ISSN: 2579-079X

International Digital Organization for Scientific Research IDOSR JST/26/1220000
IDOSR JOURNAL OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY 12(2):68-72, 2026.
https://doi.org/10.59298/IDOSR/JST/26/122.6872

Balancing Patient Autonomy and Medical Responsibility in Steroid Dependency Management: Ethical Dilemmas, Clinical Realities, and Practical Pathways

Taliikwa Nicholas Ceaser

Department of Pharmacognosy Kampala International University Uganda
Email:ceaser.taliikwa@studwc.kiu.ac.ug

ABSTRACT

Steroid dependency, most commonly involving long-term systemic glucocorticoids, sits at a difficult intersection of symptom relief, physiologic adaptation (HPA-axis suppression), psychological reliance, and iatrogenic harm. Clinicians routinely face ethically charged decisions when patients strongly prefer continued or higher-dose steroids despite clear risks (infection, osteoporosis, metabolic disease, psychiatric effects, adrenal crisis, etc.). This review synthesizes core ethical principles (autonomy, beneficence, non-maleficence, justice), contemporary models of shared decision-making, and bedside strategies for navigating conflict while maintaining patient dignity and safety. We distinguish *autonomy* from *unbounded choice*, outline how capacity and voluntariness can be compromised by steroid-induced mood/cognition changes and fear of relapse, and show how "medical responsibility" is best framed as *harm prevention + partnership*, not paternalism. We propose a practical ethical-clinical workflow: clarify indication and goals, assess dependency drivers (physiologic vs psychological vs disease-driven), quantify risk, evaluate decision-making capacity, communicate options with uncertainty transparently, agree on a harm-minimizing plan (including tapering/bridging), and document shared decisions. Special attention is given to high-risk scenarios (refusal to taper, clandestine steroid use, comorbid mental illness, pregnancy, adolescents, chronic inflammatory disease, and low-resource settings). The review concludes with a set of "ethical red flags," a negotiation toolkit, and system-level recommendations (protocols, multidisciplinary clinics, deprescribing pathways) that protect both patients and clinicians.

Keywords: glucocorticoids, steroid dependence, patient autonomy, beneficence, non-maleficence, shared decision-making.

INTRODUCTION

Steroids (most commonly systemic glucocorticoids such as prednisolone, methylprednisolone, and dexamethasone) remain among the most potent and fastest-acting anti-inflammatory medicines in clinical care. In many acute and chronic conditions, severe asthma and COPD exacerbations, autoimmune flares, inflammatory arthritis, nephritic syndromes, inflammatory bowel disease, dermatologic inflammatory crises, cerebral edema, and selected oncologic or palliative indications, steroids can be genuinely life-saving and life-changing [1]. Their clinical appeal is easy to understand: they rapidly suppress inflammation, relieve pain and dyspnea, improve appetite and energy, reduce swelling, and may temporarily restore function when other therapies are slow, inaccessible, or have failed. For some patients, the first experience of steroid therapy feels like "getting their life back," because symptoms that previously limited breathing, mobility, sleep, or daily functioning can improve dramatically within hours to days. However, the same properties that make steroids clinically powerful also make them uniquely prone to overuse, prolonged exposure, and dependency [2]. Unlike many other medicines, steroids can produce immediate, subjectively rewarding relief while simultaneously accumulating harms that are delayed, diffuse, and sometimes initially silent. These harms include hyperglycemia and diabetes, hypertension, osteoporosis and fractures, cataracts and glaucoma, myopathy, skin fragility, weight gain, Cushingoid changes, mood and sleep disturbances, gastrointestinal complications, adrenal suppression, and increased risk of infections (including opportunistic infections). Over time,

steroid-related morbidity can become substantial, particularly in settings where monitoring is inconsistent, alternative steroid-sparing therapies are costly or unavailable, and patients face barriers to follow-up [3].

