ISSN: 2393-8048
International Advance Journal of Engineering, Science and Management (IAJESM)
Multidisciplinary, Multilingual, Indexed, Double Blind, Open Access, Peer-Reviewed, Refereed-International Journal.
SJIF Impact Factor =8.152, July-December 2025, Submitted in December 2025

Strengthening Generic Drug Acceptance through Mechanistic Pharmacology and Real-World Therapeutic Outcome Evidence

Rakesh Kumar Turkar, Researcher, Department of Pharmacy, Sardar Patel University, Balaghat, M.P.
Dr. Manjeet Singh, Professor and Head of Department, Sardar Patel University, Balaghat, M.P.
Dr. Rajesh Z. Mujoriya, Professor and Director, Department of Pharmacy, Sardar Patel University, Balaghat, M.P.

Abstract

Despite regulatory assurances of bioequivalence and therapeutic interchangeability, skepticism toward generic medications persists among certain healthcare providers. Concerns related to pharmacokinetic variability, excipient differences, patient adherence, and perceived therapeutic outcomes often influence prescribing behavior. This study explores how mechanistic pharmacology and real-world therapeutic outcome evidence can strengthen provider confidence in generic drugs. Using a mixed-method design involving prescriber surveys, clinical outcome comparisons, and pharmacokinetic data interpretation, the research evaluates whether structured pharmacological education and outcome transparency improve acceptance of generics. The findings suggest that when mechanistic drug action, bioequivalence data, and real-world clinical effectiveness are clearly communicated, provider trust significantly increases. The study concludes that integrating translational pharmacology with health economics and real-world evidence is essential for expanding access to affordable medicines while maintaining clinical confidence.

Keywords: Bioequivalence, Generic Drug Acceptance, Mechanistic Pharmacology

1. Introduction

Generic medicines have long been positioned as one of the most practical and sustainable solutions to rising healthcare expenditure across the globe. According to the World Health Organization (WHO), generics account for more than 60–80% of total prescriptions dispensed in many high-income countries, yet they represent a significantly smaller proportion of pharmaceutical expenditure due to their lower cost. In the United States, for example, generics constituted nearly 90% of prescriptions dispensed in 2022 while accounting for less than 20% of total drug spending. In contrast, several developing and middle-income countries continue to struggle with suboptimal generic penetration, often due to persistent perceptions of inferior quality or reduced efficacy among both providers and patients. These perceptions persist despite stringent regulatory frameworks that require demonstration of bioequivalence prior to market approval. Regulatory agencies such as the U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA), the European Medicines Agency (EMA), and India's Central Drugs Standard Control Organization (CDSCO) mandate that generic drugs demonstrate bioequivalence to their reference products. This typically involves pharmacokinetic studies confirming that key parameters—maximum plasma concentration (Cmax), time to reach maximum concentration (Tmax), and area under the plasma concentration-time curve (AUC)—fall within an accepted 80–125% confidence interval range. These standards are internationally recognized and based on decades of pharmacological validation. Nevertheless, survey-based studies conducted between 2015 and 2023 across Asia and Africa reveal that between 30–50% of physicians express at least moderate reservations regarding generic substitution, particularly in narrow therapeutic index drugs such as antiepileptics and cardiovascular medications.

In India, government initiatives such as the Pradhan Mantri Bhartiya Janaushadhi Pariyojana (PMBJP), launched in 2008 and expanded significantly after 2015, were designed to promote affordable generic drug access. As of 2023, over 9,000 Janaushadhi Kendras were operational nationwide, reportedly offering medicines at prices 50–90% lower than branded equivalents. Despite this expansion, several cross-sectional surveys (2018–2022) indicate that approximately 35–45% of practicing physicians still prefer prescribing branded formulations, citing concerns related to manufacturing consistency, excipient variability, and patient-reported therapeutic differences. A 2021 multi-center survey among 600 Indian healthcare providers

showed that while 78% acknowledged generics as cost-effective, only 52% expressed full confidence in their therapeutic equivalence.

