JAK Inhibitors in Alopecia Areata: Which One Delivers the Most Hair Regrowth?

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

Alopecia areata (AA) is a chronic autoimmune condition causing non-scarring hair loss, a disease with a highly unpredictable course. For years, clinicians relied on non-specific immunosuppressants, but the understanding of AA's immunopathogenesis, particularly the role of the Janus kinase-signal transducer and activator of transcription (JAK-STAT) pathway, has transformed treatment. Targeted JAK inhibitors have emerged as the first reliably effective systemic treatments for severe AA, leading to regulatory approvals for baricitinib, ritlecitinib, and deuruxolitinib.1

KEY TAKEAWAYS

- The Pivot: Approved JAK inhibitors offer clinically meaningful scalp hair regrowth for severe alopecia areata, but their comparative short-term efficacy varies.
- The Data: Indirect analyses suggest differences in short-term efficacy among baricitinib, ritlecitinib, and deuruxolitinib, though head-to-head trials are absent.
- The Action: Clinicians should consider the nuanced efficacy and safety profiles of each approved JAK inhibitor, recognizing that responses often deepen with continuous therapy.

Alopecia areata represents a significant challenge for patients and clinicians alike, characterized by its immune-mediated destruction of hair follicles. The disease's heterogeneity means that while some patients experience spontaneous remission, others face extensive, persistent hair loss, including alopecia totalis (complete scalp hair loss) or alopecia universalis (complete body hair loss). The discovery of the JAK-STAT pathway's central role, involving cytokines like interferon-gamma and interleukin-15, provided a clear therapeutic target.1 This understanding paved the way for the development of JAK inhibitors, a class of oral small molecules that modulate intracellular signaling pathways, thereby dampening the autoimmune response driving AA.1

Three JAK inhibitors, baricitinib, ritlecitinib, and deuruxolitinib, have gained regulatory approval for severe AA based on Phase 3 trials that were crucial for demonstrating efficacy. These trials enrolled patients with moderate to severe AA, typically defined by a Severity of Alopecia Tool (SALT) score of 50 or higher, indicating at least 50% scalp hair loss. The primary endpoint in these studies consistently focused on achieving a SALT score of 20 or less, signifying 80% or more scalp hair coverage, or a similar threshold for significant regrowth. Patient populations generally included adults, with some extension studies and real-world data now broadening the evidence base across age groups.1

Understanding the Mechanism of Action

JAK inhibitors exert their therapeutic effects by blocking the activity of Janus kinases, a family of intracellular tyrosine kinases (JAK1, JAK2, JAK3, and TYK2) that are critical components of cytokine receptor signaling. When cytokines bind to their receptors on the cell surface, they activate associated JAKs, which then phosphorylate STAT proteins. These phosphorylated STATs translocate to the nucleus, where they regulate gene expression, including genes involved in inflammation and immune responses. In AA, this pathway is aberrantly activated, leading to immune cell attack on hair follicles.1

Each approved JAK inhibitor exhibits a distinct selectivity profile for the various JAK isoforms. Baricitinib, for example, is a selective inhibitor of JAK1 and JAK2. Ritlecitinib targets JAK3 and the TEC kinase family, while deuruxolitinib is a dual inhibitor of JAK1 and JAK2. These differences in selectivity contribute to their unique pharmacological profiles, potentially influencing both efficacy and safety. The inhibition of specific JAKs aims to disrupt the inflammatory cascade that drives AA, allowing hair follicles to recover from immune attack and resume normal growth.1

The Efficacy Data: A Comparative Look

Phase 3 trials for each agent demonstrated clinically meaningful scalp hair regrowth, which was essential for regulatory approval. Baricitinib's efficacy was established in the BRAVE-AA1 and BRAVE-AA2 trials. In BRAVE-AA1, 38% of patients receiving baricitinib 4 mg achieved a SALT score of ≤20 at week 36, compared to 22.8% on 2 mg and 5.3% on placebo (P<.001 for both doses vs. placebo).1 The BRAVE-AA2 trial showed similar results, with 35.2% of patients on 4 mg achieving the primary endpoint.1

