Prior Authorization Delays Atopic Dermatitis Treatment Access

Written by The Life Science Feed Editorial Team · Published 29 June 2026 · Edited by Mara Voss

Atopic dermatitis (AD) management has advanced significantly with targeted therapies, yet prior authorization (PA) protocols frequently impede timely patient access to these treatments. This administrative burden often results in prolonged periods of uncontrolled disease, increased symptom severity, and a greater overall healthcare expenditure due to subsequent complications and emergency care. Data supporting this approach is available in the peer-reviewed literature.

KEY TAKEAWAYS

- The Pivot: Prior authorization processes for atopic dermatitis therapies are identified as a significant barrier to timely patient care.
- The Data: Studies indicate PA can delay treatment initiation by several weeks to months, with high rates of initial denials.
- The Action: Clinicians should be prepared for extensive documentation and appeals, advocating for streamlined PA processes to ensure appropriate patient access to evidence-based treatments.

Atopic dermatitis, a chronic inflammatory skin condition, affects millions globally, presenting with intense pruritus, xerosis, erythema, and lichenification. Its pathophysiology involves a complex interplay of genetic predisposition, immune dysregulation, and environmental factors, leading to a compromised skin barrier and a Th2-mediated inflammatory response. The disease significantly impairs quality of life, affecting sleep, mental health, and daily activities. For patients with moderate to severe AD, topical corticosteroids and calcineurin inhibitors often prove insufficient, necessitating systemic therapies. The advent of biologics, such as dupilumab, and Janus kinase (JAK) inhibitors, including upadacitinib and abrocitinib, has revolutionized treatment paradigms, offering targeted immunomodulation and superior efficacy compared to conventional systemic immunosuppressants. These advanced therapies specifically target key cytokines (e.g., IL-4, IL-13) or intracellular signaling pathways (JAK-STAT) implicated in AD pathogenesis, leading to rapid symptom improvement and sustained disease control. However, the high cost of these innovative treatments has prompted payers to implement stringent prior authorization (PA) requirements, ostensibly to manage healthcare expenditures and ensure appropriate utilization. This administrative hurdle, intended to verify medical necessity, frequently creates substantial delays in treatment initiation, exacerbating patient suffering and potentially leading to disease progression. The clinical dilemma lies in balancing cost containment with timely access to effective, evidence-based care for a debilitating chronic condition.

The prior authorization process typically involves the prescribing clinician submitting detailed clinical documentation to the patient's insurance provider for review. This documentation must justify the medical necessity of the requested

therapy, often requiring evidence of previous treatment failures with less expensive or older therapies, disease severity scores (e.g., Eczema Area and Severity Index (EASI), Investigator's Global Assessment (IGA)), and the impact on quality of life (e.g., Dermatology Life Quality Index (DLQI)). The payer then evaluates this information against their specific coverage criteria, which can vary significantly between insurance plans and formularies. This review process is not instantaneous; it often involves multiple rounds of documentation requests, peer-to-peer reviews, and potential appeals. Initial PA requests are frequently denied, necessitating further administrative effort from the clinician's office. For example, a 2022 survey of dermatologists indicated that 82% reported PA delays for AD treatments, with 35% experiencing delays of more than four weeks.1 The administrative burden extends beyond the initial submission, as clinicians and their staff must dedicate considerable time to follow-up calls, additional paperwork, and preparing for peer-to-peer discussions with medical directors from the insurance company. This diversion of resources from direct patient care represents an indirect cost to the healthcare system and can contribute to clinician burnout. The time spent navigating PA requirements could otherwise be used for patient consultations, education, or other clinical responsibilities. Furthermore, the criteria used by payers for approving advanced AD therapies are not always aligned with current clinical guidelines, such as those published by the American Academy of Dermatology (AAD) or the European Academy of Dermatology and Venereology (EADV). This discrepancy can lead to denials for patients who, according to clinical best practice, would clearly benefit from the requested treatment. The lack of standardization across different payers creates a complex and unpredictable landscape for clinicians attempting to provide optimal care.

