

From Exposure to Exhaustion: Brand Fatigue, Cognitive Saturation, and Generic Reliance in Pharmaceutical Markets in India

Amit Roy¹, Dr. Chandibai Postangbam²

¹Research Scholar, Manipur International University, Imphal, Manipur, India

²Associate Professor, Manipur International University, Imphal, Manipur, India

Abstract

In everyday pharmaceutical practice, doctors are exposed to a large number of brand messages within limited time. While promotion is generally assumed to improve recall and prescribing, this effect does not continue indefinitely. After a point, repeated exposure appears to reduce attention rather than increase it.

This paper explores this phenomenon through the concept of brand fatigue, understood as a state in which continuous promotional input leads to cognitive tiredness. Instead of treating promotion as uniformly effective, the study argues that physicians operate under clear cognitive limits, and that these limits shape how brand information is received and processed.

Drawing on ideas from cognitive load theory, decision fatigue, and information overload, a framework of cognitive saturation is developed. Within this framework, two simple measures—the Brand Fatigue Ratio (BFR) and the Adjusted Fatigue Index (AFI)—are proposed to indicate how much of promotional activity may occur under reduced attention or disengagement.

The discussion also considers the role of generics, suggesting that when fatigue sets in, doctors are more likely to rely on familiar or low-effort prescribing choices. Overall, the paper offers a more grounded view of pharmaceutical promotion, particularly in markets like India where brand density is unusually high.

Keywords: Brand fatigue, cognitive saturation, pharmaceutical marketing, information overload, branded generics, prescription inertia, decision fatigue.

How to cite this article: Roy A, Postangbam C. From Exposure to Exhaustion: Brand Fatigue, Cognitive Saturation, and Generic Reliance in Pharmaceutical Markets in India. *Int J Drug Deliv Technol.* 2026;16(49s): 80-84. DOI: 10.25258/ijddt.16.49s.9

1. Introduction

Pharmaceutical promotion is often guided by a straightforward assumption: greater exposure should lead to better outcomes. In theory, repeated interactions with doctors are expected to strengthen recall and influence prescribing behaviour. However, when one looks at actual clinical settings, this relationship appears less stable than it is often assumed to be.

Doctors, particularly in busy outpatient environments, are approached by multiple medical representatives over the course of a day. Each interaction may be brief, but the cumulative exposure can be substantial. Over time, this raises a practical concern—how much of this information is genuinely processed, and how much simply passes without meaningful attention?

The Indian pharmaceutical market provides a useful context to examine this issue. With tens of thousands

of brands distributed across therapeutic categories, the level of promotional activity is intense. While competition encourages visibility, it also increases repetition and similarity across messages. Under such conditions, it is reasonable to expect that the effectiveness of promotion may not increase in a linear manner.

This paper builds on that premise and introduces the idea of brand fatigue. The central argument is that beyond a certain level of exposure, promotional efforts begin to encounter cognitive limits. Instead of improving engagement, additional messages may contribute to reduced attention and reliance on simpler decision patterns. To explore this, the study develops a conceptual framework of cognitive saturation and proposes basic measures that help in thinking about how much of promotional activity operates under such constraints.

From Exposure to Exhaustion: Brand Fatigue, Cognitive Saturation, and Generic Reliance in Pharmaceutical Markets in India

Before moving further, it is useful to briefly revisit how existing theories help explain this shift in behaviour.

2. Theoretical Background

2.1 Cognitive Capacity Constraints

Human working memory has clear limits. Cognitive load theory posits that when information input becomes too high, processing quality drops. In pharmaceutical promotion, each brand message carries details on efficacy, safety, side effects, and pricing. These demands can quickly accumulate.

2.2 Decision Fatigue and Behavioural Simplification

Repeated decision-making consumes mental energy. When cognitive resources are depleted, decision-makers tend to rely on mental shortcuts and familiar options instead of careful, effortful analysis.

2.3 Information Overload and Disengagement

Excessive information often leads to avoidance or reduced attention. Later promotional messages may receive less consideration, even from previously preferred brands.

Taken together, these theories suggest that the effect of promotion is inherently non-linear. After a certain threshold, extra exposure can produce weaker or even negative marginal returns.