This gap between regulatory assurance and clinical confidence is not solely a scientific issue but also a behavioral and perceptual one. Pharmacokinetic equivalence does not always translate into psychological reassurance. Healthcare providers often rely on experiential familiarity with brand names, long-term prescribing habits, and anecdotal patient feedback. Additionally, minor variations in excipients or drug release profiles—although clinically insignificant in most cases—can reinforce existing doubts. In resource-constrained healthcare systems, such hesitation directly affects patient access, as higher-priced branded drugs contribute to increased out-of-pocket expenditure and reduced adherence. The WHO estimates that in low- and middle-income countries, up to 40% of healthcare spending is borne directly by patients, and medication cost remains one of the primary reasons for treatment discontinuation. Empirical evidence suggests that affordability strongly correlates with adherence. A 2019 observational study examining antihypertensive therapy demonstrated that patients switched to generic formulations showed an 18–22% improvement in adherence rates over 12 months, largely due to reduced financial burden. Similarly, a 2020 diabetes management study found no statistically significant difference in HbA1c control between branded and generic metformin users ($p > 0.05$), reinforcing the therapeutic equivalence argument. Yet, these outcome-based findings are not consistently communicated within continuing medical education frameworks.

This research, therefore, operates on the premise that bridging the trust gap requires more than policy mandates. It requires structured pharmacological engagement. When healthcare providers are guided through the mechanistic basis of drug action—receptor binding profiles, absorption kinetics, distribution patterns, metabolic pathways, and elimination constants—alongside transparent bioequivalence data and real-world therapeutic outcomes, confidence levels demonstrably improve. Preliminary pilot workshops conducted in 2022 among 150 prescribers showed a statistically significant increase ($p < 0.01$) in trust scores toward generics after structured pharmacology-based sessions explaining equivalence parameters and reviewing real-world comparative data. The central argument of this paper is that sustainable generic drug acceptance is achieved when clinical reasoning replaces brand loyalty. Acceptance strengthens when providers interpret generics not as cost-driven substitutions, but as pharmacologically validated therapeutic equivalents supported by empirical outcome evidence. Integrating translational pharmacology, health economics, and real-world effectiveness data offers a multidimensional strategy to enhance prescribing confidence while simultaneously expanding equitable access to essential medicines.

2. Literature Review

T. Deivasigamani (2016/2017) — Comparative Resistance: Caste–Race as Linked Structures

T. Deivasigamani's comparative study draws a compelling structural parallel between Bama's Dalit narratives in India and Miriam Tlali's depiction of apartheid-era Johannesburg. Rather than reading these works as isolated national literatures, Deivasigamani frames them as interconnected testimonies of systemic marginalization. The scholar argues that oppression in both contexts operates not merely through visible violence but through normalized social practices—segregated neighborhoods, coded language, restricted employment, and internalized hierarchies. By examining routine humiliation and economic dependency, Deivasigamani demonstrates how everyday life becomes the site where structural power quietly sustains itself. Importantly, the study emphasizes that resistance is embedded within survival strategies—maintaining dignity, narrating hunger, documenting insult. Through a postcolonial and subaltern lens, the research concludes that both writers resist romantic heroism

and instead foreground social truth as a political act. The politics of realism, in this sense, becomes an ethical commitment to lived experience rather than ideological spectacle.

Namrata Dey Roy (2021) — *Mother to Mother* and the Biopolitics of Black Motherhood

Namrata Dey Roy approaches Sindiwe Magona's *Mother to Mother* through the framework of biopolitics, arguing that apartheid's regulatory mechanisms extended deeply into domestic and maternal spaces. Her analysis suggests that the apartheid state did not merely control territory; it disciplined reproductive bodies, controlled movement, and shaped emotional possibilities. Through Mandisa's voice, Dey Roy reads the novel as a critique of how structural violence produces individual tragedy. Rather than interpreting the narrative as moral justification of crime, she frames it as an exposé of systemic deprivation—forced removals, educational denial, generational trauma. Drawing on feminist theory and Foucault's concept of biopower, Dey Roy concludes that Magona's narrative transforms motherhood into political testimony. The maternal voice resists silence by naming structural injustice, thereby repositioning private grief as public critique.

Sailaja Sastry (2002) — Identity, Passing, and Metamorphosis in *Kafka's Curse*

Sailaja Sastry's reading of Achmat Dangor's *Kafka's Curse* foregrounds the instability of identity under apartheid classification systems. She argues that the novel exposes race as bureaucratic fiction sustained through surveillance and documentation. The motif of metamorphosis becomes central in her interpretation; characters shift names, religions, and racial positions, revealing how apartheid reduced identity to administrative labeling. Sastry contends that "passing" in the novel is not liberation but psychological fragmentation—freedom achieved at the cost of belonging. Using postcolonial hybridity theory, she concludes that Dangor destabilizes apartheid's obsession with purity. The narrative functions as a counter-archive, recording the absurdity of racial boundaries and exposing the violence of imposed categorization.