"Steroid dependency" is often treated as a single entity, but in practice it commonly reflects a hybrid of physiological, disease-related, and psychological drivers rather than classic addiction. Physiologic dependence develops when exogenous steroids suppress the HPA axis, reducing endogenous cortisol production; abrupt dose reduction or cessation can provoke adrenal insufficiency with fatigue, hypotension, nausea, weakness, and, during stress or intercurrent illness, life-threatening adrenal crisis. Disease dependence arises when the underlying condition remains insufficiently controlled by disease-modifying therapies, non-steroidal options, or optimized non-pharmacologic strategies, so tapering triggers rebound symptoms or inflammatory flares that "prove" steroids are indispensable [4]. Psychological and behavioral dependence may then be reinforced by fear of relapse, avoidance of discomfort, and the rapid relief steroids provide, sometimes amplified by mood elevation or increased energy despite accumulating harm. This multidimensional state creates ethical tension when patient preference for ongoing high-dose therapy conflicts with clinician duties of beneficence, non-maleficence, justice, and professional integrity, requiring structured, shared decision-making and risk-managed tapering pathways [5].

Despite the well-known adverse effects of long-term systemic steroid exposure, steroid-dependent prescribing remains common in many clinical contexts. Patients may present with prolonged use initiated during an acute flare and never appropriately tapered, repeated courses that blur into continuous therapy, or self-directed dose escalation during symptom recurrence. Clinicians may feel pressured by time constraints, limited access to specialist input, lack of affordable steroid-sparing agents, or fear of patient dissatisfaction and loss to follow-up. Patients, on the other hand, may prioritize immediate functional recovery over distant risks, especially when daily survival, caregiving duties, or employment demands make short-term relief feel non-negotiable [6].

The key problem is that steroid dependency creates a recurrent ethical and clinical conflict: continuing high-dose or prolonged steroids may provide short-term relief but exposes the patient to substantial foreseeable harm; stopping abruptly is unsafe due to physiologic dependence; tapering may precipitate disease flares and psychological distress; and refusing prescriptions without supportive alternatives may be experienced as abandonment. Without a structured ethical and clinical framework, clinicians may oscillate between permissive prescribing (to preserve rapport or relieve suffering) and rigid restriction (to avoid harm), with both extremes potentially worsening outcomes either through iatrogenic complications or through unmanaged disease and fractured therapeutic relationships [7]. This review aims to critically examine and synthesize the ethical principles, clinical evidence, and communication-based strategies that should guide clinicians in managing steroid dependency, and to translate these insights into a structured, practical approach to care. Specifically, it seeks to support decision-making that balances respect for patient autonomy with the clinician's professional duty to prevent harm, while enabling safe steroid reduction where feasible or rational maintenance when clinically justified. By foregrounding shared decision-making, the review will emphasize how clinicians can negotiate goals, address fear-driven reliance on steroids, and strengthen adherence, monitoring, and long-term outcomes through clear communication, documentation, and contingency planning. The significance of this work is multifaceted. Steroid dependency is associated with substantial preventable morbidity, including adrenal crisis, severe infections, metabolic complications such as steroid-induced diabetes, osteoporosis-related fractures, and psychiatric adverse effects; therefore, clarifying tapering principles and monitoring requirements can directly improve patient safety. Beyond pharmacology, dependency is a values-laden clinical reality, often shaped by uncertainty and distrust; an ethically grounded framework can help clinicians respect autonomy without abandoning responsibility or using coercion. The review also addresses clinician moral distress by offering a defensible, consistent pathway for assessment, negotiation, tapering plans, referral triggers, and risk management. System-level benefits include reduced avoidable admissions, repeated investigations, and long-term costs, advancing justice in resource use. Finally, by explicitly considering infection risk and third-party vulnerability, the review frames steroid dependency within broader public health duties and can inform protocols, education tools, and training, especially in resource-limited settings.

