When complement inhibitors fail: Recognizing breakthrough haemolysis

Written by The Life Science Feed Editorial Team · Edited by William Lopes

Patients with complement-mediated diseases rely on complement inhibitors to control haemolysis and prevent organ damage. But even with optimal dosing, some patients experience breakthrough haemolysis, a critical event that demands immediate clinical attention. Understanding the mechanisms behind this failure and implementing a rapid response strategy is paramount for improving patient outcomes.

KEY TAKEAWAYS

- The Pivot: Breakthrough haemolysis can occur despite ongoing complement inhibitor therapy, necessitating a structured diagnostic and management approach.
- The Data: No specific numeric results are available from the provided research papers, but the clinical imperative is to identify and address the underlying cause swiftly.
- The Action: Clinicians must maintain a high index of suspicion for breakthrough haemolysis, investigate potential triggers, and be prepared to escalate therapy or switch agents.

Complement-mediated diseases, such as paroxysmal nocturnal haemoglobinuria (PNH) and atypical haemolytic uremic syndrome (aHUS), are characterised by uncontrolled activation of the complement system, leading to erythrocyte destruction, thrombosis, and organ dysfunction. The introduction of complement inhibitors has revolutionised the management of these conditions, offering significant improvements in patient morbidity and mortality. These agents, typically monoclonal antibodies targeting C5, effectively block the terminal complement pathway, preventing the formation of the membrane attack complex and subsequent cell lysis.

Despite the efficacy of these therapies, a subset of patients experiences episodes of haemolysis while on treatment. This phenomenon, termed breakthrough haemolysis, is a serious complication that can lead to acute kidney injury, thrombotic microangiopathy, and life-threatening anaemia. It represents a failure of the current therapeutic regimen to adequately control complement activation, and its occurrence necessitates a thorough investigation into the underlying cause and a rapid adjustment of treatment strategy.

Understanding the Mechanisms of Breakthrough Haemolysis

Breakthrough haemolysis is not a monolithic entity; its causes are diverse and often multifactorial. One primary mechanism involves inadequate drug levels. This can stem from suboptimal dosing, particularly in patients with higher body weight or increased complement activation due to concurrent infections or inflammatory states. Some individuals may also exhibit accelerated drug clearance, leading to subtherapeutic concentrations despite standard dosing regimens. Genetic polymorphisms affecting drug metabolism or target binding could also contribute to this variability, though these

are less commonly implicated in routine clinical practice.

Another significant factor is the development of anti-drug antibodies (ADAs). These antibodies can neutralise the therapeutic effect of the complement inhibitor, rendering it ineffective. The presence of ADAs can be challenging to detect in a timely manner, as routine monitoring for these antibodies is not universally performed. When suspected, specialised laboratory testing is required to confirm their presence and assess their neutralising capacity. This is particularly relevant for patients who initially responded well to therapy but subsequently experience a loss of efficacy.

Beyond drug-related issues, breakthrough haemolysis can also be triggered by intercurrent events that acutely amplify complement activation. Infections, especially those caused by encapsulated bacteria, are well-known precipitants. Surgical procedures, trauma, and other inflammatory conditions can also overwhelm the inhibitory capacity of the complement blocker, leading to a surge in complement activity. In these scenarios, the underlying disease process itself is exacerbated, pushing the complement system beyond the drug's ability to control it. For a deeper understanding of how complement inhibition works in specific conditions, consider reviewing real-world data on proximal complement inhibition in PNH.

Recognising the Clinical Signs

Early recognition of breakthrough haemolysis is critical. Clinicians must maintain a high index of suspicion, particularly in patients presenting with new or worsening symptoms of anaemia, fatigue, dark urine, or signs of organ dysfunction. Laboratory markers provide objective evidence. A sudden drop in haemoglobin, an increase in lactate dehydrogenase (LDH), and a rise in indirect bilirubin are classic indicators of ongoing haemolysis. Haptoglobin levels will typically be low or undetectable, reflecting its consumption by free haemoglobin. The presence of schistocytes on a peripheral blood smear can further support the diagnosis of microangiopathic haemolytic anaemia, a common feature in conditions like aHUS.

Monitoring complement activity directly can also be invaluable. While C5 inhibitors block terminal complement activation, proximal complement components (e.g., C3, C4) may still be activated. Measuring CH50 (total haemolytic complement) activity can assess the overall functional integrity of the classical and alternative pathways. A persistently low or undetectable CH50 in a patient on a C5 inhibitor suggests effective blockade, but a rise in CH50 activity could indicate a loss of drug efficacy or overwhelming complement activation. Complement factor levels, such as C3 and C4, can also provide insights into the specific pathway being activated, though their interpretation requires careful consideration in the context of complement inhibitor therapy.

