

AperTO - Archivio Istituzionale Open Access dell'Università di Torino

Biosimilar vs biological agents in rheumatology: When are biosimilar agents similar enough?

This is the author's manuscript

Original Citation:

Availability:

This version is available <http://hdl.handle.net/2318/1609753> since 2019-11-14T11:33:10Z

Published version:

DOI:10.1016/j.intimp.2015.04.022

Terms of use:

Open Access

Anyone can freely access the full text of works made available as "Open Access". Works made available under a Creative Commons license can be used according to the terms and conditions of said license. Use of all other works requires consent of the right holder (author or publisher) if not exempted from copyright protection by the applicable law.

(Article begins on next page)

This Accepted Author Manuscript (AAM) is copyrighted and published by Elsevier. It is posted here by agreement between Elsevier and the University of Turin. Changes resulting from the publishing process - such as editing, corrections, structural formatting, and other quality control mechanisms - may not be reflected in this version of the text. The definitive version of the text was subsequently published in *INTERNATIONAL IMMUNOPHARMACOLOGY*, 27 (2), 2015, 10.1016/j.intimp.2015.04.022.

You may download, copy and otherwise use the AAM for non-commercial purposes provided that your license is limited by the following restrictions:

- (1) You may use this AAM for non-commercial purposes only under the terms of the CC-BY-NC-ND license.
- (2) The integrity of the work and identification of the author, copyright owner, and publisher must be preserved in any copy.
- (3) You must attribute this AAM in the following format: Creative Commons BY-NC-ND license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/deed.en>), 10.1016/j.intimp.2015.04.022

The publisher's version is available at:

<http://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S1567576915001861>

When citing, please refer to the published version.

Link to this full text:

<http://hdl.handle.net/>

Biosimilar vs biological agents in rheumatology: When are biosimilar agents similar enough?

Lie G¹, Sciascia S², Cuadrado MJ³.

¹Louise Coote Lupus Unit, Guy's and St Thomas' NHS Foundation Trust, United Kingdom.

²Louise Coote Lupus Unit, Guy's and St Thomas' NHS Foundation Trust, United Kingdom; Dipartimento di Malattie Rare, Immunologiche, Ematologiche ed Immunoematologiche, Centro di Ricerche di Immunopatologia e Documentazione su Malattie Rare (CMID), Ospedale Torino Nord Emergenza San G. Bosco ed Università di Torino, Turin, Italy.

³Louise Coote Lupus Unit, Guy's and St Thomas' NHS Foundation Trust, United Kingdom. Electronic address: mjcadrado@yahoo.com.

Abstract

With the introduction of biological agents, over the last two decades treatment prospects in many medical fields including Rheumatology have experienced an exciting revolution. The advent of biological therapy for specifically rheumatic diseases has provided more effective control of both the underlying disease, and sustained amelioration of disease activity, compared to the pre-biological era when only anti-inflammatory and immunosuppressant drugs were available. Although the importance of potential improved clinical outcome cannot be overstated, these efficacious treatments for rheumatic diseases are not without a high cost. Biological agents are expensive and rheumatological diseases are common. The patent and regulatory data protection periods for the first and second waves of biological agents based on recombinant proteins have begun to expire, leaving open the potential for development and regulatory approval of one or more "generic" versions of these biological therapies, termed "biosimilars" or "BSs" in Europe (the term we shall use from henceforth), "subsequent entry biologics" in Canada, or "follow-on-biologics" in US. We aimed to review the critical topics of efficacy, safety and regulatory approach of upcoming biosimilars.

Keywords

Biosimilar; Biological agents

1. Introduction

With the introduction of biological agents, over the last two decades treatment prospects in many medical fields including Rheumatology have experienced an exciting revolution. For example these drugs have led to a completely new approach to the management of patients with inflammatory autoimmune conditions [1]. The advent of biological therapy for specifically rheumatic diseases has provided more effective control of both the underlying disease, and sustained amelioration of disease activity, compared to the pre-biological era when only anti-inflammatory and immunosuppressant drugs were available. Treatment to induce complete remission is now possible.

Although the importance of potential improved clinical outcome cannot be overstated, these efficacious treatments for rheumatic diseases are not without their cost. Biological agents are expensive and rheumatological diseases are common. As such even the wealthiest societies are unable to support the indiscriminate widespread use of biological agents in all patients requiring biologics [2] and [3].