Clinical Meaning and Ethical Framing of Steroid Dependency

Clinically, "steroid dependency" usually refers to a pattern of ongoing systemic glucocorticoid exposure, most often oral/IV prednisolone/prednisone, methylprednisolone, dexamethasone, or hydrocortisone, where attempts to taper provoke deterioration (real or perceived) and repeated "rescue" courses become the norm. While high-dose inhaled steroids (rarely) and potent topical steroids (occasionally, with extensive use) can add systemic burden, dependency dilemmas typically center on systemic prescribing. Exposure may be iatrogenic or non-prescribed, including over-the-counter or informal-market steroids, or fragmented care through multiple prescribers.

Mechanistically, dependency is driven by HPA-axis suppression (risk increases with higher doses, longer duration, evening dosing, repeated bursts, and long-acting agents) and by confusion between symptom rebound and true inflammatory flare: withdrawal symptoms (fatigue, myalgias, low mood) can mimic relapse, reinforcing restarting [8]. A reinforcement loop often follows: rapid benefit → fear of losing function → escalating dosing → cumulative harm.

Ethically, these decisions are preference-sensitive (pain relief vs infection, function now vs bone health later, symptom relief vs diabetes worsening). The four-principles framework (autonomy, beneficence, non-maleficence, justice) highlights common tensions: autonomy supports choices among medically reasonable options and refusal of treatment, but does not compel unsafe prescribing. "Soft" paternalism may be justified when capacity is impaired or fluctuating (e.g., steroid psychiatric effects), whereas "hard" paternalism, overriding a capacitated refusal, rarely meets ethical or legal thresholds [9].

Capacity and the Ethical Tension in Ongoing Steroid Use

Respecting autonomy means confirming that a patient's decision about continued steroid use is informed, voluntary, and made with adequate capacity. Capacity is decision-specific: a patient may grasp that "steroids are risky" yet be unable to weigh consequences if steroid-induced hypomania/mania (grandiosity, impulsivity), severe anxiety or panic about symptom recurrence, or cognitive impairment from hypoglycemia, infection, or hypoxia is present [10]. Capacity can also be undermined by health-literacy gaps or misinformation (e.g., believing "steroids are vitamins"). A rapid bedside capacity check asks whether the patient can explain their condition and the role of steroids, describe major benefits and risks in their own words, compare alternatives (steroid-sparing therapy, tapering plans), state a consistent preference with reasons, and whether coercion, desperation, or impaired reality testing is evident. If capacity is compromised, clinicians can ethically tighten prescribing boundaries while treating reversible causes and involving surrogates when appropriate. This frames the core ethical dilemma: immediate relief versus later harm [11]. Patients often prioritize functioning (work, parenting), symptom control (pain, breathlessness, fatigue), avoiding admissions and costs, prior failures with alternatives, and uncertainty ("steroids are the only thing that works"). Clinicians resist because cumulative harms can be irreversible osteoporosis/fractures, cataracts, diabetes, hypertension, infections (including TB in endemic settings), adrenal suppression, skin fragility, myopathy, and psychiatric toxicity, while steroids may mask progression or infection, deviate from guidelines, increase medicolegal risk, and cause moral distress. The ethical aim is shared: convert both perspectives into a joint, harm-minimizing plan [12].

Communication-First Ethics and a Practical "5A" Workflow for Steroid Dependency Conflicts