While these ideas provide a broad foundation, they do not directly capture what happens in dense promotional environments. This is where the present framework attempts to extend the discussion.

3. Conceptual Framework

3.1 Brand Fatigue

Brand fatigue is defined as a state of cognitive depletion caused by repeated promotional exposure to multiple competing brands. It is marked by reduced attention to brand messages, lower emotional response, and decreased willingness to prescribe the promoted medicine.

3.2 Cognitive Saturation Zones

Doctor-brand interactions can be conceptually grouped into three zones:

- *The Active Zone:* Doctors process information with full attention and cognitive resources.
- *The Transitional Zone:* Fatigue begins to set in and doctors start using mental shortcuts.
- *The Fatigue Zone:* Doctors largely disengage or reject the message, defaulting to habitual or low-effort choices.

Up to this point, the discussion has remained largely conceptual. The next step is to see whether these ideas can be expressed in a simpler, more usable form.

4. Quantifying Brand Fatigue

The framework discussed so far explains what brand fatigue is, but it also raises a practical question—can

this effect be expressed in a simple and usable form? The following measures are proposed with that intention. They are not meant to be precise statistical tools at this stage, but rather conceptual devices that help make sense of promotional saturation.

4.1 Brand Fatigue Ratio (BFR)

The Brand Fatigue Ratio (BFR) is intended to capture how much of a physician's exposure occurs in conditions where messages are no longer meaningfully processed. In other words, it focuses on interactions that fall into the fatigue zone.:

$$\text{BFR} = \text{B}_{\text{ignored}} / \text{B}_{\text{total}}$$

Here, **B_{ignored}** refers to interactions that are effectively dismissed or receive minimal attention, while **B_{total}** represents the overall volume of brand exposure. This can be expressed in a simple ratio, where the number of interactions falling in the fatigue zone is divided by total exposure.

To make this clearer, consider a simple situation. Suppose a doctor is exposed to around 45 brands in a given category over a period of time. If roughly 12 of these interactions fall into the fatigue zone, the ratio becomes::

$$\text{BFR} = 12 \div 45 = 0.267 \text{ (26.7\%)}$$

This suggests that more than one-quarter of promotional effort is occurring under conditions where the doctor is no longer fully engaged.

4.2 Adjusted Fatigue Index (AFI)

The limitation of the BFR is that it treats fatigue as an all-or-nothing condition. In reality, there is often a middle zone where attention is reduced but not completely absent. The Adjusted Fatigue Index (AFI) is introduced to account for this.:

$$\text{AFI} = (\text{B}_{\text{ignored}} + \lambda \times \text{B}_{\text{transitional}}) / \text{B}_{\text{total}}$$

The parameter λ represents the degree of partial fatigue. A value of 0.5 is often used as a starting point, although it can vary depending on interpretation. This adjustment allows the model to account for interactions where fatigue is partial rather than complete.

Continuing with the same example, if 18 additional brands fall into the transitional zone, the calculation becomes:

$$\text{AFI} = (12 + 0.5 \times 18) \div 45 = 21/45 = 0.467 \text{ (46.7\%)}$$

This indicates that nearly half of all interactions are taking place under some degree of cognitive strain. The exact value may change with different assumptions of λ , but the broader implication remains—the effective attention available to promotional messages is significantly constrained.

($\lambda = 0.3$) yields AFI = 0.40 (40%),

while ($\lambda = 0.7$) produces AFI = 0.53 (53%).

4.3 Theoretical Illustration and Implications

In India's highly proliferated pharmaceutical markets, where physicians routinely encounter dozens of competing brands per therapeutic category, substantial portions of promotional activity are expected to register high values on both

From Exposure to Exhaustion: Brand Fatigue, Cognitive Saturation, and Generic Reliance in Pharmaceutical Markets in India

the **BFR** and **AFI**. These metrics serve as diagnostic tools, revealing the extent to which promotional resources are being deployed when physicians' cognitive capacity is already constrained. Consequently, they highlight the non-linear relationship between promotional volume and prescribing outcomes, and underscore the growing reliance on familiar brands and generics as cognitive shortcuts under fatigue.

