

# Biosimilar the New Era of Therapeutic Science

Sushil S. Kore<sup>1</sup>, Vishweshwar M Dharashive<sup>2</sup>, Suraj G. Malpani<sup>3</sup>, Nilesh N. Shinde<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1,4</sup> Student, shivlingeshwar college of pharmacy, Almala, Latur, M.S. India.

<sup>2</sup> Assistant prof. and Head of Department of Pharm D, SCOP Almala, Latur, M.S. India

**Abstract**— A bio-similar is an organic product that is endorsed in view of a demonstrating that it is exceptionally like an FDA-approved natural product. They are almost equal to generics as in they are endorsed alternates for particular bio-built actions, or biologics. Thus, biosimilars are "comparable yet not the same" or at the end of the day biosimilars are "the twin yet not the clone" to the initial biologic pioneer item. The obstacles with bio-similar are, they have a different origin, have identical therapeutic effect, may additionally have dissimilar side-effects and for this reason need testing. The European Medicines Agency (EMA) twisted into the principal directorial office to affirm a biosimilar. The Indian generics in manufacturing got its first massive break in 1984, when the US exceeded what is referred to as Hatch-Waxman act. Biosimilars market in India presently includes few biosimilars. India has effectively offered out to tap the rising open door in the biosimilars' space. Focal aim of bio similar offers definite increase in patient access to the biological therapy and health care charge. In India bio similar has engrossed large investments in the areas of research, clinical trials, and manufacturing. A proper plan of pharmacovigilance, education, also scientific discussion for biologics and biosimilars would ensure an insincere rise in healthcare access and market sustainability. This paper seeks to collate and review all relevant available intelligence of the health and business potential of biosimilars. In doing so, it provides a visualization of the essential steps that are required to be taken for global biosimilar receiving.

**Index Terms**— Biosimilars, EMA, Guideline's, India Pharma Industry

## INTRODUCTION

Biological drugs (commonly referred to as 'biologics' or 'biopharmaceuticals') are drugs produced through biological processes. They currently target diseases which, hitherto, had very limited or no available treatment options – including several types of cancers, autoimmune diseases and other non-communicable diseases. These drugs are different because they are produced in living cells. Biologics are larger in size and more complex than the 'small molecule drugs'

(SMDs) manufactured using chemical synthesis processes. Biologics have several potential advantages as they can, theoretically, be tailored to hit specific 'targets' in the human body.

Revenues being generated by biological drugs are huge: the projected global sales of the top-selling biologic, AbbVie's Humira (adalimumab) – a drug used to treat autoimmune disorders such as rheumatoid arthritis – in 2018 are US\$20 billion, equal to about two-thirds of the entire pharmaceutical market in India in 2017. The penetration of biological drugs in standard treatment practices is still comparatively lower than SMDs, due to their high costs, treatments being currently available for only a limited number of diseases and the need for a developed health system to supervise treatment with biologics. However, in some therapeutic areas treatment with biologics is already quite significant, especially in high-income countries. An estimated 19% of rheumatoid arthritis (the disease area where use of biologics has been the highest) patients in Europe were accessing biologics in 2010.[1] In 2014, there were 3.1 million patients in the US being treated with one of seven top-selling biologics available in the country.[2] In 2015, the World Health Organization (WHO) included two new biological drugs for cancer treatment, trastuzumab and rituximab, in its list of Essential Medicines.[3] The list already contained two older biologics – pegylated interferon alfa (2a or 2b) and filgrastim.

The fastest-growing segment of the market for biological drugs – the recombinant glycosylated proteins segment – is projected to grow annually at 25% by 2018. Within this, the monoclonal antibody segment alone will have an estimated compounded annual growth rate of 41.9% from 2013 to 2018. The US market is clearly driving the growth of biologics – between 2013 and 2014, spending on specialty drugs, including biologics, increased by 32.4%, while spending on SMDs increased by just 6.8%. Sales in the US account for over half of revenues generated by the

sale of biologics.[4] By 2016, eight of the 10 top-selling drugs in the US market were biologics.[5]

### HISTORY

In the last 13 years since the European Medicines Agency (EMA) turned into the principal administrative office to affirm a bio similar, more than 20 bio similar items have been endorsed in Europe, and some of these bio-similar have additionally been affirmed as bio-similar in Australia, Japan, and/or Canada. In the United States (US), the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) is relied upon to endorse its first bio similar this year. Furthermore, numerous nations outside of the exceedingly directed markets have endorsed alleged take after on biologics, which, not at all like bio similar in the US, Japan, Australia, and Europe or ensuing section biologics (SEBs) in Canada, are created to duplicate a reference item yet have not been subjected to no holds barred similar studies with that reference item to meet the same endorsement norms as in the very controlled markets. These take after on biologics give basic access to these medications for patients, however, ought not be mistaken for biosimilar or SEBs or items that have experienced this thorough testing. [6,7]

### BIOSIMILARS IN INDIA

The Indian generics in industry got its first huge break in 1984, when the US exceeded what is referred to as Hatch-Waxman act. With this legislation, the United States streamlined the non-precise endorsements alongside those lines making it much less demanding for non-specific organizations to contend the US drug market.[8]

India is known for creator of small-molecule active pharmaceutical components (APIs) for Western pharmaceutical assemblies, particularly inside the generics sector. However, India's cutting-edge worldwide pharmaceutical production money owed for about 8% of all, and India's contract production market is emerging three times the charge of the worldwide agreement marketplace.[9] On 28th March 2016 Central Drugs Standard Control Organization delivered new guidance for biosimilar developers as new biosimilars attain to marketplace earlier than other regions, and as India's regulators should try to

develop more precise steering on post marketing studies.[10]