Steroid dependency conflicts are often communication failures disguised as ethical disputes. Instead of leading with "You shouldn't," clinicians can run a risk-and-values conversation: elicit the patient's goals ("What matters most if we change the steroid?"), name the trade-offs (short-term symptom control vs infection/diabetes/bone risks), quantify when possible (fracture risk, glucose targets, infection red flags), and offer options (taper schedule, bridging therapy, monitoring, and a rescue plan). Agree on clear triggers when to pause the taper and when to seek urgent care, so the plan feels safe and predictable [13]. Avoid moralizing language that escalates shame and secrecy (e.g., "dependent," "abusing," "noncompliant"); use neutral, physiologic framing ("Your body has adapted," "Symptoms rebound when we reduce," "Let's keep you safe"). Shared decision-making means shared deliberation, not automatic approval: clinicians can set boundaries while staying collaborative ("I can't safely prescribe that dose long-term, but I can work with you on safer options"). Operationalize this ethically with a "5A" workflow: Ascertain indication/benefit, Appraise dependency drivers (physiologic, disease, psychosocial), Assess patient-specific risks (infection, bone, metabolic, psychiatric, adrenal crisis), Align on goals/options/boundaries (one prescriber/pharmacy, no early refills, harm reduction), and Account through documentation and close follow-up with multidisciplinary support [14].

Tapering and Harm Reduction as Ethical Tools

Tapering should be framed as risk mitigation not punishment, by explaining it as helping the adrenal system recover, reducing infection and bone risks, and identifying the lowest dose that still achieves the patient's goals. Ethical "bridge" strategies preserve both autonomy and safety: depending on the indication, introduce or optimize steroid-sparing options (e.g., DMARDs/biologics, optimized inhaled regimens, topical/local alternatives), address modifiable triggers (smoking cessation, allergen control, physiotherapy, weight management), and provide supportive symptom measures (pain control, sleep support, GI protection when indicated) [15]. A written rescue or "flare plan" can prevent panic-driven dose escalation and reduce conflict by clarifying what counts as flare versus withdrawal, when to pause the taper, when urgent care is needed, and the maximum rescue dose/duration before clinician review—supporting self-management while enforcing safety limits. When patients refuse to taper, clinicians should reconfirm understanding, explore reasons and alternatives, and negotiate harm-reducing compromises (lowest effective dose, time-limited trial, closer follow-up, bone protection, vaccines, glucose monitoring where relevant) [16]. If risk is extreme, declining unsafe prescribing is ethically permissible if care pathways and alternatives continue. If capacity is impaired, treat reversible causes, involve supports as appropriate, consider temporary prescribing limits with urgent review, and seek ethics input. If clandestine steroid acquisition is suspected, avoid punitive approaches; encourage disclosure, screen for complications/adrenal suppression, consolidate prescribing and monitoring, and address access barriers driving informal sourcing.

Justice, Special Populations, and Ethical Safeguards in Steroid Dependency

Steroid dependency ethics shift sharply in low-resource settings where specialist access is limited, steroid-sparing agents are unavailable or unaffordable, monitoring tools (e.g., DEXA, cortisol testing) are constrained, and patients may prioritize immediate function to protect livelihood. A justice-oriented approach therefore emphasizes what is feasible and high-impact: simplified taper protocols workable in primary care, prioritization of high-yield monitoring (BP, glucose, infection screening), patient education in local languages, community pharmacy engagement to reduce unregulated steroid supply, and advocacy for access to essential medicines, including steroid-sparing options when indicated [17]. High-stakes scenarios require additional safeguards. In pregnancy, clinicians must balance maternal disease control (sometimes steroid-requiring) against fetal and maternal risks, using explicit shared decision-making with obstetric collaboration. In adolescents, autonomy is evolving; involve guardians appropriately while addressing body image concerns, performance pressures, and misinformation. In patients with serious mental illness, steroid-induced psychiatric effects can destabilize favor the lowest effective potency and shortest duration, with pre-emptive monitoring and mental health co-management [18]. Perioperative or acute illness periods elevate adrenal crisis risk, creating a duty to provide clear stress-dose instructions and emergency planning. Clinicians may experience "double-bind" moral distress; protective practices include team-based protocols, consistent clinic policy, peer review/support, and documentation that reflects shared deliberation. Finally, "ethical red flags" (e.g., escalating dose requests without objective activity, early refills/multiple prescribers, severe psychiatric symptoms, recurrent infections/uncontrolled diabetes, refusal of monitoring, or unregulated sourcing) do not prove wrongdoing but warrant structured, safer prescribing and capacity assessment.