Once these measures are outlined, the broader mechanism linking exposure to behaviour can be considered more explicitly.

5. Model Development

The central theoretical mechanism is as follows: intensive promotional exposure increases cognitive load, which in turn generates brand fatigue. Fatigue then reduces attention and prescribing intent toward promoted brands while increasing prescription inertia (the tendency to continue with familiar or default choices).

Fatigue effects can also spill across therapeutic categories. Furthermore, the wide availability of generic medicines plays a moderating role. When doctors experience fatigue, they are theoretically more likely to choose familiar and lower-cost options to conserve mental effort. In India's branded generics-dominated market, this tendency toward simplification becomes particularly pronounced.

Based on the relationships discussed so far, a set of propositions can be outlined to guide future empirical work.

6. Theoretical Propositions

P1: Higher levels of promotional exposure increase perceived cognitive load for physicians.

P2: Greater cognitive load leads to higher levels of brand fatigue.

P3: Brand fatigue reduces attention to individual brand messages.

P4: Brand fatigue increases prescription inertia.

P5: The orientation toward generics strengthens the relationship between brand fatigue and prescription inertia.

Taken together, the preceding sections point toward a different way of understanding promotional effectiveness. The implications of this shift are discussed below.

7. Discussion

The framework developed in this paper suggests that pharmaceutical promotion does not operate in a simple linear manner, especially in markets where brand proliferation is high. While increasing exposure may initially improve recall, there appears to be a point beyond which additional promotion contributes little to meaningful engagement. Instead, it may begin to create a sense of cognitive overload. In such situations, doctors are unlikely to evaluate each new message with the same level of attention.

Rather, they may start relying on familiar patterns of prescribing or default options that require less effort. This shift is not necessarily deliberate; it reflects the practical constraints under which decisions are made in real clinical environments.

An important implication of this is that a considerable portion of promotional effort may be taking place when physicians are no longer fully receptive. In other words, promotion may continue, but its marginal effectiveness declines. This perspective helps explain why, despite high levels of promotional activity, differentiation between brands often remains limited in practice.

The presence of generics adds another dimension to this dynamic. When cognitive fatigue sets in, the appeal of familiar and cost-effective options tends to increase. Generics, in this sense, do not simply compete on price—they also align with the need for simplified decision-making under constrained attention.

These observations suggest that pharmaceutical firms may need to reconsider the emphasis placed on frequency of promotion. More selective, differentiated, and context-sensitive engagement strategies may be more effective than repeated exposure. At the same time, policymakers may also need to reflect on how excessive brand proliferation affects both marketing efficiency and the quality of prescribing decisions.

8. Contributions

This paper makes several theoretical contributions:

- It introduces **brand fatigue** as a distinct construct and develops a cognitive saturation framework that integrates cognitive load theory, decision fatigue, and information overload in a novel way.
- It offers two simple conceptual metrics — the **Brand Fatigue Ratio (BFR)** and the **Adjusted Fatigue Index (AFI)** — that can help analyse promotional effectiveness in saturated markets.
- Contextually, the paper sheds light on the dynamics of high-density pharmaceutical markets where branded generics dominate, as seen in India.

As with any conceptual work, there are boundaries to what can be claimed at this stage.

9. Limitations and Future Research Directions

As a purely conceptual paper, this work relies on theoretical synthesis and field-informed illustrations rather than primary data. The framework would benefit from future empirical scrutiny through diverse methodological approaches, including large-scale surveys, longitudinal designs, analysis of actual prescribing patterns, and experimental studies. Comparative research across different countries and healthcare systems would also enrich

From Exposure to Exhaustion: Brand Fatigue, Cognitive Saturation, and Generic Reliance in Pharmaceutical Markets in India

the understanding of cognitive saturation in pharmaceutical markets.

10. Conclusion

The discussion in this paper began with a simple question—what happens when doctors are exposed to more promotional information than they can realistically process? The answer, as the framework suggests, is not just reduced effectiveness, but a gradual shift in how decisions are made.