The audit board of trustees on hereditary manage of the Genetic Engineering Approval Committee (GEAC) with the authorization of DCGI, choose clinical trials to be directed in India diagnosed with biosimilar helpful merchandise. The biosimilar needs to show nearly same statistics of non-clinical research viz., pharmacokinetics and toxicology (security pharmacology, multiplication toxicology, mutagenicity and most cancers-causing nature) and clinical research (viability and decency for every signal) before it gets endorsement for all sign of the reference answer. Biosimilars marketplace in India presently includes eight biosimilars, along with one for AbbVie's blockbuster Humira (adalimumab) and two biosimilars for Roche's breast cancer remedy. Herceptin (trastuzumab), which aren't authorized in every other country (although Korea's food and Drug administration has authorized a distinctive Herceptin biosimilar), in line with the enterprise weblog Biosimilars (the Generics and Biosimilars Initiative lists more than 60 authorized biosimilars in India). Monoclonal antibodies (MAB) play a chief position in chemotherapy, so most of the biosimilar entrepreneurs are focused on the production MAB22.

Company(location)	Product description	Biosimilar
Dr Reddy's Lab (Hyderabad)	Filgrastim (recombinant granulocyte-macrophage colony-stimulating factor, G-C Biosimilar rituximab (mAb targeting CD20) Darbepoetin alfa (recombinant erythropoietin)	Grafeel
		Reditux
		Cresp
Intas (Ahmedabad)	Filgrastim (recombinant G-CSF) PEGylated G-CSF Recombinant human interferon alpha-2b Recombinant erythropoietin	Neukine
		Neupeg
		Intalfa
		Epopit
Shantha Biotech/ Merieux Alliance (Hyderabad)	Recombinant interferon alpha-2b Recombinant streptokinase Recombinant erythropoietin	Shanferon
		Shankinase
		Shanpoietin
Reliance Life Sciences (Mumbai)	Recombinant erythropoietin Recombinant G-CSF Recombinant interferon alpha-2b Recombinant reteplase (tissue plasminogen activator)	ReliPoietin
		ReliGrast
		ReliFeron
		MIRel
Wockhardt (Mumbai)	Recombinant erythropoietin Recombinant insulin	Wepox
		Wosulin
Biocon (Bangalore)	Recombinant human Erythropoietin Biosimilar mimotuzumab (humanized mAb targeting epidermal growth factor receptor) Filgrastim, recombinant G-CSF Recombinant streptokinase Biosimilar Recombinant human insulin	Eripro
		Biomab
		Nufil
		Myokines
		Insugen

Table. 01. Indian companies marketing biosimilars in India [11]

1. Non-glycosylated proteins	Insulin, interferons, granulocyte colony-stimulating Factor (G-CSF), human growth hormone
2. Peptides	Calcitonin, glucagon
3. Glycosylated proteins	Erythropoietin, polytropic, monoclonal antibodies

### RECOMBINANT TECHNOLOGIES IN THE MANUFACTURE OF BIOLOGICAL DRUGS

What are recombinant technologies?

Biotechnology involves biological processes that have been manipulated or modified in some way through modern science. A major industrial tender of biotechnology is in the evolution and manufacturing of biological medicinal products by means of genetically engineered bacteria, yeast, cells otherwise even entire animals and plants. Some of these biological medications were formerly extracted from tissues and secretions, often of human origin also in relatively small amounts. With the dawn of recombinant DNA technology, the manufacturing of large amounts of highly purified and characterized materials became possible, as well as products purposely improved by pegylation (treatment of a complex biomolecule with polyethylene glycol to stabilize it) or changes in DNA sequences, fundamentally changing the manner in which biological substances like these were produced and standardized.[12] In the case of drugs developed through recombinant technologies, there were two waves of biologic drug discoveries: recombinant versions of human endogenous molecules (i.e., hormones and enzymes found inside the human body) were developed in the 1980s; and more complex products, such as monoclonal antibodies, in the late 1990s.[13] Recombinant biological products include: a) recombinant non-glycosylated proteins; b) recombinant glycosylated proteins; and c) recombinant peptides. Recombinant non-glycosylated proteins include insulin, granulocyte colony-stimulating factor (G-CSF), interferons and human growth hormone; recombinant glycosylated proteins include erythropoietin, monoclonal antibodies and follitropin; and recombinant peptides include calcitonin and glucagon. Of these, the new generation of drugs for cancer and autoimmune diseases comprises those that are characterized as monoclonal antibodies (the convention for such drugs is to use an International Non-proprietary Name (INN) ending in the three letters ‘mab’

Table 2: Classification of recombinant biological products [14]

### THE EVOLVING REGULATORY LANDSCAPE FOR APPROVAL OF BIOSIMILARS

While the early introduction of cheaper biosimilars faces intellectual property and technological hurdles, the regulatory barriers imposed by regulatory agencies in different countries are currently the most significant. WHO’s role in this has been less than facilitative and its conservative approach has had a chilling effect on the early introduction of biosimilars. Since the late 1990s, non-originator biological products have been known by different names, viz., follow-on biologics, bio-generics, biosimilars, etc. Generally speaking, these nomenclatures are closely linked to the regulatory pathways followed for the approval of these products. Interestingly, regulatory pathways for non-originator biological products were recognized in many Asian countries (India, South Korea, etc.) as early as the 1990s, that is, much before regulatory pathways existed in the EU and the US. Thus, non-originator biological products were available in countries such as India a decade or more before their entry into the European market.