Ritlecitinib's efficacy was demonstrated in the ALLEGRO trial program. In ALLEGRO, 23% of patients on ritlecitinib 50 mg achieved a SALT score of ≤20 at week 24, compared to 1.6% on placebo (P<.001).1 Deuruxolitinib's data comes from the THRIVE-AA1 and THRIVE-AA2 trials. In THRIVE-AA1, 41.5% of patients on deuruxolitinib 12 mg twice daily achieved a SALT score of ≤20 at week 24, compared to 1.9% on placebo (P<.001).1

A network meta-analysis, published in Postgraduate Medical Journal, attempted an indirect comparison of these agents.2 The analysis found differences in short-term efficacy among the approved JAK inhibitors, but the authors cautioned that the absence of head-to-head trials requires careful interpretation.2 These indirect comparisons are inherently limited by variations in trial design, patient populations, and baseline characteristics across studies. For instance, the definition of severe AA or the duration of follow-up might differ subtly, making direct comparisons challenging.2

Safety Profiles and Adverse Events

The safety profiles of JAK inhibitors in AA are generally manageable, but clinicians must remain vigilant for potential adverse events. Common side effects across the class include infections, particularly upper respiratory tract infections, nasopharyngitis, and urinary tract infections.1 Herpes zoster reactivation is also a known risk, necessitating vaccination in appropriate patients.1

A large-scale meta-analysis of infection risk with JAK-STAT inhibitors, involving 29,000 patients across various indications, provided a broader context for safety.3 This analysis, published in the Journal of the European Academy of Dermatology and Venereology, highlighted that while infections are a concern, the overall risk profile is acceptable in appropriately selected patients.3 Other potential adverse events include elevated creatine phosphokinase (CPK) levels, lipid abnormalities, and, less commonly, venous thromboembolism (VTE) and major adverse cardiovascular events (MACE), particularly in older patients with cardiovascular risk factors, as observed with other JAK inhibitors in different

indications.1

The specific JAK selectivity of each drug may influence its safety profile. For example, JAK1/2 inhibitors like baricitinib and deuruxolitinib might have different hematological effects or lipid profiles compared to a JAK3 inhibitor like ritlecitinib. Monitoring guidelines typically recommend baseline and periodic blood tests, including complete blood counts, liver function tests, and lipid panels, to detect potential adverse events early.1

Long-Term Data and Real-World Evidence

Responses to JAK inhibitors often deepen over time with continuous therapy. Long-term extension studies for baricitinib, ritlecitinib, and deuruxolitinib have supported sustained efficacy and manageable safety profiles beyond the initial placebo-controlled periods.1 For instance, in the long-term extension of the BRAVE-AA trials, patients who continued baricitinib maintained or further improved their hair regrowth.1 This suggests that for many patients, consistent treatment is key to achieving and maintaining optimal results. Real-world data, though often less rigorously controlled than clinical trials, further supports the effectiveness of these agents in diverse clinical settings, including patients with comorbidities or those who have failed previous therapies.1

But, a substantial proportion of patients still fail to achieve near-complete or complete regrowth, highlighting an unmet need for even more effective treatments.1 All currently approved medicines for AA belong to the same drug class, which means patients who do not respond to one JAK inhibitor may not respond to another. This highlights the need for therapies with different mechanisms of action.1

Unmet Needs and Future Directions

Despite the significant advances, several challenges remain. There are currently no JAK inhibitors approved for pre-adolescents, leaving a critical gap in treatment options for younger patients with severe AA. Pediatric development programs are underway, and real-world observational studies are broadening the evidence base across age groups, but regulatory approvals for this population are still pending.1 Clinicians managing pediatric AA often face difficult decisions regarding off-label use of systemic therapies, balancing potential benefits against long-term safety concerns. For a broader perspective on patient-reported factors in AA, one might consider patient-reported factors in alopecia areata severity, which can influence treatment decisions.

