Why coeliac disease drug development keeps hitting a wall

Written by The Life Science Feed Editorial Team · Published 28 September 2026 · Edited by Mara Voss

Coeliac disease, a chronic autoimmune enteropathy triggered by gluten ingestion in genetically predisposed individuals, remains without approved pharmacologic therapies. Management relies solely on strict, lifelong adherence to a gluten-free diet, a regimen fraught with challenges and often insufficient to resolve symptoms or prevent long-term complications. This persistent reliance on dietary restriction highlights a significant unmet need for effective drug interventions.

KEY TAKEAWAYS

- The Pivot: Despite advances in understanding coeliac disease pathogenesis, no drug has yet achieved regulatory approval for its treatment.
- The Data: The primary endpoint for most trials, mucosal healing, is difficult to achieve and often does not correlate directly with patient-reported symptoms.
- The Action: Clinicians must continue to counsel patients on strict gluten avoidance, while acknowledging the limitations and patient burden of current management.

Coeliac disease affects approximately 1% of the global population, but its prevalence varies geographically. The condition manifests as inflammation and villous atrophy in the small intestine, leading to malabsorption and a wide array of gastrointestinal and extra-intestinal symptoms. These can range from abdominal pain, bloating, and diarrhoea to anaemia, osteoporosis, and neurological issues. Even with diligent dietary adherence, a substantial proportion of patients experience persistent symptoms or ongoing mucosal damage, a state often termed non-responsive coeliac disease. This clinical reality highlights the urgent demand for therapeutic alternatives beyond diet.

The immune response in coeliac disease is complex, involving both innate and adaptive immunity. Gluten peptides, particularly gliadin, are deamidated by tissue transglutaminase (tTG) in the small intestine. These deamidated peptides then bind to specific human leukocyte antigen (HLA) DQ2 or DQ8 molecules on antigen-presenting cells, leading to activation of CD4+ T cells. These activated T cells drive the inflammatory cascade, resulting in the characteristic intestinal damage. This detailed understanding of the immunopathogenesis has guided drug development efforts, targeting various points in this pathway.

The targets and the challenges

Drug development strategies for coeliac disease have broadly focused on three main areas: preventing gluten exposure or breakdown, modulating the immune response, and promoting mucosal healing. Each approach has faced distinct hurdles. Preventing gluten exposure, for instance, has involved enzymes designed to degrade gluten in the gut before it can trigger

an immune response. These oral enzyme therapies aim to supplement or replace the strict gluten-free diet, offering a degree of protection against inadvertent gluten ingestion. But achieving complete and consistent gluten detoxification in the complex environment of the human gut has proven difficult.

Modulating the immune response is another major avenue, with therapies targeting various components of the inflammatory cascade. These include agents that block specific HLA-DQ2/DQ8 binding, inhibit tTG activity, or interfere with T-cell activation and migration. For example, some investigational drugs have sought to sequester gluten peptides or block their interaction with intestinal epithelial cells. Others have explored immunomodulators that aim to dampen the T-cell response or promote regulatory T cells. The challenge here lies in achieving sufficient immune modulation to prevent damage without causing systemic immunosuppression, a common concern with many autoimmune therapies. The delicate balance between efficacy and safety is particularly critical for a chronic condition like coeliac disease, where patients may require long-term treatment.

Promoting mucosal healing directly is also a therapeutic goal, often pursued in conjunction with immune modulation. Restoring the integrity of the intestinal lining is essential for resolving malabsorption and reducing long-term risks. But mucosal healing can be slow and is not always directly correlated with symptomatic improvement, complicating clinical trial endpoints. Many trials have struggled to show a consistent and clinically meaningful impact on both histological and symptomatic outcomes. This disconnect between objective measures and patient experience is a recurring theme in chronic disease drug development, as seen in the challenges faced by patient-reported outcomes rarely making it onto drug labels.

Trial design complexities

Designing clinical trials for coeliac disease presents its own set of unique difficulties. The primary endpoint for many studies has been mucosal healing, assessed via endoscopy and biopsy. This is an invasive procedure, burdensome for patients, and subject to inter-observer variability. The definition of 'healing' itself can be debated, with different histological scoring systems in use. Symptomatic endpoints, while more patient-centric, are often subjective and can be influenced by the placebo effect, especially in conditions with fluctuating symptoms. The challenge of blinding patients to dietary interventions or potential gluten exposure further complicates trial design.

Recruiting appropriate patient populations is another hurdle. Patients with well-controlled coeliac disease on a strict gluten-free diet may not experience enough symptoms or mucosal damage to demonstrate a clear treatment effect. Conversely, patients with non-responsive coeliac disease, who represent a higher unmet need, often have more complex underlying pathologies that may not respond to a single targeted therapy. The heterogeneity of the disease presentation and severity makes it difficult to define a uniform patient cohort for clinical trials. This mirrors the difficulties in other complex neurological conditions, where the tominersen failure taught Huntington disease drug development lessons about patient selection and endpoint relevance, with the stake being the successful development of effective treatments.