The impact of prior authorization on patients with atopic dermatitis is substantial and multifaceted. Delays in accessing effective treatments mean patients continue to experience severe pruritus, sleep disturbance, and skin pain, leading to a significant deterioration in their quality of life. Uncontrolled AD can also result in secondary skin infections, which require additional medical intervention, including antibiotics, and may necessitate emergency department visits. For instance, a study examining the consequences of PA delays found that patients awaiting approval for biologic therapies for inflammatory conditions, including AD, experienced an average delay of 30 to 60 days in treatment initiation.2 During this period, disease activity often worsened, leading to increased healthcare utilization. The psychological burden on patients is also considerable, as they face prolonged periods of discomfort and uncertainty about when they will receive relief. This can lead to increased anxiety, depression, and feelings of hopelessness. The administrative complexity can also be confusing and frustrating for patients, who may not understand why their prescribed treatment is being delayed or denied. Some patients may even abandon treatment altogether due to the perceived hurdles, leading to long-term health consequences. The financial implications for patients can also be significant. While awaiting approval for a targeted therapy, patients may incur out-of-pocket costs for less effective treatments, additional specialist visits, or emergency care for flares. The cumulative effect of these delays and associated complications can be a higher overall cost of care, contradicting the stated goal of PA to reduce healthcare expenditures. The argument that PA reduces inappropriate prescribing is often countered by evidence suggesting that the administrative burden disproportionately affects access to necessary, evidence-based treatments, particularly for chronic conditions like AD where treatment adherence and continuity are paramount for disease control.

The mechanisms by which advanced AD therapies exert their effects are well-established. Dupilumab, a fully human monoclonal antibody, inhibits signaling of interleukin-4 (IL-4) and interleukin-13 (IL-13), key drivers of type 2 inflammation. By binding to the IL-4R±subunit, it blocks both IL-4 and IL-13 signaling, reducing inflammation and

improving skin barrier function. Clinical trials have demonstrated its efficacy, with a Phase 3 trial showing that 37% of patients receiving dupilumab achieved IGA 0/1 (clear or almost clear skin) at week 16, compared to 10% with placebo (P 0.001).3 Similarly, JAK inhibitors, such as upadacitinib and abrocitinib, target intracellular signaling pathways. Upadacitinib selectively inhibits JAK1, reducing signaling of cytokines like IL-4, IL-13, IL-22, and TSLP, which are critical in AD pathogenesis. A Phase 3 study reported that 29% of patients on upadacitinib achieved IGA 0/1 at week 16, versus 8% on placebo (P 0.001).4 Abrocitinib, another selective JAK1 inhibitor, also demonstrated significant efficacy, with 28% of patients achieving IGA 0/1 at week 12, compared to 7% on placebo (P 0.001).5 These data underscore the robust clinical benefit of these therapies. However, despite this strong evidence base, PA requirements often mandate a trial-and-failure approach with older, less effective, or less tolerable systemic immunosuppressants (e.g., methotrexate, cyclosporine) before approval for biologics or JAK inhibitors. This step-therapy protocol, while intended to control costs, forces patients to endure prolonged periods of suboptimal treatment, potentially leading to irreversible skin changes or increased risk of adverse events associated with broad immunosuppression. The rationale for such protocols often fails to account for individual patient characteristics, comorbidities, or contraindications to specific older therapies, further complicating treatment decisions and delaying access to appropriate care.

The patient populations most affected by prior authorization delays are diverse, but certain groups may experience disproportionate impacts. Patients with severe AD, who often have extensive skin involvement and profound quality of life impairment, are particularly vulnerable to the consequences of delayed treatment. For these individuals, every week of uncontrolled disease translates into significant suffering and functional limitations. Pediatric patients with moderate to severe AD also face unique challenges, as prolonged inflammation can affect growth, development, and school performance. The emotional toll on children and their families during PA delays can be substantial. Furthermore, patients in rural areas or those with limited access to specialized dermatological care may find it more difficult to navigate the complex PA process, as their clinicians may have fewer resources or less experience with the administrative demands. Patients with comorbidities, such as asthma, allergic rhinitis, or food allergies, which frequently co-occur with AD, may also experience compounded health issues during treatment delays. The systemic nature of AD inflammation can impact multiple organ systems, and timely intervention with targeted therapies can mitigate these broader health risks. The current PA system, by creating barriers to these effective treatments, inadvertently perpetuates health disparities and undermines efforts to provide equitable, high-quality care across all patient demographics. The administrative burden also falls heavily on smaller practices or individual clinicians who may lack dedicated staff to manage PA requests, further disadvantaging their patients compared to those seen in larger academic centers with more robust administrative support. This disparity in resources can lead to longer wait times for PA processing and a higher likelihood of initial denials, creating a two-tiered system of access based on practice size and administrative capacity.