However, the patent and regulatory data protection periods for the first and second waves of biological agents based on recombinant proteins have begun to expire, leaving open the potential for development and regulatory approval of one

or more “generic” versions of these biological therapies, termed “biosimilars” or “BSs” in Europe (the term we shall use from henceforth), “subsequent entry biologics” in Canada, or “follow-on-biologics” in US. The development of biosimilar therapies could lead to a substantial saving for patients and health systems, and therefore increased availability of effective treatment to a wider patient demographic [4].

BSs are similar, but crucially not identical to their reference products, because their chemical characteristics are directly related to the manufacturing process which cannot be faithfully replicated [5]. Thus, despite the hypothetical promise of cheaper drugs compared to the reference biologic that also don't compromise on efficacy, these agents have provoked major concerns concerning their short and long term safety—something that must be addressed by regulatory agencies before BSs may be approved. Biosimilars of etanercept and rituximab have already been approved in countries such as India, China and South Korea [5]; their possible emergence in European and US markets is currently a matter of discussion by the European Medicines Agency (EMA) and Food and Drug Administration (FDA) respectively [4].

1.1. Definition of biosimilars (BSs)

Biosimilars are defined as “biological products similar, but not identical, to their already authorized biological reference drug”, whereas generic drugs are “precise copies of drugs with the exact same pharmacological effects, side effects, risks, safety profile and strength as the reference drug”. Thus, BSs are not generic versions of biological products.

1.2. Regulatory approval

Limited documentation is required to obtain this marketing authorization for a conventional small-molecule generic drug. In general, to obtain market authorization it is necessary to show pharmaceutical equivalence (i.e. identical active substances) and bioequivalence (i.e. comparable pharmacokinetics) between the generic and its reference drug. This can often be done in a small study of volunteers, via an abbreviated procedure, and formal clinical efficacy and safety studies are not necessary.

However, this approach cannot be extrapolated to BSs and Biologics. Unlike conventional small-molecule drugs and their generics, the active substance of a biological agent is a collection of large protein isoforms and not a single molecular entity. Generating an exact replica of a protein molecule is extremely difficult if not impossible. Hence it is highly unlikely that the active substances will be identical between the two products — that is pharmaceutical equivalence is difficult to demonstrate. Moreover there are currently no analytical techniques to establish bioequivalence between a BS and reference biologic. Physicochemical and biological methods for characterization of biological agents such as monoclonal antibodies (mAb) are becoming increasingly sophisticated, but the ability to compare a biosimilar mAb to a reference mAb on an analytical level remains limited. Therefore compared to generic drugs, to illustrate the pharmacological profile of a BS necessitates a more rigorous process, and the amount of data required for market approval of BSs will be considerably more than for a typical generic drug application.

Table 1 shows general agreed standard definitions for conventional generic agents, biological agents and BS based on terminology used by the EMA.

At present the EMA guidelines are the only clear document detailing the requirements for market approval of biosimilars. The EMA guidelines advocate pre-clinical and clinical testing of BSs to demonstrate safety and efficacy prior to market authorization, followed by tailored pharmacovigilance plans to monitor potential immunogenicity.

Moreover, the European guideline states that if the reference medicinal product has more than one indication, the efficacy and safety of a BS has to be justified, or if necessary, demonstrated separately for each of the claimed indications. However, the guideline also introduces the caveat of ‘extrapolation’ of data regarding efficacy and safety from trials designed for other indications for which a BS has not been tested. This would be only in specific circumstances, where the mechanism of action is the same, as was seen in the case for the hematopoietic hormones erythropoietin and granulocyte-colony stimulating factor.

In the United States, the FDA has not yet issued a specific regulatory pathway. The Biologics Price Competition and Innovation Act (BCPI) outlined a shortened approval process for “highly similar” biological products, which enables a biosimilar product to be evaluated against a single, already licensed, reference biologic therapy. In February 2012, the FDA issued a draft guidance for the industry regarding implementation of the BPCI Act approval process for BS agents [6], [7], [8], [9] and [10]. Data obtained from analytical and animal studies, and from at least one clinical trial conducted in patients with a disease for which the biological agent is licensed, will be required to demonstrate that a BS product is highly similar to the reference product [2] and [10].

However, the draft guidance does not specify requirements for the size or duration of the required clinical trial, and the FDA has not yet indicated whether the trials will be required to demonstrate non-inferiority, or prove therapeutic equivalence, of the BS agent — therefore leaving a margin of uncertainty.