Practice Recommendations and Future Directions for Long-Term Steroid Use

At the bedside (micro-ethics), clinicians should normalize dependency mechanisms to reduce shame, use shared decision-making with clear boundaries, and provide a written taper plan plus a rescue plan for symptom flares. Harm prevention should be routine: monitor and mitigate adverse effects affecting bone health, glycemic control, infection risk, and mental health, and reassess decision-making capacity whenever mood or cognition changes. At the clinic/system level (macro-ethics), services should implement deprescribing pathways and taper templates, supported by multidisciplinary "steroid stewardship" programs analogous to antimicrobial stewardship. One-prescriber policies for long-term systemic steroids can improve continuity and reduce duplicative or unsafe prescribing [19]. Patient-facing supports, education leaflets and clear guidance on emergency steroid cards should be standard, alongside audits of long-term steroid prescribing and associated complications to drive quality improvement. Future directions include developing biomarkers that better distinguish inflammatory flare from withdrawal, conducting pragmatic taper trials across diseases and care settings, and advancing implementation science to embed stewardship in primary care. Digital tools for adherence and symptom tracking may support autonomy while maintaining safety. Finally, policy should curb unregulated steroid access while improving availability of safer alternatives and structured care pathways.

CONCLUSION

Long-term systemic steroid use sits at the intersection of clinical necessity and ethical responsibility. At the bedside, reducing stigma around dependence, setting clear shared decisions, and providing written taper and rescue plans help patients remain informed, safe, and engaged throughout dose reduction. Routine prevention and surveillance of harms skeletal, metabolic, infectious, and psychological should be treated as core care, with reassessment of capacity when cognition or mood shifts. At the system level, structured deprescribing pathways, taper templates, and multidisciplinary steroid stewardship can standardize best practice, reduce variation, and strengthen accountability through one-prescriber policies. Patient education resources and emergency steroid card guidance further improve preparedness and continuity, while auditing prescribing and complications closes the quality-improvement loop. Moving forward, better biomarkers, pragmatic taper trials, and implementation science are needed to separate flare from withdrawal and translate evidence into real-world care. Digital tracking tools and smarter policy can reinforce autonomy, curb unregulated access, and expand safer therapeutic alternatives.

REFERENCES

1. Hodgens, A., Sharman, T.: Corticosteroids. In: StatPearls. StatPearls Publishing, Treasure Island (FL) (2025)
2. Poster Abstracts. J. Parenter. Enter. Nutr. 47, S71–S246 (2023). https://doi.org/10.1002/jpen.2491
3. Tavares, L.C.P., Caetano, L. de V.N., Ianhez, M.: Side effects of chronic systemic glucocorticoid therapy: what dermatologists should know. An. Bras. Dermatol. 99, 259–268 (2024). https://doi.org/10.1016/j.abd.2023.05.005
4. Pharmacotherapy Handbook, 11th Edition, https://studylib.net/doc/26238683/pharmacotherapy-handbook-11th-edition
5. Gavin T, Madeline S, Andrea L H, Jessica A W, Jessica K, Max A, et al (2021). Shotgun sequencing of the faecal microbiome to predict response to steroids in patients with lower gastrointestinal acute graft-versus-host disease: An exploratory analysis.*British journal of haematology, 192, 3*. Dio 10.1111/bjh.17238

6.Blackwell, J., Selinger, C., Raine, T., Parkes, G., Smith, M.A., Pollok, R.: Steroid use and misuse: a key performance indicator in the management of IBD. Frontline Gastroenterol. 12, 207–213 (2020). https://doi.org/10.1136/flgastro-2019-101288

7.Mukherjee, S.S., Chaudhury, S., Kumari, A.: Steroid dependence and withdrawal syndrome. Ind. Psychiatry J. 34, 559–560 (2025). https://doi.org/10.4103/ipj.ipj_290_24