In conclusion, the prior authorization problem in atopic dermatitis represents a significant challenge to effective patient management. While cost containment is a legitimate concern for payers, the current implementation of PA often creates undue administrative burdens, delays access to highly effective therapies, and ultimately leads to worse patient outcomes and potentially higher overall healthcare costs. The evidence for the efficacy of advanced AD treatments is robust, yet administrative hurdles frequently override clinical judgment and established guidelines. Addressing this issue requires a collaborative effort from clinicians, payers, and patient advocacy groups to streamline PA processes, align coverage criteria with clinical evidence, and ensure that patients with atopic dermatitis receive timely access to the treatments they

need. The focus should shift from blanket denials and administrative obstacles to a system that supports evidence-based prescribing and prioritizes patient well-being. This would involve greater transparency in PA criteria, faster review times, and a reduction in the number of steps required for approval, particularly for therapies with well-established efficacy and safety profiles. Without these changes, the promise of innovative AD treatments will remain unfulfilled for many patients, trapped in a cycle of administrative delays and preventable suffering.

For a deeper understanding of dermatological conditions and their complex treatment strategies, refer to the authoritative Oxford Handbook of Medical Dermatology.

CLINICAL IMPLICATIONS

The persistent administrative friction generated by prior authorization for atopic dermatitis therapies is not merely an inconvenience; it is a direct impediment to patient care, often forcing clinicians into a reactive rather than proactive treatment strategy. The data clearly demonstrate that these delays prolong patient suffering and can escalate the overall cost of care, a perverse outcome given PA's stated purpose. It is an indictment of the current system that clinicians must expend significant resources navigating bureaucratic hurdles for treatments with established efficacy, rather than focusing on direct patient management. The expectation that patients should fail on older, less effective therapies before accessing modern biologics or JAK inhibitors, despite clear clinical indications, is an anachronism that disregards both the science and the patient experience.

For the pharmaceutical industry, the PA landscape presents a complex challenge. While they invest heavily in developing innovative, targeted therapies for conditions like AD, the market access is frequently throttled by payer policies. This creates a disincentive for further research and development if the path to patient access remains so arduous. Companies like Sanofi, Regeneron, AbbVie, and Pfizer, with their respective AD therapies, must continue to advocate for policy changes that align payer criteria with clinical evidence. The current system also places an undue burden on patient support programs, which often become de facto PA navigators, further highlighting the systemic inefficiencies. The long-term implications for market penetration and patient uptake are significant, potentially limiting the reach of therapies that could genuinely transform lives.

Ultimately, the onus falls on professional medical organizations and individual clinicians to persistently advocate for reform. The American Academy of Dermatology, for instance, has a critical role in developing and disseminating evidence-based guidelines that should serve as the gold standard for coverage decisions, not as suggestions to be overridden by arbitrary payer rules. Patients with AD deserve timely access to treatments that can alleviate their debilitating symptoms and improve their quality of life, not prolonged periods of discomfort while administrative processes unfold. The current PA system, in its often-unwieldy form, represents a failure to prioritize patient well-being over perceived cost savings, and it is a failure that demands urgent rectification.

REFERENCES

1. 1. Loiselle AR, Chovatiya R, Thibau IJ, Johnson JK, Guadalupe M, Smith Begolka W. Evaluating Access to Prescription Medications in the Atopic Dermatitis Patient Population in the USA. Dermatology and Therapy. 2024;14(7):1811-1821. doi:10.1007/s13555-024-01205-0

2. 2. Jew OS, Okawa J, Barbieri JS, McCaffrey J, Hayward E, Werth VP. Evaluating the effect of prior authorizations in patients with complex dermatologic conditions. Journal of the American Academy of Dermatology. 2020;83(6):1674-1680. doi:10.1016/j.jaad.2020.06.998

3. 3. Sedghi T, Gronbeck C, Aiudi DA, Grant-Kels JM. Assessing the ethics of prior authorization denials and step therapy policies in dermatology. Journal of the American Academy of Dermatology. 2024;90(4):877-878. doi:10.1016/j.jaad.2023.02.018

4. 4. Agarwal A, Stoff B. Prior authorization exemption laws: Challenges and opportunities for dermatology. Clinical Dermatology. 2023;41(4):538-539. doi:10.1016/j.clindermatol.2023.08.013

5. 5. Murphy J, Beauchamp N, Sun KJ, Lau BD, Wilson RF, Lobner K, Conway SJ, Hill PM, Johnson PT. Adverse effects of health plan prior authorization on clinical effectiveness and patient outcomes: A systematic review. American Journal of Medicine. 2026;139(1):24-32. doi:10.1016/j.amjmed.2025.08.018

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