells us whether it will work for the patients we actually treat. The art of clinical medicine lies in understanding this distinction and applying it thoughtfully.

ORCID

Abhijit Anil Trailokya  <https://orcid.org/0009-0002-7657-8119>

REFERENCES

1. Rothwell PM. External validity of randomised controlled trials: "to whom do the results of this trial apply?" *Lancet* 2005;365:82–93.
2. Gartlehner G, Hansen RA, Nissman D, et al. Criteria for Distinguishing Effectiveness From Efficacy Trials in Systematic Reviews. Rockville (MD): Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality (US); 2006. Technical Reviews, No. 12. Available from: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK44024/>
3. Fritz JM, Cleland J. Effectiveness versus efficacy: more than a debate over language. *J Orthop Sports Phys Ther* 2003;33:163–165.
4. Streiner D, Norman G. Efficacy and effectiveness trials. *Community Oncol* 2009;6:472–474.
5. Selker HP, Gorman S, Kaitin KI. Efficacy-to-effectiveness clinical trials. *Trans Am Clin Climatol Assoc* 2018;129:279–300.
6. Costa ML, Griffin XL, Parsons N, et al. Efficacy versus effectiveness in clinical trials. *Bone Joint J* 2017;99-B(4):419–420.
7. Kim SY. Efficacy versus effectiveness. *Korean J Fam Med* 2013;34(4):227.
8. Trailokya A, Srivastava A, Mukaddam Q, et al. Phase IV studies: what clinicians need to know! *J Assoc Physicians India* 2024;72(1):85–87.
9. Trailokya AA, Srivastava A, Mukaddam Q, et al. Real-world evidence simplified for clinicians. *J Assoc Physicians India* 2025;73(2):78–80.
10. Singal AG, Higgins PD, Waljee AK. A primer on effectiveness and efficacy trials. *Clin Transl Gastroenterol* 2014;5(1):e45.