The clinical picture often dictates the urgency of intervention. Patients presenting with severe anaemia requiring transfusion, acute kidney injury, or neurological symptoms demand immediate and aggressive management. Less severe presentations may allow for a more systematic diagnostic workup, but the principle remains the same: identify the cause and intervene swiftly to prevent irreversible organ damage. The Oxford Handbook of Clinical Haematology offers a concise reference for managing such complex haematological conditions.

Responding to Breakthrough Haemolysis

Once breakthrough haemolysis is suspected, a structured response is essential. The first step involves confirming the diagnosis through laboratory testing and ruling out other causes of anaemia or organ dysfunction. This includes assessing for concurrent infections, drug-induced haemolysis, or other autoimmune conditions that might mimic

complement-mediated disease. A thorough medication review is also necessary to identify any drugs that might interfere with the complement inhibitor or exacerbate haemolysis.

If inadequate drug levels are suspected, increasing the dose or frequency of the current complement inhibitor may be warranted. Therapeutic drug monitoring (TDM) can guide these adjustments, ensuring that drug concentrations are within the therapeutic range. For patients who develop ADAs, switching to an alternative complement inhibitor with a different epitope binding site or a different mechanism of action may be necessary. Newer complement inhibitors targeting different points in the complement cascade, such as C3 inhibitors, offer alternative therapeutic options for these challenging cases. The evolving market of these therapies is a constant area of discussion, similar to the considerations for BTK inhibitors in CLL.

In cases where intercurrent events trigger breakthrough haemolysis, managing the underlying trigger is paramount. This includes aggressive treatment of infections with appropriate antibiotics, supportive care for inflammatory conditions, and careful monitoring during surgical procedures. Plasma exchange (PLEX) can be a life-saving intervention in acute, severe breakthrough haemolysis, particularly in aHUS, by removing activated complement components and replenishing deficient regulatory proteins. PLEX provides a rapid, albeit temporary, control of complement activity while definitive measures are being implemented.

Long-term management often involves a re-evaluation of the patient's baseline complement activity and disease severity. Some patients may require a higher maintenance dose of their complement inhibitor, or a combination therapy approach, to prevent future episodes. The goal is to achieve sustained control of haemolysis and prevent long-term complications, ensuring patients can maintain a good quality of life. The open-label design of many initial studies in this area is an obvious caveat, as it can introduce bias in symptom reporting, but the clinical imperative to manage these events remains clear.

CLINICAL IMPLICATIONS

The occurrence of breakthrough haemolysis on complement inhibitors highlights the need for vigilant monitoring and a proactive approach in managing these complex patients. Clinicians cannot assume that a patient on a complement inhibitor is immune to haemolytic crises; the reality demands a high index of suspicion for any new or worsening symptoms. This requires a shift from reactive management to a more anticipatory strategy, particularly around intercurrent illnesses or surgical interventions.

The pharmaceutical industry also faces a challenge. The development of anti-drug antibodies is a known issue with many biologics, and complement inhibitors are no exception. Better assays for early detection of ADAs and the development of novel agents with different mechanisms of action or reduced immunogenicity are critical. This would provide more options for patients who fail initial therapy, moving beyond simply escalating the dose of an ineffective drug.

For patients, breakthrough haemolysis can be terrifying, often mimicking the initial presentation of their disease. Clear communication about the potential for such events, and what symptoms to look out for, is essential. Empowering patients to recognise early signs and seek prompt medical attention can significantly impact outcomes, potentially averting severe complications and hospitalisations. The next generation of trials needs to focus on predictive biomarkers to identify patients at highest risk of breakthrough events before they occur.

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. Hill A, DeZern AE, Kinoshita T, Brodsky RA. Paroxysmal nocturnal haemoglobinuria. Nat Rev Dis Primers. 2017;3:17028. doi:10.1038/nrdp.2017.28
2. 2. Manning JE, Ciantar E, Griffin M, Kelly RJ. Paroxysmal nocturnal haemoglobinuria in pregnancy-a systematic review with meta analysis. Ann Hematol. 2025;104(4):2517-2525. doi:10.1007/s00277-025-06353-7
3. 3. Heo YA. Pegcetacoplan: A Review in Paroxysmal Nocturnal Haemoglobinuria. Drugs. 2022;82(18):1727-1735. doi:10.1007/s40265-022-01809-w
4. 4. Waheed A, Shammo J, Dingli D. Paroxysmal nocturnal hemoglobinuria: Review of the patient experience and treatment landscape. Blood Rev. 2024;64:101158. doi:10.1016/j.blre.2023.101158
5. 5. Godby RC, Shah S. Paroxysmal Nocturnal Hemoglobinuria. Mayo Clin Proc. 2025;100(12):2206-2227. doi:10.1016/j.mayocp.2025.07.029
6. 6. Brodsky RA. Paroxysmal nocturnal hemoglobinuria. Blood. 2014;124(18):2804-11. doi:10.1182/blood-2014-02-522128

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