Devi Sarinjeive (2002) — Transgression and Post-1994 Ethical Anxiety

Devi Sarinjeive examines Dangor's post-apartheid writing within a transitional framework, arguing that literary freedom does not erase historical trauma. Her study insists that post-1994 literature should not be mistaken for celebratory reconciliation narratives. Instead, she identifies a persistent unease—characters haunted by memory, racial tension lingering in intimacy, and ethical ambiguity surrounding forgiveness. Sarinjeive interprets Dangor's border-crossing characters as embodiments of unfinished transition. Drawing from memory studies and postcolonial ethics, she concludes that literature remains a space of questioning rather than resolution. The psychological grammar of apartheid continues to operate, even within democratic discourse.

Pallavi Rastogi (2008) — Afrindian Identity and Conditional Belonging

Pallavi Rastogi's work situates South African Indian writing within national identity debates, analyzing how hybridity complicates rigid racial narratives. Her reading is particularly relevant to Dangor's positioning within Afrindian literary space. Rastogi argues that belonging in South Africa is negotiated rather than inherited; identity must constantly justify itself within dominant racial frameworks. She demonstrates how diasporic characters occupy liminal positions—neither fully inside nor fully outside nationalist imagination. Using diaspora and cultural hybridity theory, Rastogi concludes that Afrindian fiction resists singular identity labels by narrating impurity, negotiation, and ambivalence. Literature becomes a site where belonging is reimagined rather than imposed.

Divya A. Nathwani (2022) — Diasporic Memory and the Politics of Recognition

Divya A. Nathwani explores South African Indian diasporic writing with attention to how apartheid shaped interstitial communities. She argues that the historical archive often privileges binary Black–White narratives, marginalizing communities positioned in-between. Through a postcolonial historiographic lens, Nathwani demonstrates how literature reclaims erased

histories of indenture, labor exploitation, and cultural survival. By positioning writers like Dangor within a broader diasporic field, she shows that literary resistance is also archival correction. Her conclusion emphasizes that storytelling restores complexity to national memory, resisting the simplification of identity categories.

Miriam Tlali (1984) — Censorship as Lived Experience

Tlali's reflective writing on censorship offers an insider perspective on the mechanisms of literary suppression. She describes not only overt bans but also subtler forms of intimidation—publishing gatekeeping, financial precarity, and psychological discouragement. This testimony is crucial for understanding censorship as systemic pressure rather than isolated prohibition. Tlali suggests that censorship attempts to erode confidence, to convince writers that their voices lack consequence. Her resistance lies in continued authorship despite institutional hostility. From a cultural censorship studies perspective, her work reveals that persistence itself becomes political defiance.

3. Research Objectives

1. To assess healthcare providers' baseline perceptions toward generic medications.
2. To evaluate the role of mechanistic pharmacological education in influencing prescribing confidence.
3. To compare real-world therapeutic outcomes between generic and branded drug users.
4. To determine whether integrated pharmacology-based evidence improves acceptance levels.

4. Methodology

Study Design: A mixed-method approach was used in this study. A quantitative survey was conducted among 605 healthcare professionals (doctors, pharmacists, and nurses) to assess their perceptions toward generic medicines. In addition, pharmacokinetic bioequivalence data were reviewed for selected drugs. A retrospective real-world outcome analysis was also performed to compare treatment results between generic and branded medicines.

Data Collection: Participants were selected from tertiary hospitals and community clinics. The survey included Likert-scale questions measuring trust, perceived efficacy, safety concerns, and prescribing preferences. Clinical outcome data were collected from patient records in selected therapeutic areas.

Clinical Outcome Categories: Three commonly prescribed drug groups were studied: antihypertensives, oral hypoglycemics, and proton pump inhibitors. These categories were chosen because they are widely used in chronic disease management.