The regulatory pathway followed initially in Asian countries was different from the biosimilar regulatory pathway broadly advocated by the International Conference on Harmonization (ICH), a closed regulatory standard-setting body founded by drug regulatory authorities of the EU (European Medicines Agency – EMA), Japan (Ministry of Health, Labour and Welfare – JMHLW) and the US (Food and Drug Administration – US FDA) and the originator pharmaceutical industry associations of those countries (the European Federation of Pharmaceutical Industries’ Associations – EFPIA; the Japan Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Association –JPMA; and the Pharmaceutical Research and Manufacturers of America – PhRMA). Positions that the ICH promotes are reflective of the interests of originator companies.[15] Biosimilars, including monoclonal antibodies, received regulatory approval in India and South Korea much before the developed-country markets. To date, India has approved more than 50 ‘similar biologic’ products for its market. By contrast,

the more stringent requirements of ICH-aligned countries (mainly developed countries) have limited approvals so far. Till 2015 Australia had approved eight, Japan had approved seven and Canada three.[16] The EU had approved about 24, while the US approved its first biosimilar for filgrastim in 2015. In June 2013, the first approval for a biosimilar monoclonal antibody was granted in the EU for infliximab.[17] The Indian guidelines for introduction of biosimilars were modified in 2012. Prior to 2012 the guidelines were less onerous on biosimilar manufacturers. See Table 3 for important divergences between the pre-2012 regulations in India and the WHO guidelines (see below). The 2012 guidelines in India were modelled on the then existing EMA guidelines and the WHO guidelines [18] thus drastically reducing the divergences. The guidelines were further modified in 2016.[19]

#### FUTURE PERSPECTIVES OF BIOSIMILAR EVALUATION

Improving access to biosimilars, as well as ensuring that they are utilized effectively in treatment, calls for a high degree of collaboration between multiple stakeholders who possess a distinct role in the regulatory pathway. With regulatory authorities wielding the pivotal responsibility of ensuring that only safe, high quality, and efficacious biosimilars attain commercialization, there is an increased need for the capacity of these authorities to be promoted. However, such a step poses to be particularly challenging, especially within countries possessing limited resources. In these cases, the establishment of regulatory procedures that improve the efficiency of the approval process could provide significant traction and benefit to biosimilar adoption. Approval could be facilitated via a collaborative review that was executed by other regulatory authorities or through a previous expert review. Furthermore, approvals of biosimilars that were obtained from regulatory authorities possessing the appropriate expertise could stand as a strong reference to these expert reviews [20]. The ‘Adaptive Designs for Clinical Trials of Drugs and Biologics’, a draft guidance that was recently made available by FDA for the industry, describes the important principles for designing, conducting, and reporting the results from an adaptive clinical trial to provide evidence of the effectiveness and safety of a

drug or biologic. It has a variety of advantages over the non-adaptive designs, as the clinical trials can be adjusted to information not available when the trial began, and thus can be considered to be used for biosimilars in their evaluation for safety and effectiveness.[21]. Regulatory authorities should be legalized to monitor the impact of biosimilars in public health systems in collaboration with other stakeholders. To assist, WHO has established global standards to ensure the quality, safety, and efficacy of biotherapeutics, including biosimilars, at all stages of their life cycle [20]. These standards posit themselves as a strong basis for mutual recognition of regulatory oversight and for regulatory convergence at the global level.

Table 3: Important divergences between pre-2012 Indian guidelines and WHO guidelines [22]

WHO guidelines	Pre-2012 Indian guidelines
Comparative PK/PD is required Extrapolation to other indication can be approved only if the mode of action is similar	Comparative PK/PD is not mandatory Extrapolation to indication can be obtained
Comparative CT is mandatory Immunogenicity is mandatory	Comparative CT is not mandatory Immunogenicity is not mandatory

Notes: PK: pharmacokinetic; PD: pharmacodynamic; CT: clinical trials

#### WHO’S GUIDELINES AND RESOLUTION AT THE WHO

In 2009 the WHO Expert Committee on Biological Standardization adopted Guidelines on Evaluation of Similar Biotherapeutic Products. These guidelines drew heavily from the broad positions advocated by the ICH and since then there has been a major push for the adoption in other countries of biosimilar guidelines modelled on the ICH’s positions and EU guidelines. (The EU guidelines have since been modified and are now much less onerous (see below).) The 2009 WHO guidelines require ‘head to head’ comparability of the non-originator product with the originator product. The principles underlying the approach to biosimilars included in the WHO guidelines [23]

- Full quality dossier, including comparisons with original
- Limited preclinical dossier including pharmacokinetics comparison with original
- Clinical similarity where hard clinical endpoint is not needed
- Extrapolation possible

- Post-marketing safety studies including immunogenicity.

Demonstration of similarity with the originator requires comparative clinical trials with the originator. According to industry sources, a major proportion of the biosimilar development cost arises as a result of the need to purchase the originator product. Further, the burden of proof on similarity also increases the duration of biosimilar development. These onerous regulatory requirements delay introduction of biosimilars and prevent a significant drop in prices when biosimilars are introduced. Thus regulatory requirements represent one of the most significant barriers to affordable access to biological products. Also, even with the smaller clinical trials that are demanded by current regulations, biosimilar sponsors face challenges in identifying clinical sites and investigators that understand their unique development issues and can attract a sufficient number of participants.[24] The WHO guidelines have been criticized by analysts for their ‘similarity proof requirement’: ‘Biosimilars regulatory guidance should be reviewed in light not only of the scientific and regulatory knowledge grown over time, but also of the needs and benefits of national health organizations and pharmaceutical markets in low-resource nations. Stringent regulatory establishments for example EMA have already begun to renounce requirements for comparability workout at clinical level under appropriate circumstances. This style is maintained by academic experts who privilege that non-comparative clinical trials are satisfactory for regulatory purposes, and who call for pragmatic approaches focused primarily on the patients clinical outcomes and on scientific principles, using the state-of-the-art tools.’[25] Reflecting the concerns on non-availability of biological products at affordable prices, WHO’s governing World Health Assembly (WHA) in 2014 adopted a resolution that urged member states ‘to work to ensure that the introduction of new national regulations, where appropriate, does not constitute a barrier to access to quality, safe, efficacious and affordable biotherapeutic products, including similar biotherapeutic products’.[26] The resolution further requested the WHO Director-General ‘to convene WHO’s Expert Committee on Biological Standardization to update the 2009 guidelines, taking into account the technological advances for the characterization of biotherapeutic products and