8.Margaret L M, Shernan G H, Armin R, Todd E D, Claudio G B, John E W, et al (2018). Validation of minnesota acute GVHD risk score and identification of new factors associated with initial response to steroids: not all GVHD is created equal. Blood, 132, 67, https://doi.org/10.1182/blood-2018-99-113085

9.Cheraghi, R., Valizadeh, L., Zamanzadeh, V., Hassankhani, H., Jafarzadeh, A.: Clarification of ethical principle of the beneficence in nursing care: an integrative review. BMC Nurs. 22, 89 (2023). https://doi.org/10.1186/s12912-023-01246-4

10. Ajluni, V.: Respecting autonomy: Prioritizing patient-centered care and decision-making capacity for stronger doctor–patient relationships. J. Fam. Med. Prim. Care. 12, 1752–1753 (2023). https://doi.org/10.4103/jfmpc.jfmpc_712_23

11. Celalettin U, Jacqueline B, Debra A M, Eris T, Marisa M, Armin R, et al (2020). Necessity for treatment of steroid-refractory severe GIT GVHD: patience of providers. *Bone marrow transplantation*, *55*, *(4)*, *833-835*.

12. Davenport, C., Ouellet, J., Tinetti, M.E.: Use of the Patient-Identified Top Health Priority in Care Decision-making for Older Adults With Multiple Chronic Conditions. JAMA Netw. Open. 4, e2131496 (2021). https://doi.org/10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2021.31496

13. Howick, J., Bennett-Weston, A., Solomon, J., Nockels, K., Bostock, J., Keshtkar, L.: How does communication affect patient safety? Protocol for a systematic review and logic model. BMJ Open. 14, e085312 (2024). https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjopen-2024-085312

14. Shernan G H, Ashraf S, Armin R, Brian C B, Margaret L M, Celalettin U, et al (2019). RNA Sequencing of Intestinal Biopsies Expands the T Cell-Centric Paradigm of Steroid-Refractory Acute Graft-Versus-Host Disease. *Biology of Blood and Marrow Transplantation*, *25*, *(3)*, *S295*.

15. Posters in Viewing Sessions. Eur. J. Pain. 29, e70133 (2025). https://doi.org/10.1002/ejp.70133

16. Margaret L M, Shernan G H, Armin R, Todd E D, Bruce B, Daniel J W (2017). Pediatric Acute GVHD Grade, Risk Prediction and Response to Upfront Steroids in 370 Children Treated at the University of Minnesota. *Blood*, *130*, *4486*. https://doi.org/10.1182/blood.V130.Suppl_1.4486.4486

17. Tsige, A.W., Simegn, K., Beyene, D.A., Ayenew, K.D., Wondmkun, Y.T., Endalifer, B.L., et al.: Assessment of systemic steroid use and its determinants among admitted patients at Debre Berhan University Hakim Gizawu Teaching Hospital. Sci. Rep. 14, 30804 (2024). https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-024-81425-8

18. Hamid A.A, Kaushal T., Ashraf R., Singh A, Gupta A. C, Prakash O. M, et al (2017). (22β, 25R)-3β-Hydroxy-spirost-5-en-7-iminoxy-heptanoic acid exhibits anti-prostate cancer activity through caspase pathway. *Steroids 119*, *43-52*. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.steroids.2017.01.001

19. Dolezal, L., Gibson, M.: Beyond a trauma-informed approach and towards shame-sensitive practice. Humanit. Soc. Sci. Commun. 9, 214 (2022). https://doi.org/10.1057/s41599-022-01227-z

CITE AS: Taliikwa Nicholas Ceaser. (2026). Balancing Patient Autonomy and Medical Responsibility in Steroid Dependency Management: Ethical Dilemmas, Clinical Realities, and Practical Pathways. IDOSR JOURNAL OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY 12(2):68-72, 2026. https://doi.org/10.59298/IDOSR/JST/26/122.6872