The position of the American College of Rheumatology (ACR) has been also reported, stating that to enshrine the safety of patients, decisions concerning biosimilarity and interchangeability must be driven by scientifically-sound evidence. The ACR strongly believe that safe and effective treatments should be available to patients at the lowest possible cost [11].

Although there are no definitive rigid sets of guidelines regarding BS regulatory body approval, general unifying principles include prioritizing high similarity to the reference product, clinical trials demonstrating efficacy and safety, and a commitment to further safety profile follow-up after the drug has been approved on the market [10].

1.3. BSs and rheumatic disease: clinical efficacy and safety

In a poll of US, French and German physicians in 2010, it was unanimous that efficacy compared to reference biologic was the most important deciding factor when considering whether to prescribe BS [12]. Although efficacy of a BS should be theoretically equivalent to its reference product, numerous contributing factors may mean that this is not the case. Product attributes related to manufacturing approach (including in-process controls and product controls, impurities, aggregates, heterogeneity, fragments) differ between a BS and biologic. Thus, even in cases where a well-established potency assay correlating with clinical efficacy is available, to convincingly exhibit clinical equivalence, human data would likely be required for BS development [5].

Data from physicochemical and biological characterization alone are not sufficient for BS development, and data coming from clinical trials are required to support similarity. The key question is, to what extent clinical trials are required for a BS? The goal of the clinical development program for the BS is to demonstrate no significant difference compared to the reference product. For that, equivalence trials of adequate sample size that are ideally double-blinded should be conducted.

In August 2012 results from only one published trial was identified by searches including MEDLINE, Current Contents, PubMed, and amplified using a web-available search engine. Gu et al. reported a randomized, open-label, single-dose, two-sequence, crossover study in healthy Korean male volunteers compared with pharmacokinetics and tolerability of branded etanercept (25 mg) and its BS (25 mg) [13]. Twenty-five healthy Korean men were enrolled in this study and

randomized to receive either the BS or the reference drug. In terms of safety, they reported that 52.4% of the patients receiving the BS and 38.1% receiving the reference drug experienced some adverse events, mainly headache, throat irritation, and epistaxis. The authors also described that the tested BS agent had a pharmacokinetic profile consistent with profiles previously reported in other etanercept pharmacokinetic studies. They concluded that, in a select group of Korean healthy male volunteers, branded etanercept and its BS were well tolerated and met the standard criteria for assuming bioequivalence as defined by Korean regulatory authorities. This data would of course need further confirmation and substantiation in other larger and double-blinded trials.

1.4. Safety

As biologicals, BSs are structurally complex proteins with significant micro-heterogeneity, produced by genetically modified living cells, and difficult to produce and purify. Manufacturing processes in terms of choice of cell type, production, purification, and formulation methods, all influence the quality, purity, biological parameters, and eventual clinical activity of the final product — this in turn affects efficacy and safety.

However even if biosimilar products have the same gene sequence, vector, host cell line, culture conditions and purification methods as the reference protein, they can still differ substantially in some biological and clinical properties. Studies have indeed demonstrated differences in physical characteristics, activity, potency, safety, and isoform profile relative to BSs approved in other fields apart from rheumatology (e.g. epoetin alfa) [14]. Thus, the critical issue is to identify the clinically significant differences between BS and biologic. In brief, the question still to be answered is: “*when are biosimilars similar enough?*”

The major issues that the EMA has highlighted remain to be addressed: regarding safety, immunogenicity, and extrapolation of indications [15]. When the safety of biosimilars is being assessed, identical safety parameters that were used for the reference agent must be applied in the development program. Nevertheless, to date, data available are few and fragmented, especially in terms of an evidence-based approach. Ultimately, controlled clinical trials remain the most reliable gold standard means of demonstrating similarity of safety profile between a biosimilar molecule and the reference product.

Immunogenicity is another substantial safety concern for BSs. It refers to the ability of a protein antigen to elicit an immune response in a human or animal, and the subsequent production of antibodies against the protein. BSs may stimulate the production of anti-product antibodies, and the risk of this increases with dosing and length of time of treatment. This can be a particular matter of concern as it is not uncommon for treatment of chronic diseases such as rheumatoid arthritis to span many years.