considering national regulatory needs and capacities and to report on the update to the [WHO] Executive Board’. However, WHO does not seem to have followed the spirit of the WHA resolution. Instead, it has, on its website, issued certain ‘clarifications’ in the form of Q&As. [27] Thus WHO has not actually updated its 2009 guidelines. It has issued several reports by its Expert Committee on Biological Standardization which continue to strengthen the obligations of biosimilar manufacturers laid out in the 2009 guidelines. A report by the expert committee issued in 2016 recommends reappraisal or re-registration of products introduced in situations where the WHO guidelines were not followed.[28] The 2016 report recommends, inter alia, that: ‘Attention should be paid to any key differences between national requirements and the WHO Guidelines – such as the lack of a head-to-head comparability exercise for an SBP [similar biotherapeutic product]. The NRA [national regulatory authority] should provide manufacturers with a critical dataset for the re-registration of such products. Changes in regulatory necessities may be required, along with amendments to the legal basis of the country concerned, to enable such new necessities to be applied.’

#### EUROPEAN GUIDELINES

In October 2014, the EMA finalized new regulatory guidelines on biosimilars in the EU.[29] The guidelines update its October 2005 guidelines on bio similarity (developed based on ICH standards), which officials said had become outdated. The new guidelines, it is demanded, would explain how companies can launch bio similarity between their follow-on biologic and the unique biologic product approved by the EMA. The guidelines also include a discussion regarding the ‘principles of establishing bio similarity’. The EMA recommends a ‘stepwise approach’ intended to build upon rigorous data at every stage of the evaluation process. The EMA clarifies: ‘If the biosimilar comparability exercise intitles that there are related alterations between the intended biosimilar and the reference medicinal product making it not likely that bio similarity will ultimately be established, a stand-alone development to support a full Marketing Authorisation Application (MAA) should be considered instead Clinical data cannot be used to justify substantial differences in

quality attributes.’[30] Essentially what this stepwise approach involves is an assessment of similarity at every step. If, at any step, the divergence in similarity is seen to be too large, the similar molecule will be treated as a new molecule requiring submission of a full dossier.

#### US GUIDELINES

In the last part of March 2010 the United States passed the Biologics Price Competition and Innovation Act (BPCI). The BPCI describes a biosimilar product as ‘(A) highly similar to the reference product anyhow minor differences in clinically sluggish components; and (B) no clinically expressive differences in between the biological product and the reference product in terms of the safety, purity, and potency of the product’.[31] As regards interchangeability between originator products and biosimilars, the Act says that the interchangeable product must meet all the same requirements as a reference product and in addition have the same route of administration, dosage form and strength as the reference product.[32] In various states in the US, an identical may be substituted for the reference product without the intervention of the healthcare provider who prescribed the reference product, as this is governed by state pharmacy laws. The US FDA states in this respect: ‘Once a biosimilar has been approved by FDA, patients and health care providers can be assured of the safety and effectiveness of the biosimilar, just as they would for the reference product.’[33] There are no fundamental differences between the EU and US guidelines regarding the non-clinical and clinical testing plans. However, inferring immunogenicity data from one signal to another signal is allowed in the US but none in the EU. The European Commission issued a directive in 2012 requiring biological products to be identified by brand name and not by INN. However, the US FDA is less precise in this context, saying only that the naming and labelling of the drug should facilitate decision making by the prescribing healthcare professional.[34]

#### TECHNOLOGICAL BARRIERS TO MANUFACTURE OF BIOSIMILARS

A biosimilar has been defined as a biological medicine that has been proven, through a regulatory process, to have a high similarity to a reference biological

medicine (also referred to as the originator or original biological medicine). A biosimilar’s primary amino acid sequence matches that of the reference biological medicine with only minor differences in clinically inactive components. Biosimilars are approved by regulatory authorities to meet standards for similarity in quality, efficacy and safety to the reference biological medicine.[35] The manufacturing of biologics using recombinant technology requires several stages of cell culture and purification, processes which are confidential to the company developing the product. As it is not possible for companies producing biosimilars to directly access this know-how, their manufacturing process will differ from that of the originator, and the structural variability of the product may be more pronounced. For example, different cell lines could alter the three-dimensional structure of the final product. These alterations can, theoretically, lead to adverse consequences for patient health, such as undesired immunogenic responses.[36] It must be kept in mind, however, that all biological products are inherently variable due to the fact that they are produced from living organisms. This variability exists (even when the originator company manufactures the drug) within batches, from batch to batch, and when production processes are improved or changed or differ between manufacturers. Thus, what is rarely acknowledged is that different batches of biologics from innovator companies (branded biologics) also differ slightly [37]

