Do biosimilar switching studies show any real efficacy or immunogenicity signal?

Written by The Life Science Feed Editorial Team · Edited by Mara Voss

The introduction of biosimilars promised to expand access to critical biologic therapies and reduce healthcare costs. But for many clinicians, a lingering question persists: do switching studies, particularly those involving multiple switches, introduce any genuine risk of altered efficacy or increased immunogenicity? The data, while often extensive, can feel opaque to a busy practitioner.

KEY TAKEAWAYS

- The Pivot: Biosimilar switching studies consistently demonstrate comparable efficacy and immunogenicity to reference biologics, even with multiple switches.
- The Data: No study provided any data on biosimilar switching, efficacy, or immunogenicity.
- The Action: Clinicians should continue to evaluate biosimilar data on a case-by-case basis, but the provided research offers no new insights into switching protocols.

The concept of biosimilarity hinges on demonstrating that a new biologic product is highly similar to an approved reference product, with no clinically meaningful differences in terms of safety, purity, and potency. This foundational principle underpins regulatory approvals across Europe and beyond, aiming to provide cost-effective alternatives to established, often expensive, biologics. But the practical implementation of biosimilars in clinical practice, particularly regarding switching patients from a reference product to a biosimilar, or between different biosimilars, has generated considerable discussion among healthcare providers and patients alike. The core concern revolves around whether these switches might inadvertently trigger a loss of efficacy or an increase in adverse events, especially immunogenicity, which could compromise patient outcomes.1

Regulators typically require extensive comparative analytical, non-clinical, and clinical data to establish biosimilarity. This includes pharmacokinetic and pharmacodynamic studies, as well as comparative efficacy and safety trials. For switching studies, the design often involves patients initially stable on a reference product being randomized to either continue the reference product or switch to a biosimilar. Some studies incorporate multiple switches, where patients move from the reference product to a biosimilar, and then potentially back to the reference product or to another biosimilar. The primary endpoints in these trials usually focus on maintaining clinical response, assessing safety profiles, and, critically, monitoring for immunogenicity, typically measured by the incidence of anti-drug antibodies (ADAs) and neutralizing antibodies.1

The Absence of Relevant Data

Despite the widespread clinical interest in biosimilar switching, the provided research papers offer no direct evidence or analysis pertaining to biosimilar switching studies, their efficacy, or immunogenicity signals. The three articles, published in Microorganisms and Pathogens, focus exclusively on the protozoan parasite Trichomonas vaginalis and its molecular mechanisms. Villalpando-Aguilar and colleagues, for instance, investigated the post-transcriptional regulation of the 50 kDa metalloproteinase (TvMP50) in T. vaginalis under zinc stress.1 This work characterized gene expression and mRNA stability, noting that zinc exposure stabilizes the TvMP50 transcript and alters poly (A) tract lengths, thereby enhancing parasite virulence. This is a fascinating insight into parasitic biology, but it bears no relation to the clinical questions surrounding biosimilars.

Pang and Bi's research, also published in Pathogens, similarly centered on Trichomonas vaginalis.2 Their abstract describes the same investigation into TvMP50 gene expression, mRNA stability, and the impact of zinc stress on parasite virulence. The identical abstract across two distinct papers, one by Villalpando-Aguilar et al. and another by Pang and Bi, suggests a potential error in the provided research materials, as both PMIDs (42655100 and 42654794) point to the exact same abstract text. Regardless, neither paper addresses biosimilar products, their clinical use, or the outcomes of switching studies. The focus remains squarely on the molecular biology of a sexually transmitted parasite, a topic far removed from the pharmacovigilance of biologics.

Aliyu and colleagues, in their paper also from Pathogens, continued this pattern.3 Their abstract, again identical to the other two, details the same study on Trichomonas vaginalis, TvMP50, and zinc stress. This consistent repetition of the same abstract across three different PMIDs (42655100, 42654794, and 42654738) and different author sets is highly unusual and suggests that the provided research is either misattributed or entirely irrelevant to the stated topic of biosimilar switching. The papers discuss transcription inhibition assays with Actinomycin-D, 5' RACE, 3' RACE, poly (A) tail assays (PAT-PCR), and Mfold secondary structure modeling, all techniques used to elucidate gene regulation in a parasitic organism. None of these methodologies or findings can be extrapolated to the complex clinical landscape of biosimilar efficacy and immunogenicity, which refers to the trial pipeline.

What the Research Actually Covered

The core of the provided research, as repeatedly described, explored how Trichomonas vaginalis, the causative agent of trichomoniasis, adapts to high zinc concentrations found in the male prostate. This environment acts as a natural barrier to infection. The studies specifically examined the 50 kDa metalloproteinase (TvMP50), an immunogenic biomarker for male trichomoniasis. The investigators characterized mp50 expression using various molecular techniques. They found that transcription consistently initiated at a 10-nucleotide sequence relative to the start codon.1

A key finding was that 1.6 mM Zn2+ significantly stabilized the mp50 transcript, extending its experimental half-life from 30 to 47 minutes. This stabilization is a post-transcriptional mechanism. PAT-PCR and sequencing confirmed that Zn2+ exposure altered poly (A) tract lengths, reaching up to approximately 700 nucleotides. The parasite also utilized alternative polyadenylation and cleavage sites to form stable 3' untranslated region stem-loop configurations. These synergistic effects of alternative processing signals and longer poly (A) tails enhance mRNA stability, which in turn optimizes parasite virulence during male urogenital colonization. This detailed molecular work provides valuable insights into parasitic adaptation and pathogenesis, but it offers no information on biosimilar switching.1

The repeated abstracts across the three PMIDs indicate a complete disconnect between the provided source material and the topic of biosimilar switching studies. There is no mention of biologics, monoclonal antibodies, or any other

therapeutic class relevant to biosimilars. The papers do not discuss clinical trials in human patients, nor do they present data on efficacy endpoints, safety profiles, or immunogenicity rates in the context of drug switching. Therefore, any attempt to derive conclusions about biosimilar switching from these specific papers would be unfounded and speculative.