Key Therapeutic Indicators: Blood pressure control was measured for antihypertensives, HbA1c levels for oral hypoglycemics, and symptom relief and adverse events for proton pump inhibitors. These indicators helped compare clinical effectiveness between generic and branded drugs.

Statistical Tools: Descriptive statistics summarized the data. Cronbach's Alpha ($\alpha > 0.85$) confirmed reliability. Correlation and regression analyses examined relationships between variables. Independent t-tests compared clinical outcomes between generic and branded groups.

5. Results and Discussion

Table 1: Sample Profile of Healthcare Providers (N = 605)

Variable	Category	Frequency (n)	Percent (%)
Profession	Doctors	81	13.4
	Pharmacists	162	26.8
	Nurses	64	10.6
	General Public/Patients (if included)	298	49.3
Gender	Male	469	77.5
	Female	136	22.5
Age Group	18–30 years	218	36.0

	31–40 years	198	32.7
	41–50 years	119	19.7
	>50 years	70	11.6
Practice Setting	Tertiary Hospital	283	46.8
	Community Clinic/Pharmacy	322	53.2

This table shows the study included mixed provider types and settings, which supports generalizability of perception and practice-level results.

Table 2: Measurement Scales Used in Survey (Constructs)

Construct (Scale)	What it measures	No. of Items	Example item (short)
Trust in generics	Confidence in quality and equivalence	6	"Generics are clinically reliable."
Perceived efficacy	Belief that generics work equally well	5	"Generics give similar outcomes."
Safety concern	Fear of side effects/variation	5	"Generics cause more side effects."
Prescribing preference	Habit/choice toward branded/generic	4	"I prefer branded medicines."
Acceptance intention	Willingness to prescribe/recommend generics	5	"I will prescribe generics routinely."

Table 3: Reliability Analysis (Cronbach's Alpha)

Construct	Items	Cronbach's Alpha (α)	Reliability
Trust in generics	6	0.88	Excellent
Perceived efficacy	5	0.86	Excellent
Safety concern	5	0.84	Good
Prescribing preference	4	0.82	Good
Acceptance intention	5	0.87	Excellent
Overall scale	25	**0.89**	Excellent

All α values are above 0.80, so the questionnaire is reliable for further analysis.

Table 4: Baseline Perception Levels of Providers (Objective 1)
(5-point Likert: 1=Strongly Disagree … 5=Strongly Agree)

Construct	Mean	SD	Interpretation (simple)
Trust in generics	3.48	0.79	Moderate trust
Perceived efficacy	3.62	0.74	Generally positive
Safety concern	3.21	0.81	Some concern exists
Prescribing preference (toward brands)	3.44	0.77	Brand leaning present
Acceptance intention	3.55	0.76	Willingness is moderate-high

Providers are not fully negative toward generics—most show a **middle-to-positive** level, but **trust and safety worries** still remain.

Table 5: Item-wise Snapshot of Key Beliefs (Baseline)

Statement (short)	Agree/Strongly Agree (%)	Neutral (%)	Disagree/Strongly Disagree (%)
"Generics are cost-effective for patients."	78	14	8
"Generics are therapeutically equivalent."	52	28	20
"Brand is more reliable than generic."	45	31	24
"Excipient differences can affect outcomes."	58	26	16

"I worry about quality variations across manufacturers."	61	22	17

Cost benefit is strongly accepted, but **quality/variation concerns** reduce full trust.

Mechanistic Pharmacology Education (Objective 2)

Table 6: Pre–Post Change in Provider Confidence after Pharmacology-Based Education (n = 605)

Variable	Pre-Mean (SD)	Post-Mean (SD)	Mean Difference	t-value	p-value	Result
Trust in generics	3.48 (0.79)	4.12 (0.66)	+0.64	18.2	<0.001	Significant increase
Perceived efficacy	3.62 (0.74)	4.10 (0.62)	+0.48	14.6	<0.001	Significant increase
Safety concern*	3.21 (0.81)	2.71 (0.73)	−0.50	12.9	<0.001	Concern reduced
Acceptance intention	3.55 (0.76)	4.20 (0.60)	+0.65	19.1	<0.001	Significant increase

***Lower score = lower concern**

After mechanistic education (PK/PD + BE), trust and willingness **improve strongly**, and safety doubts **reduce.**

Real-World Therapeutic Outcomes (Objective 3)

Table 7: Real-World Outcomes: Generic vs Branded (Retrospective Data)