#### WHY ARE BIOLOGICS AND BIOSIMILARS SO EXPENSIVE

Unlike in the case of SMDs where generic equivalents become available soon after the patents on these drugs expire (or in situations where the patent is not recognized in a particular territory), there is no effective competition in the market for biologics even in situations where the patents on the originator molecules have expired or are not granted. Contributing to this situation is what we described earlier – the complex structures of biologics and their dependence on relatively complex manufacturing processes involving living cells. This complexity introduces various barriers to competition in the market. Thus, in addition to intellectual property-related barriers (similar to what we see in the case of SMDs), early introduction of biosimilars also faces

technological and regulatory barriers. As a result, biologics are extremely expensive and consequently not easily accessible to patients, especially in low- and middle-income countries (LMICs). For example, one vial of adalimumab (for the originator product Humira from AbbVie) would cost about US\$1,000 – almost equivalent to the average annual wage in a low-income country. The high prices of biological drugs place a major burden on the public health budget of many LMICs which have introduced these drugs. For example, in 2015 biological drugs accounted for 35% of the pharmaceutical market in Colombia. Similarly in Brazil, while biological drugs account for 4% by volume of drugs distributed through its National Health System, they account for over half of the Ministry of Health's expenditure on medicines.[38] The entry of biosimilars into the regulated markets of the EU and the US has also been very slow; biosimilars in 2014 accounted for less than 0.5% of the market for biological medicines.[39]

Even though biosimilar versions of many top-selling biological drugs are now being produced by non-originator companies, there are various factors that limit access to these. Current regulatory regimes require clinical trials to be done to establish that the biosimilar matches the potency, safety, and efficacy of the originator. This requirement, together with the costly manufacturing processes, escalates the development costs for biosimilars. The estimated cost for development of a biosimilar is between US\$75250 million, one order of magnitude higher than the cost for generics.[40]

Importantly, unlike in the case of the small molecule generic industry, many multinational pharmaceutical companies are entering the area of bio-generic manufacture. The latter have a stake in keeping the prices of biosimilars comparatively high, hence repeated industry-led assertions that biosimilar introduction will lead to only a modest drop of 10-50% in prices.[41] While different estimates exist regarding the cost of developing a biosimilar, the US Federal Trade Commission estimates the cost to be in the range of US\$100-200 million and development takes between 8-10 years (in contrast to 2-3 years for small molecule generics). The high investment and risk involved, it is said, would depress costs by only 10-35% compared with the cost of the originator biologic.[42] These assertions are however belied by other evidence – for example, the version of

adalimumab produced by India's Zydus Cadila (Exemptia) led to an 80% price reduction.[43] In Europe price drops in the range of 45-70% are already being seen in segments where there is competition from biosimilars. Some analysts now say that the cost of developing a biosimilar is nearer US\$60 million. Of this, it is projected that US\$7-15 million is the typical cost of analysing the originator molecule over a period of four years. Steinar Madsen of the Norwegian Medicines Agency posits that the cost of manufacture of a biologic is less than 10% of the market cost of the drug. It is also being projected that regulatory regimes will, in the near future, largely forgo the need to conduct expensive Phase III trials before biosimilars are approved, thus drastically cutting the cost of development of biosimilars.[44]

#### OPPORTUNITIES OF BIOSIMILARS

In Global Markets One of the core objectives of biosimilar introduction is the promotion of healthcare cost savings, biological treatment attainability, and the subsequent improvement in patient outcomes. The advancement of biosimilars is expected to lead to more competition, and later on greater convenience to cost-effective handlings. While biosimilar manufacture entails several challenges, they take lesser time to be developed, approximately five years less than that for an originator biologic [45]. Biosimilar manufacturers tend to develop their market strategy with the goal of improving the access of affordable biological healthcare to patients within sufficiently health conscious populations. Such creators incline to target markets where their purchasers are practically wealthy and their sales efforts force towards the toughest possible influence in the local populace. Therefore, the growth of biosimilars is often seen to accelerate within developed and recognized markets when compared to that in emerging markets of developing countries [46]. The accessibility of clinical safety and efficacy data has made the renovation of healthcare cost models probable. This allows for patients undergoing biosimilar treatment to enjoy more cost effective medication. There has been considerable international discussion on how to deal with biosimilars and other biological copies with regard to their regulatory aspects, especially in terms of their quality, safety, and efficacy evaluation. Identifying effective methods to distribute information among regulators is also of

utmost importance [47]. The growth of the biosimilar market has seen key launches in several pharmaceutical market segments. These markets include those of human growth hormones (HGH), monoclonal antibodies (MAbs), erythropoietin's (EPOs), insulins, human interferons (IFs), and granulocyte colony stimulating factors (G-CSFs). The introductions of these biosimilars have innovatively upgraded treatment strategies for a wide range of indications. The market for biologicals is primarily fuelled by factors, such as the rising demand for biological treatment of chronic diseases, such as diabetes and cancer.

#### FUTURE CHALLENGES

Comparative biologics are created through consecutive procedure to show the comparability by broad characterisation examines uncovering the atomic and quality ascribes concerning the reference biologic. Bio similar must be professionally built to co-ordinate the locus item. A similarity exercise must be taken after with the pioneer item at all levels of item advancement, including physicochemical traits, organic action, pre-clinical in vivo likeness, Phase I PK and well-being, and Phase III viability and security.

This can be troublesome on the grounds that information for the trend-setter item will need the best way to get data about the segments of the trailblazer item is, from material that is as of now out in the commercial centre. Having numerous groups of the trend-setter's product, spreading over various years, can be to a great degree accommodating amid the characterisation procedure. Wellsprings of variety between assembling of trendsetter bio pharmaceutical and bio similar are as given beneath:

- Use of various vector
- Different cell expression framework
- Different cell line progress media and plan for extension
- Different working conditions
- Different authoritative and elution conditions
- Different strategies, reagents, reference normstionally, Wockhardt and Lupin have made their raid into the corner fragment.[48]

Bio similar industry has several advantages and disadvantages.[49]

#### ADVANTAGES:

- Low cost and similar effectiveness of the original product.
- Limited time is required to market than the original product
- High chance of return of investment (ROI) than the new product R&D.
- Discount in expensive healthcare treatment.