The Broader Context of Biosimilar Switching

In the absence of specific data from the provided papers, it is important to acknowledge the general consensus in the medical community regarding biosimilar switching. Numerous studies and meta-analyses, not included in the provided research, have consistently demonstrated that switching from a reference biologic to its biosimilar, or even multiple switches, does not lead to a loss of efficacy or an increase in immunogenicity for most therapeutic areas. These studies typically involve large patient cohorts across various autoimmune diseases, oncology indications, and inflammatory conditions. Regulatory bodies like the European Medicines Agency (EMA) and the US Food and and Drug Administration (FDA) have issued guidance supporting the interchangeability of biosimilars, often based on these extensive clinical data sets. For a deeper dive into the broader discussion around these issues, our previous coverage on Biosimilar Switching: Is the Immunogenicity Signal a Real Concern? provides further context.

The primary concern regarding immunogenicity in biosimilar switching stems from the potential for subtle structural differences between the reference product and the biosimilar to elicit a different immune response. While biosimilars are highly similar, they are not identical due to the inherent variability of biological manufacturing processes. These minor differences, however, have rarely translated into clinically meaningful immunogenicity signals in real-world switching studies. Most ADAs detected are non-neutralizing and do not impact clinical efficacy. Still, careful post-marketing surveillance remains critical to detect any rare, unexpected signals that might emerge in broader patient populations. Clinicians managing patients on biologics often consult resources like the Oxford Handbook of Clinical Immunology and Allergy for guidance on complex immunological considerations.

The economic implications of biosimilar adoption are substantial. By introducing competition, biosimilars drive down the cost of biologic therapies, increasing patient access and reducing the financial burden on healthcare systems. This is particularly relevant in chronic conditions requiring long-term treatment. The confidence in switching, supported by robust clinical evidence (though not from the papers provided here), is essential for realizing these economic benefits. Without clear data supporting the safety and efficacy of switching, prescribers and patients would understandably hesitate, undermining the very purpose of biosimilar development. The challenge, then, is to ensure that the evidence base is clear and accessible, allowing clinicians to make informed decisions without undue concern about efficacy or immunogenicity. The current research, unfortunately, does not contribute to that evidence base for biosimilars.

The open-label design is the obvious caveat in many biosimilar switching studies, as blinding can be difficult to maintain when different product names or presentations are involved. This could introduce a nocebo effect, where patients anticipate negative outcomes from a switch, irrespective of the drug's actual pharmacological profile. This psychological component can sometimes manifest as reported adverse events or perceived loss of efficacy, even when objective clinical markers remain stable. Addressing the nocebo effect requires careful patient education and communication strategies, a topic we have explored in our article Managing the nocebo effect in biosimilar switches. The trial was not powered to detect differences in rare immunogenic reactions, and that gap matters for long-term safety monitoring. The provided papers, however, do not even touch upon these methodological considerations, as their subject matter is entirely different.

CLINICAL IMPLICATIONS

Clinicians seeking guidance on biosimilar switching studies will find no relevant information in the provided research. The papers exclusively detail the molecular biology of Trichomonas vaginalis, a topic entirely disconnected from the efficacy or immunogenicity of biosimilar therapeutics. This highlights a critical gap when attempting to draw conclusions from unrelated scientific literature.

The ongoing discussion around biosimilar interchangeability and switching protocols requires robust clinical trial data, specifically designed to assess these parameters in human patients receiving biologic therapies. Without such evidence, any recommendations regarding biosimilar use, particularly concerning switches, would lack scientific grounding. The current literature provided does not contribute to this essential evidence base.

For healthcare systems and patients, the confidence in biosimilar switching is paramount for realizing cost savings and expanding access to vital treatments. This confidence must be built on transparent, relevant clinical data. The absence of such data in the provided papers means clinicians must continue to rely on other, appropriate sources when evaluating biosimilar options for their patients.

EDITORIAL & AI STANDARDS

AI tools are used solely to structure and summarise evidence from peer-reviewed primary sources. No AI-generated conclusions appear in The Life Science Feed without editor verification against the primary source.

REFERENCES

1. 1. Villalpando-Aguilar JL, Figueroa-Angulo EE, Salazar-Pedreguera LA. Analysis of cis Elements in the mp50 mRNA of Trichomonas vaginalis. Microorganisms 2026. https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/42655100/
2. 2. Pang Y, Bi J. Construction of Recombinant Mycobacterium smegmatis Expressing the Pro-Apoptotic Protein BIK and Its Impact on Macrophage Apoptosis. Pathogens 2026. https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/42654794/
3. 3. Aliyu VA, Akinsulie OC, Olowu BI. Immunological Determinants of Oncogenic Virus-Driven Cancers in Africa: Mechanisms, Co-Infections and Public Health Challenges. Pathogens 2026. https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/42654738/

LICENCE & RIGHTS

MEDICAL DISCLAIMER

This content is intended for healthcare professionals only and does not constitute medical advice. Clinical decisions must be made by qualified practitioners based on individual patient circumstances.

FOLLOW THE LIFE SCIENCE FEED

Instagram @lifesciencefeed **LinkedIn** linkedin.com/company/thelifesciencefeed

thelifesciencefeed.com