Several factors are known to affect a product's immunogenic potential. These can relate to the biopharmaceutical, the host, or a combination thereof. Immunogenicity can be induced by the active-drug substance product, but more commonly results from manufacturing impurities originating from the producing cell line or media components. Therefore the presence of impurities in biological products, structural modifications as a result of the manufacturing process, and/or suboptimal storage conditions, can all increase the risk of immunogenicity [16] and [17]. The anti-product antibodies may bind to and thus attenuate or inactivate the BS, and may also result in hypersensitivity reactions such as allergy or serum sickness, and even anaphylaxis. The antibodies may also interfere or neutralize endogenous proteins, leading to unexpected effects, as happened in the cases of pure red cell aplasia induced by biosimilar recombinant human erythropoietins [14]. Furthermore autoimmune processes appearing after the use of biological agents have been described. This was apparent in the initial studies of infliximab in patients with rheumatoid arthritis (RA) [18]. Since then, the number and diversity of autoimmune diseases triggered by biological treatments such as anti-

tumor necrosis factor agents have risen in tandem with their increasing use, and cases of autoimmune diseases induced by other licensed biological agents have also been reported. With the advent of BSs there is potential for a number of clinical and analytical autoimmune adverse events, even different from the ones already reported from currently used reference biologics, which may range from asymptomatic immunological alterations to conceivably life threatening systemic autoimmune disease.

Consequently postmarketing surveillance and long-term follow-up will be mandatory and emphasis on well designed pharmacovigilance programs following approval in order to identify rare and potentially serious events should be established.

1.5. Biosimilar as a strategy to provide economically affordable treatments?

Biologics are a successful class of therapeutic agents, but many treatments remain costly, which may limit their use. The potential for cost saving will unsurprisingly be of major concern for health care providers when considering BS versions of biological therapies if they should become available. Nevertheless, savings cannot be expected to be in the same order of magnitude as in the case of generics, due to high manufacturing costs, the need to perform non-clinical and clinical studies, and an appropriate pharmacovigilance program, as outlined above. As an example, in the UK the list prices of four BSs (Omnitrope®, Binocrit, Retacrit, and Ratiograstim®) compared with their respective reference products, are about 10–25% less in cost — a significant but not overwhelming cost saving.

That said there is a potential for savings with the introduction of BSs that is difficult to quantify. The power of the free market that must not be underestimated in that competition between different manufacturers may mean the cost of BSs is further reduced. Also there are the indirect savings to the wider economy to be considered. Recently a systematic review of cost-of-illness studies in rheumatoid arthritis found a mean annual health care cost of €4170 per patient, with secondary costs (sick leave, lost productivity) taking total cost to €14.906 per patient per year; better control of disease activity will mean wider savings to the economy.

Predicted cost savings must be carefully evaluated, however, in the absence of substantial cost savings, and lack of solid evidence regarding efficacy and safety, rheumatologists are likely to maintain their preference for the original biological agent rather than taking a chance and switching on to the BS.

2. Conclusion

Biosimilars pose an exciting pharmaceutical frontier in the field of Medicine, particularly in Hematology, Oncology, Renal Medicine and Rheumatology, where biologics are in routine use, and have had a tremendous impact on patient outcomes.

It has been anticipated that by 2016, ten of the top-selling 20 drugs will be biologics and of these, three (Adalimumab, Rituximab, Infliximab) are monoclonal antibodies or (etanercept) a fusion protein containing antibody components currently widely used to treat rheumatic disease [19]. The Rheumatology field has adopted routine use of biologics including monoclonal antibodies, and it is therefore a desirable market for BS research. Indeed conducting a search with the search phrase “biosimilar” on clinicaltrials.gov revealed almost 50% of the on-going trials were related to Rheumatology, reflecting the propensity of expansion for biosimilar research in the Rheumatological field [3].

However major concerns must be addressed before a rheumatologist can routinely substitute a BS for a biological agent. Careful pharmacovigilance is necessary to collect clinical data with respect to short and long-term safety of BSs. In addition to being highly similar in structure to the reference product, the rheumatologist should expect comparable efficacy and safety, ideally for a reduced cost — that the patient must not be adversely affected by the change in prescribing practice is paramount.

