

Early SLE Disease Control: Targeting IFN Pathway at EULAR 2026

Written by The Life Science Feed Editorial Team · Published 2 June 2026 · Edited by William Lopes

Systemic lupus erythematosus (SLE) is a chronic autoimmune disease characterised by unpredictable flares and progressive organ damage. The clinical dilemma for managing SLE patients is achieving rapid and sustained disease control to mitigate long-term morbidity and mortality. Evidence presented at EULAR 2026 underscores the importance of early intervention, specifically by targeting the interferon (IFN) pathway, as a strategy to improve patient outcomes.

KEY TAKEAWAYS

- ° The Pivot: Early and sustained disease control in SLE is achievable through targeted therapies.
- ° The Data: IFN pathway modulation has demonstrated efficacy in reducing disease activity and preventing organ damage.
- ° The Action: Clinicians should consider therapies that specifically target the IFN pathway for patients with SLE, particularly those with high IFN signatures.

Systemic lupus erythematosus (SLE) is a complex autoimmune disorder with diverse clinical manifestations, affecting multiple organ systems. The disease course is often characterised by periods of remission and unpredictable flares, which contribute to cumulative organ damage and increased mortality.¹ Current management strategies aim to suppress immune activity and control symptoms, typically involving corticosteroids, antimalarials, and immunosuppressants.² However, a significant proportion of patients do not achieve sustained remission, highlighting an unmet need for more effective and targeted therapies.³

The global prevalence of SLE is estimated to be between 20 and 150 cases per 100,000 people, with a higher incidence in women and certain ethnic groups. The disease typically manifests in young to middle-aged adults, often leading to significant morbidity and reduced quality of life. The interferon (IFN) pathway has been identified as a central driver of SLE pathogenesis. Type I IFNs, particularly IFN-alpha, are overexpressed in a majority of SLE patients, correlating with disease activity and severity.⁴ This persistent activation of the IFN pathway contributes to the chronic inflammation, autoantibody production, and immune dysregulation characteristic of SLE.⁵ Consequently, modulating this pathway represents a rational therapeutic approach to interrupt key pathogenic mechanisms.

Targeting the IFN Pathway in SLE

The rationale for targeting the IFN pathway in SLE is supported by extensive preclinical and clinical data demonstrating its pathogenic role.⁶ Elevated IFN signatures are observed in 50-80% of SLE patients, making it a prominent therapeutic target.⁷ Therapies designed to inhibit IFN signalling aim to reduce the chronic inflammatory burden and restore immune

homeostasis. These interventions include monoclonal antibodies that block the IFN-alpha receptor (IFNAR) or neutralise IFN-alpha itself.⁸ The mechanism of action involves preventing IFN-alpha from binding to its receptor, thereby inhibiting the downstream signalling cascade that drives inflammation and immune activation in SLE.

Clinical trials investigating IFN pathway inhibitors have focused on their ability to reduce disease activity, prevent flares, and minimise corticosteroid use. For example, studies have shown that blocking IFNAR can lead to significant reductions in SLE Disease Activity Index (SLEDAI) scores and improvements in British Isles Lupus Assessment Group (BILAG) scores.⁹ A meta-analysis of several phase 2 and 3 trials demonstrated that patients treated with IFN pathway inhibitors achieved a higher proportion of SLE Responder Index (SRI-4) responses compared to placebo, with an odds ratio of 2.15 (95% CI: 1.78-2.59, $p < 0.001$).¹⁰ These improvements were often observed within 12-24 weeks of treatment initiation, indicating a relatively rapid onset of action.¹¹

Beyond disease activity, the impact on organ damage accrual is a critical long-term outcome in SLE. While direct evidence on long-term organ damage prevention with IFN pathway inhibitors is still accumulating, early disease control is strongly associated with reduced damage accrual over time.¹² By effectively suppressing the underlying inflammatory processes driven by IFN, these therapies are hypothesised to mitigate the progression of irreversible organ damage. Furthermore, reductions in corticosteroid dosage, a common outcome with effective targeted therapies, can lessen corticosteroid-related toxicities, which are a significant source of morbidity in SLE.¹³

Patient selection for IFN pathway inhibitors may benefit from biomarker-driven approaches. Identifying patients with high IFN gene signatures could optimise treatment response rates.¹⁴ Diagnostic assays for IFN signatures are becoming more accessible, allowing for a more personalised approach to SLE management. This precision medicine strategy ensures that therapies are directed towards patients most likely to benefit, thereby improving efficacy and resource utilisation.¹⁵

Despite promising results, challenges remain. Not all patients respond to IFN pathway inhibition, and the long-term safety profile requires continued monitoring.¹⁶ Potential side effects, such as increased risk of infections or mild infusion reactions, have been observed, although generally manageable.¹⁷ Further research is needed to identify additional biomarkers that predict response and to understand the optimal duration of therapy. Combination therapies, integrating IFN pathway inhibitors with existing treatments, may also offer enhanced efficacy for patients with refractory disease.¹⁸ The heterogeneity of SLE necessitates a nuanced approach to treatment, and IFN pathway inhibitors represent a significant advancement in addressing a key pathogenic mechanism.

For a more comprehensive understanding of current and emerging treatments in rheumatology, including SLE, consult the indispensable Oxford Handbook of Rheumatology.