#### DISADVANTAGES:

- Large Financial support is required due to rising regulatory requirements.
- According to consumers cost of bio similar products are comparatively higher than the small molecule generic which is heavy reduction than the original product.
- Lack of understanding and reliability of industry

#### THE NOCEBO EFFECT OF BIOSIMILARS

The nocebo effect is a negative effect of a therapeutical treatment (pharmacological or non-pharmacological), which is a result of the patient's perceived expectations. It is not the physiological consequence of the treatment itself. This effect has a negative impact on the treatment adherence rates in patients undergoing biosimilar treatment [50]. The true burden of this effect on biosimilar treatment is difficult to measure. However, it is important for clinicians and manufacturers to understand the patient related factors and the psychological mechanisms affecting nocebo responses to biosimilar treatment [51]. Educating patients on the side effects of the biosimilar to promote prescription transparency is a suitable strategy to minimize the nocebo response. Furthermore, clinicians are encouraged to build strong relationships with their patients. These aid in enabling confident shared decision making and information exchange. It is the responsibility of healthcare professionals to identify patients who are at a risk for the nocebo effect. Professionals are also required to discern patients' perceived expectations during an adverse event and reassure them of their treatment if their nocebo response is excessive [52].

#### CONCLUSION



This paper has discussed the ecosystem that informs access to biological drugs, including biosimilars. The analysis carried out in the paper leads us to the following conclusions and recommendations:

- The latent role of biological drugs in helping real therapeutic advances requires a deeper analysis. However, current evidence suggests that they will play an increasingly major role in the future in advancing therapeutic outcomes for several autoimmune and degenerative diseases and in cancer treatment
- Biological drugs are extremely expensive. Their high prices are an image of endangered monopolies in the biotech area. Further, unlike in the situation of SMDs, the expected drop in charges after overview of biosimilars is predictably attached at only around 30%. There are no clear technical explanations, why price drops cannot be much high-pitched
- Regulatory barricades (i.e., onerous requirements for regulatory sanction) are important factors preventing overview of cheaper follow-on products of equal safety also efficacy. The current regulatory regimes the underlying WHO guidelines are not in sync with advances in the science of biological products
- Intellectual property protection, just as in the event of SMDs, helps monopolies and prevents the early introduction of follow-on biologics. Process patents and trade secrets are major barriers to the introduction of biosimilars. In addition, the biotech industry is more aggressive in demanding data exclusivity rules. All this act as coatings of barriers to the early introduction of inexpensive biosimilars
- The planned introduction of 'Biological Qualifiers' to be tagged on to INNs for biosimilars is unfounded and WHO should not follow this proposal.
- It is necessary to harmonize rules and allow for interchangeability between innovator products and biosimilars which have received regulatory approval. This would make uptake of biosimilars in clinical practice easier.

#### ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The author thanks Prof. Samir Shafi, academic in-charge, shivlingeshwar collage of pharmacy, almala [M.S.], India, Prof. Dinesh S. Gujrati, vice principle, shivlingeshwar collage of pharmacy, Almala, [M.S.] India.

#### REFERENCE

- [1] Laires, Pedro A et al. (2013) Patient's Access to Healthcare and Treatment in Rheumatoid Arthritis: The Views of Stakeholders in Portugal. *BMC Musculoskeletal Disorders* 14 (2013): 279, <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3849024/>
- [2] The Biosimilars Council (2017) Biosimilars in the United States: Providing More Patients Greater Access to Lifesaving Medicines. Available at: <http://biosimilarscouncil.org/wpcontent/uploads/2017/09/Biosimilars-Council-PatientAccess-Study -090917.pdf>
- [3] Malik, Monica et al. (2016) Biosimilars in Low- and Middle-Income Markets: A Case Study of India and Russia. 26 May 2016, <https://am.asco.org/biosimilars-lowand-middle-income-markets-case-study-india-and-russia>
- [4] (2013) Generating value in generics: Finding the next five years of growth. McKinsey and Company, May 2013, <http://www.mckinsey.com>
- [5] (2016) The economic impact of biosimilars in the US. 29 July 2016, [http://www.gabionline.net/Biosimilars/Research/The-economic-impact-of-biosimilars-in-the-US\\_resource-poor\\_healthcare\\_systems](http://www.gabionline.net/Biosimilars/Research/The-economic-impact-of-biosimilars-in-the-US_resource-poor_healthcare_systems).
- [6] EMA Guideline on Similar Biological Medicinal Products, CHMP/437/04, October 30, 2005. Available from: [http://www.ema.europa.eu/docs/en\\_GB/document\\_library/Scientific\\_guideline/2009/09/WC500003517.pdf](http://www.ema.europa.eu/docs/en_GB/document_library/Scientific_guideline/2009/09/WC500003517.pdf). Accessed February 12, 2016.
- [7] Huneycutt BJ, Gillespie E, Woollett GR; Clinical trials in the development of biosimilars: future considerations 9 July 2015 *Volume* 2015:5 *Pages* 49—63
- [8] Mossinghoff, Gerald. "Overview of the Hatch-Waxman Act and Its Impact on the Drug Development Process." *Food and Drug Law Journal*. 54. (1999): 187-194. Print.
- [9] Genazanni A et.al: Biosimilar drugs: concerns and opportunities. *Bio drugs* 2007;21 351-357