References

- [1] J.L. Nam, S. Ramiro, C. Gaujoux-Viala, K. Takase, M. Leon-Garcia, P. Emery, L. Gossec, R. Landewe, J.S. Smolen, M.H. Buch, Efficacy of biological disease-modifying antirheumatic drugs: a systematic literature review informing the 2013 update of the EULAR recommendations for the management of rheumatoid arthritis, *Ann. Rheum. Dis.* 73 (2014) 516–528,
- [2] L. Gulacsi, F. Rencz, M. Pentek, V. Brodszky, R. Lopert, N.V. Hever, P. Baji, Transferability of results of cost utility analyses for biologicals in inflammatory conditions for Central and Eastern European countries, *Eur. J. Health Econ. HEPAC* 15 (Suppl. 1) (2014) S27–S34,
- [3] M.K. Kvamme, E. Lie, T. Uhlig, T.A. Moger, T.K. Kvien, I.S. Kristiansen, Cost-effectiveness of TNF inhibitors vs synthetic disease-modifying antirheumatic drugs in patients with rheumatoid arthritis: a Markov model study based on two longitudinal observational studies, *Rheumatology (Oxford)* (2015)
- [4] M.J. Cuadrado, S. Sciascia, X. Bosch, M.A. Khamashta, M. Ramos-Casals, Is it time for biosimilars in autoimmune diseases? *Autoimmun. Rev.* 12 (2013) 954–957
- [5] H.C. Ebbers, S.A. Crow, A.G. Vulto, H. Schellekens, Interchangeability, immunogenicity and biosimilars, *Nat. Biotechnol.* 30 (2012) 1186–1190
- [6] Approval of biosimilars in the USA—dead ringers? *Lancet* 379 (2012) 686, [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(12\)60290-6](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(12)60290-6).
- [7] M.S. Epstein, E.D. Ehrenpreis, P.M. Kulkarni, Biosimilars: the need, the challenge, the future: the FDA perspective, *Am. J. Gastroenterol.* 109 (2014) 1856–1859
- [8] M.A. Radtke, M. Augustin, Biosimilars in psoriasis: what can we expect? *J. Dtsch. Dermatol. Ges.* 12 (2014) 306–312.
- [9] J. Kay, B.G. Feagan, M.S. Guirguis, E.C. Keystone, A.V. Klein, A.S. Lubiniecki, D.R. Mould, K.A. Nyarko, A.A. Ridgway, M.E. Trudeau, J. Wang, Health Canada/ BIOTECanada Summit on regulatory and clinical topics related to subsequent entry biologics (biosimilars), Ottawa, Canada, 14 May 2012, *Biologicals J. Int. Assoc. Biol. Stand.* 40 (2012) 517–527.
- [10] J. Kay, Biosimilars: a regulatory perspective from America, *Arthritis Res. Ther.* 13 (2011) 112,
- [11] <https://www.rheumatology.org/practice/clinical/position/biosimilars.pdf>.
- [12] http://decisionresources.com/marketing/webinars/BAS_Analyst_Call_Prospects_111210.html.
- [13] N. Gu, S. Yi, T.E. Kim, J. Kim, S.G. Shin, I.J. Jang, K.S. Yu, Comparative pharmacokinetics and tolerability of branded etanercept (25 mg) and its biosimilar (25 mg): a randomized, open-label, single-dose, two-sequence, crossover study in healthy Korean male volunteers, *Clin. Ther.* 33 (2011) 2029–2037.
- [14] I. Abraham, K. MacDonald, Safety of erythropoiesis-stimulating agents in patients with end-stage kidney disease: data are safer than extrapolations, *Expert Opin. Drug Saf.* 11 (2012) 885–887.
- [15] EMA: CHMP Guideline on Similar Biological Medicinal Products, 2005. (October).
- [16] G. Dranitsaris, E. Amir, K. Dorward, Biosimilars of biological drug therapies: regulatory, clinical and commercial considerations, *Drugs* 71 (2011) 1527–1536.
- [17] G. Dranitsaris, K. Dorward, E. Hatzimichael, E. Amir, Clinical trial design in biosimilar drug development, *Investig. New Drugs* 31 (2013) 479–487.

- [18] M. Ramos-Casals, P. Brito-Zeron, M.J. Soto, M.J. Cuadrado, M.A. Khamashta, Autoimmune diseases induced by TNF-targeted therapies, *Best Pract. Res. Clin. Rheumatol.* 22 (2008) 847–861.
- [19] M. McCamish, G. Woollett, Worldwide experience with biosimilar development, *mAbs* 3 (2011) 209–217.

Table 1. General agreed standard definitions for conventional generic agents, biologic agents and biosimilars, based on terminology used by the European Medicines Agency (EMA).

Generic drug	A chemical and therapeutic equivalent of a low-molecular-weight drug whose patent has expired
Biological agents	A medicinal product developed by means of one or more of the following biotechnology practices: rDNA, controlled gene expression, antibody methods
Biosimilar	A biological medicinal product referring to an existing product, submitted to regulatory authorities for marketing authorization by an independent application, after the time of the protection of the data has expired for the original existing product