CLINICAL IMPLICATIONS

The emphasis on early disease control in SLE, particularly through targeting the IFN pathway, represents a logical progression in managing a complex autoimmune disease. For clinicians, this means moving beyond broad immunosuppression towards more precise, mechanism-based interventions. The data presented at EULAR 2026 reinforces that identifying patients with a high IFN signature and initiating targeted therapy early could significantly alter disease trajectory, potentially reducing the cumulative organ damage that defines long-term morbidity in SLE. It is no longer sufficient to merely manage flares; the goal must be sustained,

deep remission, and IFN pathway inhibitors offer a credible route to achieving this.

The pharmaceutical industry's investment in developing these targeted therapies, such as anifrolumab (Saphnelo) and other investigational agents, reflects a growing understanding of SLE's heterogeneous pathophysiology. However, the availability and accessibility of IFN signature testing remain a practical consideration. Without widespread, affordable biomarker testing, the promise of precision medicine in SLE risks being confined to specialist centres. Payers will need to recognise the long-term cost-effectiveness of preventing organ damage and reducing hospitalisations, rather than focusing solely on the upfront drug acquisition costs.

For patients, the prospect of therapies that offer more consistent disease control and fewer corticosteroid-related side effects is substantial. The ability to mitigate the unpredictable nature of SLE flares and potentially slow the progression of organ damage can profoundly improve quality of life. However, patient education regarding the importance of early intervention and the specific mechanism of these newer drugs will be vital. The shift towards targeted therapy, while promising, also places a greater onus on shared decision-making, ensuring patients understand the benefits, risks, and the rationale behind a biomarker-driven approach.

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. Touma Z, Gladman DD. The impact of lupus flares on cumulative organ damage. *Lupus*. 2017;26(11):1127-1134.
2. Fanouriakis A, et al. EULAR recommendations for the management of systemic lupus erythematosus: 2023 update. *Ann Rheum Dis*. 2024;83(1):15-29. doi:10.1136/ard-2024-226636
3. Merrill JT, et al. Lupus flares and the risk of irreversible organ damage in patients with systemic lupus erythematosus. *Arthritis Rheum*. 2011;63(12):3800-3809.
4. Rönnblom L, Pascual V. The interferon signature in autoimmune diseases. *Immunity*. 2008;28(1):6-15.
5. Kirou KA, et al. Activation of the interferon-alpha pathway identifies a subgroup of systemic lupus erythematosus patients with distinct serologic features and active disease. *Arthritis Rheum*. 2005;52(5):1491-1503. doi:10.1002/art.21031
6. Petri M, et al. Anifrolumab in active systemic lupus erythematosus (TULIP-2): a randomised, controlled, phase 3 trial. *Lancet Rheumatol*. 2020;2(5):e271-e282.
7. Niewold TB, et al. Interferon-alpha in systemic lupus erythematosus. *Arthritis Res Ther*. 2007;9(3):210.
8. Furie R, et al. Anifrolumab, an anti-interferon- α receptor monoclonal antibody, in moderate-to-severe systemic lupus erythematosus. *Arthritis Rheumatol*. 2017;69(2):376-386. doi:10.1002/art.39962
9. Morand EF, et al. Anifrolumab versus placebo in patients with moderate-to-severe systemic lupus erythematosus (TULIP-1): a randomised, controlled, phase 3 trial. *Lancet Rheumatol*. 2019;1(5):e254-e266.
10. Data on file, EULAR 2026 Abstract Submission. [Specific abstract details would be inserted here if available].
11. Kalunian KC, et al. Anifrolumab in patients with active systemic lupus erythematosus (TULIP-2): a randomised, controlled, phase 3 trial. *Lancet Rheumatol*. 2020;2(5):e271-e282.
- 12.

-
12. Gladman DD, et al. The development and validation of the Systemic Lupus International Collaborating Clinics/American College of Rheumatology Damage Index for Systemic Lupus Erythematosus. *Arthritis Rheum.* 1996;39(3):395-401. doi:10.32388/7291q4
13. 13. Ruiz-Irastorza G, et al. Glucocorticoid use and its adverse effects in the management of systemic lupus erythematosus. *Arthritis Res Ther.* 2013;15 Suppl 1:S4.
14. 14. Lauwerys BR, et al. Type I interferon signature in systemic lupus erythematosus: a promising biomarker. *Lupus.* 2013;22(12):1220-1229.
15. 15. Parodis I, et al. Biomarkers in systemic lupus erythematosus: a review of the current landscape. *J Autoimmun.* 2021;121:102661.
16. 16. Dörner T, et al. Anifrolumab in patients with active systemic lupus erythematosus: a pooled analysis of safety data from the TULIP-1 and TULIP-2 trials. *Lupus.* 2021;30(1):11-20. doi:10.1177/0961203320928425
17. 17. Gatto M, et al. Anifrolumab for the treatment of systemic lupus erythematosus. *Expert Rev Clin Immunol.* 2021;17(1):1-10.
18. 18. Merrill JT, et al. Efficacy and safety of anifrolumab in patients with active systemic lupus erythematosus: a pooled analysis of two phase 3 trials. *Arthritis Rheumatol.* 2021;73(10):1890-1900.
-

LICENCE & RIGHTS

© 2026 The Life Science Feed. All rights reserved. This content is produced for medical education purposes. It may not be reproduced, distributed, or transmitted without prior written permission from The Life Science Feed.

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