The gluten challenge, a controlled reintroduction of gluten to provoke symptoms and mucosal damage, has been used in some trials to create a more uniform disease state. But this approach raises ethical concerns and can cause significant distress to patients, potentially impacting recruitment and retention. The duration of trials is also a factor; given the chronic nature of coeliac disease, long-term safety and efficacy data are essential, but extended trials are costly and complex to manage. The absence of a clear, universally accepted biomarker for disease activity or response to therapy complicates monitoring and endpoint assessment. While serological markers like anti-tTG antibodies are

useful for diagnosis, their utility in tracking treatment response is less clear, particularly in the short term. For a comprehensive overview of gastrointestinal and hepatological diseases, clinicians often refer to the Oxford Handbook of Gastroenterology & Hepatology.

The regulatory environment

Regulatory agencies, including the EMA and FDA, require robust evidence of both efficacy and safety for new drug approvals. For coeliac disease, this means demonstrating a clear benefit on clinically meaningful endpoints, such as sustained mucosal healing, significant symptom improvement, or a reduction in long-term complications. The lack of a single, universally accepted primary endpoint has made it difficult for developers to meet these stringent requirements consistently. Many candidates that showed early promise have failed in later-stage trials, unable to demonstrate a statistically significant and clinically relevant improvement over placebo or dietary management.

The high bar for safety is also a major consideration. Since coeliac disease is a chronic condition, any approved therapy would likely be taken for many years. This necessitates an extremely favourable safety profile, especially given that the current standard of care, a gluten-free diet, carries no direct drug-related adverse effects. Immunomodulatory drugs, in particular, face intense scrutiny regarding their potential for opportunistic infections or other long-term side effects. The industry has seen autoimmune drugs revoked following new safety data, underscoring the vigilance required.

But the scientific community continues to explore novel approaches. Gene therapy, microbiome modulation, and even vaccines against gluten are all areas of active research. These cutting-edge strategies aim to address the fundamental immunological drivers of the disease, potentially offering more durable and comprehensive solutions. But these are early-stage investigations, and the path to clinical translation is long and uncertain. The journey from understanding disease mechanism to developing an effective, safe, and approved drug for coeliac disease remains one of the more formidable challenges in gastroenterology.

CLINICAL IMPLICATIONS

The persistent absence of approved pharmacologic treatments for coeliac disease leaves clinicians in a difficult position, relying solely on dietary advice that is often insufficient. Patients continue to struggle with symptoms and the psychological burden of strict gluten avoidance, highlighting a profound gap in our therapeutic arsenal. This situation forces a pragmatic approach, where managing expectations and providing comprehensive dietary support become paramount.

Drug developers face an uphill battle, not just with the complex pathophysiology of coeliac disease, but also with the inherent challenges of trial design and regulatory expectations. The disconnect between histological endpoints and patient-reported outcomes is a recurring problem, making it hard to demonstrate a clear, compelling benefit. Until a therapy can consistently show both mucosal healing and symptomatic relief without significant side effects, the pipeline will remain frustratingly thin.

For now, the focus remains on optimising dietary adherence and managing complications. Clinicians must continue to educate patients thoroughly on gluten-free living, while also being acutely aware of the limitations of this approach. The hope for a true disease-modifying agent persists, but the road to approval is clearly paved with significant scientific and logistical obstacles.

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. Catassi C, Verdu EF, Bai JC, Lionetti E. Coeliac disease. Lancet. 2022;399(10344):2413-2426. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(22)00794-2
2. 2. Laurikka P, Kivelä L, Kurppa K, Kaukinen K. Review article: Systemic consequences of coeliac disease. Aliment Pharmacol Ther. 2022;56 Suppl 1(Suppl 1):S64-S72. doi:10.1111/apt.16912
3. 3. Shiha MG, Schiepatti A, Maimaris S, Nandi N, Penny HA, Sanders DS. Clinical outcomes of potential coeliac disease: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Gut. 2024;73(12):1944-1952. doi:10.1136/gutjnl-2024-333110
4. 4. Lebwohl B, Sanders DS, Green PHR. Coeliac disease. Lancet. 2018;391(10115):70-81. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(17)31796-8
5. 5. Al-Toma A, Volta U, Auricchio R, et al. European Society for the Study of Coeliac Disease (ESsCD) guideline for coeliac disease and other gluten-related disorders. United European Gastroenterol J. 2019;7(5):583-613. doi:10.1177/2050640619844125
6. 6. Gandini A, Gededzha MP, De Maayer T, Barrow P, Mayne E. Diagnosing coeliac disease: A literature review. Hum Immunol. 2021;82(12):930-936. doi:10.1016/j.humimm.2021.07.015

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