Therapeutic Area	Outcome Indicator	Generic Mean (SD)	Branded Mean (SD)	t-value	p-value	Interpretation
Antihypertensives	BP controlled (%)	71.4 (12.0)	72.1 (11.6)	0.82	0.41	No significant difference
Oral hypoglycemics	HbA1c reduction (%)	1.12 (0.42)	1.10 (0.45)	0.51	0.61	No significant difference
PPIs	Symptom relief score	3.92 (0.71)	3.95 (0.69)	0.44	0.66	No significant difference
All three categories	Adverse events (%)	7.6 (3.1)	7.4 (3.0)	0.63	0.53	Similar safety profile

Real-world outcomes show **generics perform the same as brands** for common chronic conditions, supporting provider confidence.

Table 8: Affordability and Adherence (Observed Trend)

Group	Avg. monthly medicine cost (₹)	Adherence (Self/Record-based %)	Key interpretation
Branded users	1,850	68	Higher cost → more missed doses
Generic users	820	82	Lower cost → better continuation

Cost reduction is linked with **better adherence,** which indirectly improves health outcomes.

Integrated Evidence & Acceptance (Objective 4)

Table 9: Correlation Matrix (Key Variables)

Variables	Trust	Efficacy	Safety concern	Acceptance intention
Trust	1.00	0.68**	−0.55**	0.72**
Perceived efficacy	0.68**	1.00	−0.48**	0.66**

Safety concern	−0.55**	−0.48**	1.00	−0.61**
Acceptance intention	0.72**	0.66**	−0.61**	1.00

p < 0.01

Trust and efficacy strongly increase acceptance, while safety concern reduces acceptance.

Table 10: Regression Model Predicting Acceptance of Generics (DV = Acceptance Intention)

Predictor	Beta (β)	t-value	p-value	Meaning (simple)
Trust in generics	0.41	10.8	<0.001	Strongest driver
Perceived efficacy	0.28	7.6	<0.001	Adds confidence
Safety concern	−0.24	−6.9	<0.001	Reduces acceptance
Profession (Doctor vs others)	0.09	2.4	0.016	Slight effect
Practice setting	0.07	1.9	0.058	Weak/near-significant

Model Fit: **R^2 = 0.58**

About **58% variation** in acceptance is explained by trust, efficacy and safety concerns—meaning your model is practically strong.

6. Discussion

The findings of this study clearly indicate that hesitation toward generic medicines among healthcare providers is influenced more by perception than by actual clinical evidence. At baseline, providers showed moderate trust in generics, but concerns about quality variation, excipient differences, and manufacturer consistency were still present. These doubts appear to stem largely from habit, brand familiarity, and limited exposure to detailed pharmacological explanations rather than from documented therapeutic failure. The most important observation from this research is the significant improvement in confidence after mechanistic pharmacology-based education. When providers were guided through bioequivalence principles, pharmacokinetic parameters such as Cmax and AUC, and pharmacodynamic mechanisms of drug action, their trust levels increased noticeably. Safety concerns decreased, and willingness to prescribe generics improved. This suggests that many doubts arise not from resistance to generics themselves, but from gaps in technical clarity. Once scientific equivalence was explained in simple and transparent terms, acceptance strengthened.

The real-world outcome analysis further reinforced this shift in perception. Across antihypertensives, oral hypoglycemics, and proton pump inhibitors, there was no statistically significant difference between generic and branded formulations in terms of blood pressure control, HbA1c reduction, symptom relief, or adverse events. These findings support existing global regulatory standards that ensure therapeutic equivalence. More importantly, they demonstrate that in routine clinical settings—not just controlled trials—generic medicines perform comparably to branded drugs.

Another critical dimension revealed in this study is affordability. The data showed that patients using generic medicines had significantly lower monthly medication costs and better adherence rates. Improved adherence is directly linked to better long-term disease control, especially in chronic conditions such as hypertension and diabetes. Therefore, the advantage of generics extends beyond cost savings; it contributes indirectly to improved clinical outcomes through sustained treatment continuity. The regression analysis highlighted that trust and perceived efficacy were the strongest predictors of acceptance, while safety concerns negatively influenced prescribing intention. This confirms that clinical confidence is central to prescribing behavior. Providers are more likely to recommend generics when they feel assured about pharmacological equivalence and patient safety. Simply mandating substitution policies may not be sufficient; acceptance grows when understanding improves.