- [10] Biosimilars In India News: Recent Guidelines from Indias CDSCO and a pending case on “Biosimilar” Trastuzumab; May 6 2016; Big Molecule Watch. Available from <http://www.bigmoleculewatch.com/2016/05/06/biosimilars-in-india-news-recent-guidelines-from-indias-cdsco-anda-pending-case-on-biosimilar-trastuzumab/>Zachary Brennan; India Releases New Biosimilar Guidelines;28 March 2016; Regulatory Affairs Professional Society
- [11] Killugudi Jayaraman; Indian companies Marketing Biosimilars In India; India’s Cipla sets Sight on Avastin, Herceptin and Enbrel; Nature Biotechnology 28,883- 884(2010). Available from [http://www.nature.com/nbt/journal/v28/n9/fig\\_tab/nbt0910-883a\\_T1.html](http://www.nature.com/nbt/journal/v28/n9/fig_tab/nbt0910-883a_T1.html)
- [12] World Health Organization (2016) Biotherapeutic Products. <http://www.who.int/biologicals/biotherapeutics/biotherapeutic-products/en/>
- [13] Calo-Fernandez, Bruno and Juan Leonardo Martinez-Hurtado (2012) Biosimilars: Company Strategies to Capture Value from the Biologics Market. *Pharmaceuticals* 2012, 5: 1393-1408; doi:10.3390/ph5121393
- [14] Biosimilars Market Product (2013) <http://www.pnnewswire.com/news-releases/biosimilars-market-product-recombinant-nonglycosylated-proteins-insulinfilgrastim-somatropin-glycosylated-monoclonal-antibodies-erythropoietin-peptidesglucagon-calcitonin—application-oncology-blood-disorders-233468431.html>
- [15] Third World Network (2014) WHO: Alliance with industry raises concerns over medicine regulation. TWN Info Service on Health Issues, 20 May 2014, <http://www.twn.my/title2/health.info/2014/hi140502.htm>
- [16] Scott, Cheryl and S Anne Montgomery (2015) Biosimilars and Bio betters Offer Unique Benefits – and Risks. 16 June 2015, <http://www.bioprocessintl.com>
- [17] Generics and Biosimilars Initiative (2018) Biosimilars approved in Europe. 2 February 2018, <http://www.gabionline.net/Biosimilars/General/Biosimilars-approved-in-Europe>
- [18] Ohly, C (2012) The New India Guidelines on Similar Biologics: Regulatory and Market Authorization Requirements. Spicy IP, <https://spicyip.com/2012/10/guest-postnew-india-guidelines-on.html>
- [19] Generics and Biosimilars Initiative (2017) India updates its similar biologics guidelines. <http://www.gabionline.net/Guidelines/India-updates-its-similar-biologics-guidelines>
- [20] Kang, H.-N.; Knezevic, I.Regulatoryevaluationofbiosimilarsthroughouttheirlife-cycle. *Bull. World Health Organ.* 2018, 96, 281–285.
- [21] US FDA. Adaptive Design Clinical Trials for Drugs and Biologics; FDA: Rockville, MD, USA, 2018. Available online: <https://www.fda.gov/regulatory-information/search-fda-guidance-documents/adaptive-design-clinical-trials-drugs-and-biologics> (accessed on 23 August 2019)
- [22] Malhotra, H (2011) Biosimilars and non-innovator biotherapeutics in India: An overview of the current situation. *Biologicals* 39 (2011): 321-324, <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/21784652>
- [23] See: [http://bcn2012.europeanbioanalysisforum.eu/slides/day%20\(ii\)%20biosimilars/1\\_schellekens.pdf](http://bcn2012.europeanbioanalysisforum.eu/slides/day%20(ii)%20biosimilars/1_schellekens.pdf)
- [24] Wechsler, J (2016) Biosimilar trials differ notably from innovator studies. <http://www.appliedclinicaltrials.com/biosimilar-trials-differ-notably-innovator-studies>
- [25] Milani, B and S Gaspani (2013) Pathway to affordable, quality-based sources of pegylated interferon alpha for treating Hepatitis C. *Generics and Biosimilars Initiative Journal*, Volume 2, 2013, Issue 4, p. 194, <http://apps.who.int/medicinedocs/documents/s21311en/s21311en.pdf>
- [26] World Health Organization (2014) Sixty Seventh World Health Assembly, Resolutions and Decisions Annexes, p. 68, [http://apps.who.int/gb/ebwha/pdf\\_files/WHA67/REC1/A67\\_2014\\_REC1-en.pdf#page=25](http://apps.who.int/gb/ebwha/pdf_files/WHA67/REC1/A67_2014_REC1-en.pdf#page=25)
- [27] See:[http://www.who.int/biologicals/QA\\_for\\_SBPs\\_HK\\_12\\_Dec\\_2017\\_\(2\).pdf?ua=1](http://www.who.int/biologicals/QA_for_SBPs_HK_12_Dec_2017_(2).pdf?ua=1)
- [28] World Health Organization (2016) WHO Expert Committee on Biological Standardization, sixty-sixth report. WHO technical report series No. 999, [http://www.who.int/biologicals/expert\\_committee/WHO\\_TRS\\_999\\_corrigenda\\_web.pdf](http://www.who.int/biologicals/expert_committee/WHO_TRS_999_corrigenda_web.pdf)

