

The Timing of Medicine Is Part of Its Pharmacology

ABSURD HEALTH INSTITUTE | 15 OCTOBER 2026 | III. Beyond targets and state-based pharmacology

Abstract

This concept paper examines the timing of medicine is part of its pharmacology. It develops an argument drawn from Beyond Targets, identifies the relevant biological or clinical mechanisms, and considers where that argument may fail. This is a narrative perspective, not a systematic review or an original clinical study.

The central problem

Dose and chemical identity are important, but medication timing can also affect exposure, response and toxicity. Biological clocks regulate aspects of absorption, metabolism, receptor availability and the natural pattern of disease. The hypothesis worth exploring is that a meaningful subset of drug regimens could improve when matched to measured biological timing, while acknowledging that chronotherapy is already a developed field with drug-specific evidence.

Mechanisms and causal architecture

Blood pressure follows diurnal patterns; steroid physiology differs across the day; sleep-promoting agents interact with circadian phase; chemotherapy and immunological responses may show timing dependence. None of these observations justifies relocating every medication to a supposedly optimal hour. Timing can interact with adherence, meal composition, interactions, kidney function and sleep. Especially for drugs with long half-lives, pharmacodynamic timing may be less important than maintaining stable exposure and regular adherence.

A discriminating example

Imagine comparing identical treatment doses given at different circadian phases. The result would depend on the disease, drug half-life, pharmacodynamic endpoint and adherence. Circadian variation is not a reason to improvise a new schedule for essential medications. It is a reason to ask whether evidence shows a clinically important timing effect in this specific setting.

Competing explanations and limitations

Claims based solely on animal circadian patterns may fail in humans. Night-shift work, chronotype, age, disease state and medication formulations alter timing relationships. Adherence may decline under overly intricate schedules, eliminating a theoretical advantage. A timing intervention that changes a surrogate marker but not meaningful outcomes needs careful interpretation.

What evidence would change the interpretation?

One should compare otherwise equivalent dose regimens at prespecified times, measure pharmacokinetics or clinical endpoints, and report harms. Positive results must be evaluated for external validity and consistency with existing standards, rather than generalized across unrelated drugs.

Implications for medical interpretation

The clinical message is modest but important: ask whether dosing time is an evidence-supported component of treatment. Do not change essential medications solely because of a general circadian theory.

Selected scientific reading

Scheer et al. (2009), Adverse metabolic and cardiovascular consequences of circadian misalignment, PNAS.
<https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.0808180106>

Drucker (2018), Mechanisms of action and therapeutic application of GLP-1, Cell Metabolism.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cmet.2018.03.001>

Original source: Beyond Targets. All source books supplied by the author.

Conceptual research commentary. Not a peer-reviewed clinical study, original trial, systematic review, validated diagnostic instrument or treatment protocol. Consult qualified care for medical decisions.