In markets such as India, where brand proliferation is unusually high, this shift becomes more visible. Promotion continues, but attention does not keep pace. Instead, doctors appear to rely increasingly on familiarity, habit, and practical shortcuts. In that sense, brand fatigue is not an isolated outcome; it is part of a broader adjustment to cognitive limits.

The conceptual tools proposed in this paper, particularly the Brand Fatigue Ratio (BFR) and the Adjusted Fatigue Index (AFI), are intended to make this adjustment easier to think about. They do not claim precision at this stage, but they help in asking a more relevant question—how much of promotional effort is actually being received under conditions where it can still have an effect?

Seen in this light, the challenge for pharmaceutical marketing is not simply to increase visibility, but to recognise when additional exposure stops contributing meaningfully. A more measured approach, with greater emphasis on clarity and timing, may be more effective than repeated contact alone.

Finally, this paper remains conceptual by design. The arguments presented here would benefit from empirical examination across different contexts and specialties. Such work could help clarify how widespread these effects are and whether similar patterns emerge beyond high-density markets. For now, the intention is to open up a different way of thinking about promotion—one that takes cognitive limits seriously rather than assuming they can be continuously stretched.

References

Baumeister, R. F., & Tierney, J. (2011). *Willpower: Rediscovering the greatest human strength*. Penguin Press.

Baumeister, R. F., Vohs, K. D., & Tice, D. M. (2007). The strength model of self-control. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 16(6), 351–355. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8721.2007.00534.x>

Berndt, E. R., Bui, L. T., Reiley, D. H., & Urban, G. L. (1995). Information, marketing, and pricing in the U.S. antiulcer drug market. *American Economic Review*, 85(2), 100–105.

Bettman, J. R., Luce, M. F., & Payne, J. W. (1998). Constructive consumer choice processes. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 25(3), 187–217. <https://doi.org/10.1086/209535>

Boulding, W., Lee, E., & Staelin, R. (1994). Mastering the mix: Do advertising, promotion, and sales force activities lead to differentiation? *Journal of Marketing Research*, 31(2), 159–172. <https://doi.org/10.1177/002224379403100202>

Cialdini, R. B. (2009). *Influence: Science and practice* (5th ed.). Pearson.

Competition Commission of India. (2021). *Market study on the pharmaceutical sector in India*. Government of India.

Economic Survey 2025–26. (2026). Government of India.

Eppler, M. J., & Mengis, J. (2004). The concept of information overload: A review of literature. *The Information Society*, 20(5), 325–344. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01972240490507974>

Fazio, R. H. (1990). Multiple processes by which attitudes guide behavior. In M. P. Zanna (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 23, pp. 75–109). Academic Press. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0065-2601\(08\)60318-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0065-2601(08)60318-4)

Gourville, J. T., & Soman, D. (2005). Overchoice and assortment type: When and why variety backfires. *Marketing Science*, 24(3), 382–395. <https://doi.org/10.1287/mksc.1040.0109>

Iyengar, S. S., & Lepper, M. R. (2000). When choice is demotivating: Can one desire too much of a good thing? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 79(6), 995–1006. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.79.6.995>

Kahneman, D. (2011). *Thinking, fast and slow*. Farrar, Straus and Giroux.

Manchanda, P., & Honka, E. (2005). The effects and role of direct-to-physician marketing in the pharmaceutical industry. *Marketing Science*, 24(2), 201–217. <https://doi.org/10.1287/mksc.1040.0082>

Meyerhoefer, C. D., & Zuvekas, S. H. (2008). The shape of demand: What does it tell us about direct-to-consumer marketing of antidepressants? *The B.E. Journal of Economic Analysis & Policy*, 8(2), 1–37.

Mizik, N., & Jacobson, R. (2004). Stock return response modeling and marketing: Conceptual framework and empirical evidence. *Marketing Science*, 23(4), 604–626.

Press Information Bureau. (2026, March 21). *India's pharmaceuticals in global healthcare*. Government of India.

Sweller, J. (1988). Cognitive load during problem solving: Effects on learning. *Cognitive Science*, 12(2), 257–285. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15516709cog1202_4

From Exposure to Exhaustion: Brand Fatigue, Cognitive Saturation, and Generic
Reliance in Pharmaceutical Markets in India