WJPMR, 2025, 11(12), 42-45 Review Article aayush.m.verma@gmail.com

WORLD JOURNAL OF PHARMACEUTICAL AND MEDICAL RESEARCH

www.wjpmr.com

ISSN (O): 2455-3301
ISSN (P): 3051-2557
Coden USA: WJPMBB

A REVIEW ON CHALLENGES IN DEMONSTRATING BIOSIMILARITY OF COMPLEX BIOLOGICS

Aayush Verma*

Department of Quality Assurance, Indore Institute of Pharmacy, Pithampur Road, Opposite IIM, Rau, Indore, Madhya Pradesh, 453331, India.

***Corresponding Author: Aayush Verma**

Department of Quality Assurance, Indore Institute of Pharmacy, Pithampur Road, Opposite IIM, Rau, Indore, Madhya Pradesh, 453331, India.

DOI: https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.17745970

How to cite this Article: Aayush Verma* (2025). A Review On Challenges In Demonstrating Biosimilarity Of Complex Biologics. World Journal of Pharmaceutical and Medical Research, 11(12), 42–45.

Article Received on 20/10/2025 **Article Revised on 09/11/2025** **Article Published on 01/12/2025**

ABSTRACT

The development and regulatory approval of biosimilars that are highly comparable with an approved reference drug product has speeded globally in the last few years because of their potential for enhanced patient access and lower healthcare expenses. But the verification of biosimilarity of such complicated biologics as fusion protein, monoclonal antibodies and other highly glycosylated/heterogenous molecules, is still technically and regulatorily challenging. Ther key implications are structural heterogenicity, post translational modification, batch to batch variation, high order structure variation, orthogonal techniques employed to ensure biosimilarity and comparison of primary regulatory paradigms of different regulatory bodies. This overview discusses the key technical, scientific, analytical, regulatory and clinical barriers encountered in the development and approval of development of complex biologics.

KEYWORDS: biosimilar, complex biologics, monoclonal antibody, analytical comparability, immunogenicity, regulatory challenges and quality assurance.

INTRODUCTION

Biologics which are manufactured from living cells have revolutionized treatment paradigms in oncology, autoimmune diseases as well as rare diseases. Biosimilars are biological products that are very similar to an already marketed reference drug product with regards to its quality and efficacy. Unlike small molecule generics, biosimilars cannot be identical copies due to inherent variability of biological production system and complex post translational modification system (PTM's). Hence, the demonstration of biosimilarity requires an extensive comparability exercise involving combination of analytical, clinical, non-clinical data. This review targets the complexities unique to complex biologics and takes an overview of modern approaches and regulatory requirements for working with these complexities.

Understanding Complex Biologics

Complex biologics are being essentially defined as molecular type of high molecular mass, structural complexities and multiple post translational modification system (PTM's). The different prototypical examples are monoclonal antibodies (mAb's), antibody drug conjugates (ADC's) and highly glycosylated proteins. Their drug activity is based on the exact tertiary or quaternary arrangements, glycosylation patterns, receptor binding characteristics, etc. Small variation in cell line, upstream/downstream processing may change the critical quality attributes (CQA's) and the establishment of biosimilarity would become more challenging as it may influence clinical performance.

Structural Heterogenicity and PTM's

Proteoforms resulting from glycosylation, deamidation, oxidation, truncation, and other post-translational modifications generate a profile of molecular species. Glycan microheterogeneity impacts PK, immunogenicity, and effector functions. Thus, the precise mapping and comparison of these variants between suggested biosimilars and reference products are critical but technically demanding.

Higher Order Structure (HOS) Analysis

Higher order structure (secondary, tertiary, and quaternary structures) plays a crucial role in determining biological activity. The methods like circular dichroism

(CD), Fourier-transform infrared spectroscopy (FTIR), hydrogen-deuterium exchange (HDX) MS, and nuclear magnetic resonance (NMR) give information regarding HOS, yet all of them have resolution limitations. Hence, orthogonal combination of strategies is necessary to develop confidence in similarity evaluations.

Functional And Bioactivity Assay

Functional assays—binding assays (e.g., SPR, ELISA), cell-based potency assays, and effector function assays—quantify biological activity. Developing robust, sensitive, and reproducible assays that model clinically relevant mechanisms of action is still a challenge, particularly for multifunctional biologics.

Batch to Batch Variability and Reference product Drift

Reference biologics themselves also evolve through manufacturing changes with time creating batch-to-batch differences. Sponsors are required to develop comparability strategies to meet range of variability seen for the reference product. Thus, Identification of a suitable "similarity range" and proof that the biosimilar lies within such a range becomes challenging in cases of drift or wide variability.