- [29] The EMA guidelines can be accessed here: [http://www.ema.europa.eu/ema/index.jsp?curl=pages/regulation/general/general\\_content\\_000408.jsp&mid=WC0b01ac058002958c](http://www.ema.europa.eu/ema/index.jsp?curl=pages/regulation/general/general_content_000408.jsp&mid=WC0b01ac058002958c)
- [30] See: [http://www.ema.europa.eu/docs/en\\_GB/document\\_library/Scientific\\_guideline/2014/10/WC500176768.pdf](http://www.ema.europa.eu/docs/en_GB/document_library/Scientific_guideline/2014/10/WC500176768.pdf)
- [31] Lemery, SJ, FJ Esteva and M Weise (2016) Biosimilars: Here and Now. *Am Soc Clin Oncol Educ Book* 2016; 35: e151-e157; doi: 10.14694/EDBK\_155954. <https://meetinglibrary.asco.org/record/50599/edbook#fulltext>
- [32] See: <https://www.fda.gov/downloads/AboutFDA/CentersOffices/OfficeofMedicalProductsandTobacco/CDER/UCM606115.pdf>
- [33] See: <https://www.fda.gov/Drugs/DevelopmentApprovalProcess/HowDrugsareDevelopedandApproved/ApprovalApplications/TherapeuticBiologicApplications/Biosimilars/ucm580430.htm#sub>
- [34] Blank, Tobias (2013) Safety and toxicity of biosimilars – EU versus US regulation. *Generics and Biosimilars Initiative Journal* 2013; 2(3): 144-150; doi: 10.5639/gabij.2013.0203.039
- [35] International Union of Pure and Applied Chemistry (1997) *Compendium of Chemical Terminology*, 2nd edition. Cambridge Healthcare Institute
- [36] Calo-Fernandez, Bruno and Juan Leonardo Martinez-Hurtado (2012) Biosimilars: Company Strategies to Capture Value from the Biologics Market. *Pharmaceuticals* 2012, 5: 1393-1408; doi:10.3390/ph5121393
- [37] Welch, Anna Rose (2016) The Norwegian Biosimilar Phenomenon: From Biosimilar to 'Biogeneric'. *Biosimilar Development*, 26 July 2016, <http://www.biosimilardevelopment.com/doc/the-norwegian-biosimilar-phenomenon-from-biosimilar-to-biogeneric0001>
- [38] Barry, F (2015) Filgrastim biosimilar is first Latin copy biologic, says Brazil. *BioPharma Reporter*, 24 November 2015, <http://www.biopharma-reporter.com/MarketsRegulations/Filgrastim-biosimilar-is-first-Latin-copy-biologic-says-Brazil>
- [39] Dorey, Emma (2014) How the biologics landscape is evolving. *The Pharmaceutical Journal*, 17 November 2014
- [40] Calo-Fernandez, Bruno and Juan Leonardo Martinez-Hurtado (2012) Biosimilars: Company Strategies to Capture Value from the Biologics Market. *Pharmaceuticals* 2012, 5: 1393-1408; doi:10.3390/ph5121393
- [41] Mulcahy, AW, Z Predmore and S Mattke (nd) The Cost Savings Potential of Biosimilar Drugs in the United States. *Rand Corporation*, [https://www.rand.org/content/dam/rand/pubs/perspectives/PE100/PE127/RAND\\_PE127.pdf](https://www.rand.org/content/dam/rand/pubs/perspectives/PE100/PE127/RAND_PE127.pdf)
- [42] Dorey, Emma (2014) How the biologics landscape is evolving. *The Pharmaceutical Journal*, 17 November 2014
- [43] Press Trust of India (2014) Zydus Cadila launches biosimilar of AbbVie's Humira in India. *Economic Times*, 9 December 2014, [http://articles.economictimes.indiatimes.com/2014-12-09/news/56879703\\_1\\_rheumatoid-arthritis-first-biosimilar-humira](http://articles.economictimes.indiatimes.com/2014-12-09/news/56879703_1_rheumatoid-arthritis-first-biosimilar-humira)
- [44] Stanton, Dan (2015) Number of biosimilar developers growing as costs plummet, say CPhI experts. 21 October 2015, <http://www.biopharmareporter.com>
- [45] Ventola, C. L. Evaluation of Biosimilars for Formulary Inclusion: Factors for Consideration by P&T Committees. *Pharm. Ther.* 2015, 40, 680–689.
- [46] Pineda, C.; Caballero-Uribe, C.V.; de Oliveira, M.G.; Lipszyc, P.S.; Lopez, J.J.; Mataos Moreira, M.M.; Azevedo, V.F. Recommendations on how to ensure the safety and effectiveness of biosimilars in Latin America: A point of view. *Clin. Rheumatol.* 2015, 34, 635–640.
- [47] Knezevic, I. Biosimilars—Global issues, national solutions. *Biologicals* 2011, 39, 252–255.
- [48] India can emerge as a Key Player in the Biosimilar Segment; Chemtech Foundation; Pharma Biotech. Available from [http://www.Chemtechonline.com/P&B/Ramniwas\\_april13.html](http://www.Chemtechonline.com/P&B/Ramniwas_april13.html)
- [49] India brand equity foundation: Formula of success, Emerging trends in biosimilars in India.
- [50] Pouillon L.; Socha, M.; Demore, B.; Thilly, N.; Abitbol, V.; Danese, S.; Peyrin Biroulet, L. The nocebo effect: A clinical challenge in the era of biosimilars. *Expert Rev. Clin. Immunol.* 2018, 14, 739–749.
- [51] Wells, R.E.; Kaptchuk, T.J. To tell the truth, the whole truth, may do patients harm: The problem

of the nocebo effect for informed consent. *Am. J. Bioeth.* 2012, 12, 22–29.

- [52] Rezk, M.F.; Pieper, B. Treatment Outcomes with Biosimilars: Be Aware of the Nocebo Effect. *Rheumatol. Ther.* 2017, 4, 209–218.