The pipeline for AA treatments extends beyond JAK inhibitors, with other immunomodulatory strategies under investigation. These include agents targeting different cytokines or immune cell populations, offering hope for patients who do not respond to JAK inhibition.1 The goal is to develop therapies that can address AA pathobiology more comprehensively, potentially leading to higher rates of complete hair regrowth and more durable responses. The Oxford Handbook of Medical Dermatology provides a step-by-step guide to diagnosing and managing various skin conditions, including alopecia areata, offering practical guidance for clinicians.

The lack of head-to-head trials remains an obvious caveat when comparing the efficacy of baricitinib, ritlecitinib, and deuruxolitinib. While network meta-analyses offer some insight, they are indirect comparisons and cannot fully account for all differences between studies. Clinicians must weigh the available data, considering individual patient characteristics, comorbidities, and preferences when selecting a JAK inhibitor. The choice often comes down to a balance of perceived efficacy, safety profile, and patient-specific factors, rather than a clear-cut 'best in class' designation. The evolving market of autoimmune disease treatments, including JAK inhibitors in rheumatoid arthritis, provides a broader

context for understanding the class's safety and efficacy considerations.

The long-term safety data, particularly regarding cardiovascular events and malignancies, continues to be an area of active surveillance for the entire JAK inhibitor class. While the initial trials in AA have shown manageable safety, the broader experience with JAK inhibitors in other autoimmune conditions, such as rheumatoid arthritis, has raised concerns about these risks in specific patient populations.1 Continuous pharmacovigilance and real-world studies are essential to fully characterize the long-term safety profile of these agents in AA patients. This ongoing monitoring is critical for informing prescribing practices and ensuring patient safety.

The heterogeneity of AA itself presents a challenge for treatment. Patients with different clinical presentations, disease durations, or concomitant autoimmune conditions may respond differently to JAK inhibitors. Biomarkers that predict response to specific JAK inhibitors are still largely elusive, meaning treatment selection often relies on empirical approaches. Developing such biomarkers could personalize treatment strategies, ensuring that the right patient receives the right drug at the right time, thereby optimizing outcomes and minimizing unnecessary exposure to potential side effects. This is a common challenge across autoimmune diseases, as seen in the discussion around BTK inhibitors in CLL, where patient stratification is also a key area of research.

CLINICAL IMPLICATIONS

The arrival of JAK inhibitors has fundamentally changed how we manage severe alopecia areata, moving beyond broad immunosuppression to targeted therapy. Clinicians now have three approved oral options, baricitinib, ritlecitinib, and deuruxolitinib, each demonstrating significant hair regrowth in trials that were critical for their approval. This is a welcome shift for patients who previously had few effective systemic treatments.

But, the absence of head-to-head trials means direct comparisons of efficacy are based on indirect analyses, which carry inherent limitations. While some data points to differences in short-term efficacy, these are not definitive. Prescribing decisions must therefore consider individual patient factors, including comorbidities and potential drug interactions, alongside the specific safety profiles of each agent.

The class-wide safety concerns, particularly regarding infections and the need for careful monitoring, remain paramount. While generally manageable, clinicians must counsel patients thoroughly on these risks and adhere to monitoring guidelines. The fact that all approved agents belong to the same class also means that patients failing one JAK inhibitor may not benefit from another, highlighting the ongoing need for therapies with alternative mechanisms of action.

The current lack of approved options for pre-adolescents is a significant gap. While pediatric programs are in development, clinicians treating younger patients with severe AA are left with limited evidence-based choices. This highlights the need for continued research and development to address the full spectrum of patient needs in alopecia areata.

REFERENCES

1. 1. Domingues J, King B, Torres T. Alopecia Areata: Current and Emerging Therapies. Drugs. 2026.
2. 2. Xia Y, Chen H, Chen Y. Comparative efficacy of Janus kinase inhibitors in severe alopecia areata: a network meta-analysis based on randomized controlled trials. Postgrad Med J. 2026.
3. 3. Krebs M, Gulyás L, Fazekas KK. Large-scale meta-analysis of infection risk with JAK-STAT inhibitors in 29,000 patients. J Eur Acad Dermatol Venereol. 2026.

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