Analytical Characterization Approach

The contemporary paradigm of biosimilar development focuses on sophisticated analytical characterization to minimize residual clinical data requirements. Among the main analytical strategies are:

Mass Spectrometry (MS)-Centered Approaches - LC–MS, top-down and middle-down MS, peptide mapping, and native MS facilitate comprehensive analysis of primary sequence, PTMs, disulfide bonds, and certain aspects of HOS. Evolution of MS sensitivity and data analysis pipelines has significantly enhanced capabilities for detection of low-level variants.

Separation Techniques and Charge/Size Variant **Analysis -** CE–SDS, SEC, IEX, and iCIEF are the norm for assessing size and charge heterogeneity.

Tools for Higher-order Structure - HDX–MS, DSC, and NMR yield orthogonal HOS data. HDX–MS in specific has proven to be an extremely useful method for localizing minor conformational variations.

Orthogonal Functional Assay - Biophysical binding assays (SPR/BLI), cell-based potency assays, and effector function assays (ADCC/CDC) together cover functional similarity. The application of several, orthogonal bioassays consistent with the mechanism of action of the molecule provides added assurance in the comparability package.

Non-Clinical And Clinical Challenges

Animal model Limitation

Nonclinical models frequently poorly forecast human immunogenicity and even occasionally fail to capture human PK/PD for sophisticated biologics. Regulation encourages a stepwise process wherein sensitive, well-supported nonclinical studies are employed mainly to de-risk clinical programs and not necessarily to establish biosimilarity.

Clinical Study Design

Clinical programs in the past used to incorporate comparative efficacy trials, but regulators now recognize that with adequate analytical similarity and PK/PD comparability, the clinical program can be reduced. Nevertheless, showing equivalence in PK and immunogenicity in population as well as across formulations may be difficult and necessitate intensive statistical planning.

Immunogenicity Assessment

Anti-drug antibodies (ADAs) may neutralize potency or enhance safety risk. Immunogenicity depends on sequence-related attributes, impurities, aggregation, and formulation. Sensitive, validated tests and sufficient follow-up duration are required to identify clinically relevant differences.

Regulatory Challenges and Global Harmonization

EMA, FDA and WHO Expectations

Principal regulators (EMA, FDA, WHO) stress a totality-of-evidence strategy with focus on analytical comparability underpinned by designed nonclinical and clinical investigations. Guidance's describe a stepwise approach and the use of orthogonal analytics and sensitive clinical endpoints.

Country Specific Complexities (India)

CDSCO direction for comparable biologics offers India-specific quality, nonclinical, and clinical data requirements. Local clinical data or bridging studies were required in the past in a few instances, which complicates global development programs.

Interchangeability and substitution

Interchangeability demands further evidence showing that reference to biosimilar and vice versa does not pose an increase in risk or decrease efficacy. The FDA interchangeability guidance outlines trial designs and immunogenicity issues pertinent to interchangeability claims. Substitution policy in most areas, such as the EU, is left to member countries or payers, resulting in a heterogeneous context.

Perspective on Quality Assurance

A strong Quality Management System (QMS) and Good Manufacturing Practice (GMP) compliance are essential. Risk-based approaches and QbD concepts enable CQAs prioritization and process control. Lifecycle management, change control and comparability

procedures are part of both development and post-approval changes.\

Future Direction and Opportunities

New tools like AI/ML for pattern recognition in high-dimensional analytical data, advanced MS workflows, and improved in vitro cell-based systems—hold promise to decrease clinical burdens while increasing sensitivity to subtle distinctions. Greater global regulatory convergence and common reference standards would further simplify biosimilar development.

CONCLUSION

Establishing biosimilarity for intricate biologics requires a stepwise, multidisciplinary effort combining leading-edge analytics, sensitive bioassays, focused nonclinical and clinical studies, and rigorous QA methodologies. Scientific and regulatory hurdles exist, but evolution in analytical techniques and increasing regulatory experience are increasingly reducing obstacles to biosimilar development. Ongoing cooperation among industry, regulators, and academia is necessary to bring safe, effective, and accessible biologic therapies to patients around the world.