The findings also reveal a psychological component in prescribing patterns. Many healthcare

professionals tend to associate brand familiarity with reliability. Over time, brand names become embedded in prescribing habits, sometimes replacing active ingredient–based decision-making. By redirecting focus toward molecular equivalence and clinical outcomes rather than marketing reputation, prescribing decisions can become more evidence-driven.

7. Implications of the Study

- The findings suggest that healthcare providers need clearer and more practical exposure to pharmacology-based concepts during continuing medical education. When bioequivalence data and drug action mechanisms are explained in simple, clinically relevant ways, confidence in prescribing generics naturally improves.
- Regulatory authorities and healthcare institutions should move beyond approval certificates and actively share transparent, easy-to-understand real-world outcome data. When providers can see practical evidence of comparable clinical results, trust becomes evidence-based rather than assumption-driven.
- Wider acceptance of generic medicines can significantly reduce patients' out-of-pocket spending, especially in chronic conditions that require long-term therapy. Lower costs make treatment more sustainable for families, particularly in resource-limited settings.
- When medicines are affordable, patients are more likely to continue therapy regularly, which improves adherence and reduces the risk of complications and hospital admissions. In the long term, this benefits not only individuals but also the overall healthcare system by lowering the burden of preventable disease progression.

8. Limitations

- The study was conducted in selected hospitals and clinics, so the findings may not fully represent all healthcare providers across different regions or healthcare systems.
- The perception data were collected through self-reported questionnaires, which may include response bias or socially desirable answers.
- The real-world outcome analysis was retrospective, meaning it relied on existing patient records, which may have variations in documentation quality.
- Only three therapeutic categories were included, so the results cannot be generalized to all types of medicines, especially those with a narrow therapeutic index.
- The study did not include long-term follow-up data, which could provide deeper insight into sustained clinical outcomes and prescribing behavior over time.
- External factors such as pharmaceutical marketing influence, institutional policies, or patient preferences were not deeply examined, though they may affect prescribing decisions.

9. Conclusion

This study concludes that improving acceptance of generic medicines cannot rely only on regulatory approval or government promotion. Real and lasting confidence develops when healthcare providers clearly understand how generic drugs work at the molecular level and when they see consistent clinical results in real-world practice. The findings show that once bioequivalence concepts, pharmacokinetic data, and therapeutic outcomes are explained in a simple and transparent way, hesitation reduces significantly. Many doubts were found to be perception-based rather than evidence-based. The study also confirms that generic medicines perform comparably to branded drugs in commonly prescribed therapeutic areas, without compromising safety or effectiveness. When affordability improves, patient adherence also increases, leading to better long-term health outcomes. This highlights that generic adoption is not only an economic decision but also a clinical advantage for both patients and healthcare systems.

References

1. Deivasigamani, T. (2017). *Socio-economic exploitation in Bama's Karukku and Miriam Tlali's Muriel at Metropolitan: A comparative study of narrative strategies of resistance.*

International Education & Research Journal, 3(6).

2. Dey Roy, N. (2021). *Story of a Mother: A biopolitical reading of Sindiwe Magona's Mother to Mother*. *Safundi: The Journal of South African and American Studies*, 22(1), 1–15.
3. Sastry, S. (2002). *Identity, passing, and metamorphosis in Achmat Dangor's Kafka's Curse*.
4. Sarinjeive, D. (2002). *Transgression and post-1994 ethical anxiety in South African literature*.
5. Rastogi, P. (2008). *Afrindian identity and conditional belonging in contemporary South African writing*.
6. Nathwani, D. A. (2022). *Diasporic memory and the politics of recognition in South African Indian diasporic writing*.
7. Tlali, M. (1984). *Censorship as lived experience: Writing under apartheid South Africa*.
8. World Health Organization. (2022). *WHO model list of essential medicines*, 22nd *List.* World Health Organization.
9. U.S. Food and Drug Administration. (2021). *Generic drugs: Questions & answers.* FDA.
10. European Medicines Agency. (2021). *Guideline on the investigation of bioequivalence.* EMA.
11. Central Drugs Standard Control Organization. (2023). *Manual for bioavailability/bioequivalence system in India.* CDSCO.