REFERENCES

1. US Food and Drug Administration. *Development of Therapeutic Protein Biosimilars: Comparative Analytical Assessment and Other Quality-Related Considerations; Guidance for Industry*. FDA, 2019.
2. US Food and Drug Administration. *Scientific Considerations in Demonstrating Biosimilarity to a Reference Product; Guidance for Industry*. FDA, 2015.
3. European Medicines Agency (EMA). *Guideline on similar biological medicinal products (CHMP/437/04 Rev 1)*. EMA, 2014.
4. Biosimilars and interchangeability: Regulatory, scientific, and global perspectives. *Biologics*. [Review]. PubMed; 2023.
5. Niazi SK. Scientific Justification and Policy Recommendations to the US Food and Drug Administration for Waiving Comparative Efficacy Studies. *Pharmaceuticals*, 2025; 18(6): 779.
6. Niazi SK, Lokesh S. Biosimilars: Lessons Learned From Regulatory Approvals. *Regulations.gov*.
7. Krämer I. Immunogenicity of biosimilars: Regulatory and clinical perspectives. *Ther Umsch*, 2011; 68(11): 659–66.
8. Heinemann L, et al. Biosimilar therapeutics—what do we need to consider? *Clin Kidney J*., 2009; 2(suppl 1): i27–i33.
9. Analytical Data and Single-Dose PK are Sufficient to Conclude Comparable Immunogenicity for Biosimilars: an Ustekinumab Case Study. *BioDrugs*, 2025.
10. Comparative immunogenicity assessment of biosimilars. *mAbs*, 2018; 10(2): 266–275.
11. Safety, Immunogenicity and Interchangeability of Biosimilar Monoclonal Antibodies and Fusion Proteins: A Regulatory Perspective. *Drugs*, 2021; 81(5): 483-499.
12. Immunogenicity of biosimilars: a matter of concern? *Drugs R D.*, 2024; 24: 145–158.
13. Investigation of Immunogenicity Assessment of Biosimilar Monoclonal Antibodies in the United States. *Clin Pharmacol Ther*, 2023; 114(2): 272–280.
14. Analysis of post-translational modifications in recombinant monoclonal antibody IgG1 by reversed-phase liquid chromatography/mass spectrometry. *Anal Biochem*, 2007; 362(1): 61–70.
15. Ebbers H, et al. Biopharmaceuticals as Challenges: immunogenicity risk, post-translational modifications, and manufacturing. *Lygature*, 2016.
16. AjMC Staff. Current Market and Regulatory Landscape of Biosimilars. *AJMC*, 2024.
17. Nadeem N, et al. Emerging Trends in Biosimilars: Regulatory Pathways and Clinical Equivalence. *Clin Pharmacol Biopharm*, 2024; 13: 473.
18. Ghia P, et al. Challenges in molecular characterization of biosimilars: A review. *BJMMR*, 2016; 12(7): 1–7.
19. Uozumi R, Hamada C. Adaptive seamless design for establishing pharmacokinetics and efficacy equivalence in developing biosimilars. *arXiv*, 2016.
20. Craveur P, Narwani T, Rebehmed J, et al. Investigation of the impact of PTMs on the protein backbone conformation. *arXiv*, 2019.
21. Schubert B, Schärfe C, Dönnes P, et al. Population-specific design of de-immunized protein biotherapeutics. *arXiv*, 2017.
22. LeDuc RD, Deutsch EW, Binz PA, et al. Proteomics Standards Initiatives ProForma 2.0: Unifying the encoding of proteoforms and peptidoforms. *bioRxiv / arXiv*, 2021.
23. Lloyd KA, Steen J, Amara K, et al. Variable domain N-linked glycosylation and negative surface charge are key features of monoclonal ACPA: implications for B-cell selection. *arXiv*, 2018.
24. J Biochem Technol. Analytical methods for characterization of monoclonal antibodies: SEC, DLS, peptide mapping, HOS by CD/FTIR/NMR. *J Biochem Technol*, 2024; 15(2): 27–32.
25. Ebbers H, et al. Risk-based immunogenicity assessment for biosimilars: lessons from marketed products. *Lygature*, 2016.
26. EMA. Q&A on the scientific rationale supporting interchangeability of biosimilar medicines in the EU. EMA/93740/2023 Rev 1.
27. First Biosimilars Guidances Issued by FDA: quality, structure, and the role of orthogonal analytic methods. *Wiley Law Review*, 2015.
28. PharmaTutor. Biosimilars and its regulatory considerations. *PharmaTutor*, 2024.
29. Analytical and Bioanalytical Chemistry. Biopharmaceutical analysis — current analytical challenges, limitations, and perspectives, 2025.
30. Sathyan A, et al. Review of primary and secondary outcomes for biosimilars based on guidelines:

regulatory framework and statistical considerations. *J Drug Delivery Ther*, 2025; 15(2): 149–155.