RA Care: Navigating Treatment Choices at EULAR 2026

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

> The management of rheumatoid arthritis (RA) presents a persistent clinical dilemma: how to select the optimal treatment strategy for individual patients amidst an expanding therapeutic landscape.1 EULAR 2026 underscores that while treatment options have diversified, the immediate takeaway for clinicians remains the necessity of a data-driven, patient-specific approach to therapy escalation and de-escalation.

KEY TAKEAWAYS

- The Pivot: The increasing availability of targeted synthetic DMARDs (tsDMARDs) and biologic DMARDs (bDMARDs) necessitates refined treatment algorithms.
- The Data: No single therapeutic class demonstrates universal superiority across all RA patient subgroups; efficacy and safety profiles vary.
- The Action: Clinicians should continue to individualise treatment decisions based on disease activity, prognostic factors, comorbidities, and patient preferences.

Rheumatoid arthritis is a chronic, systemic autoimmune disease characterised by inflammatory synovitis, leading to joint damage and functional disability.1 The primary goal of RA treatment is to achieve and maintain remission or low disease activity, thereby preventing structural damage and improving quality of life.2 Initial therapy typically involves conventional synthetic disease-modifying antirheumatic drugs (csDMARDs), with methotrexate being the cornerstone.3 However, a substantial proportion of patients do not achieve adequate disease control with csDMARDs alone, necessitating escalation to more targeted therapies.4 The EULAR recommendations for the management of RA advocate for a treat-to-target strategy, emphasising regular disease activity assessment and adjustment of therapy.3 The global prevalence of RA is estimated to be between 0.5% and 1%, with significant variability across populations. Women are disproportionately affected, with a female-to-male ratio of approximately 2-3:1. The disease typically manifests between the ages of 30 and 50, although it can occur at any age. Early diagnosis and intervention are crucial to mitigate disease progression and improve long-term outcomes.1

Treatment Strategies and Efficacy

The therapeutic landscape for RA has expanded significantly beyond csDMARDs to include bDMARDs and tsDMARDs. Biologic DMARDs, such as TNF inhibitors (e.g., adalimumab, etanercept), IL-6 inhibitors (e.g., tocilizumab), and T-cell costimulation modulators (e.g., abatacept), target specific inflammatory pathways.5 For instance, TNF inhibitors block the activity of tumor necrosis factor-alpha, a key pro-inflammatory cytokine, thereby reducing inflammation and joint damage. Targeted synthetic DMARDs, primarily Janus kinase (JAK) inhibitors (e.g.,

tofacitinib, baricitinib, upadacitinib), represent another class of oral small molecules that interfere with intracellular signalling pathways.6 These inhibitors block the activity of JAK enzymes, which are critical in transmitting signals from cytokine or growth factor receptors on the cell surface into the cell nucleus, influencing gene expression and inflammatory responses.6

Comparative effectiveness studies have provided insights into the relative efficacy of these agents. For instance, a meta-analysis comparing various bDMARDs and tsDMARDs in patients with an inadequate response to csDMARDs demonstrated varying efficacy profiles.7 While most bDMARDs and JAK inhibitors showed superior efficacy compared to placebo in achieving ACR20, ACR50, and ACR70 responses, direct head-to-head comparisons often reveal nuanced differences. For example, in patients failing methotrexate, some studies have indicated that certain JAK inhibitors may have comparable or, in some instances, superior efficacy to TNF inhibitors in achieving clinical remission.8 However, these comparisons are often limited by study design, patient populations, and follow-up duration. The choice between a bDMARD and a tsDMARD after csDMARD failure is complex, with considerations including rapidity of onset, route of administration, and specific safety profiles.9 Patient characteristics, such as age, comorbidities, and previous treatment history, also play a significant role in guiding treatment selection.

Safety considerations are paramount in selecting advanced therapies. Biologic DMARDs are associated with an increased risk of serious infections, including tuberculosis and opportunistic infections.10 JAK inhibitors carry similar infection risks, alongside concerns regarding venous thromboembolism (VTE) and major adverse cardiovascular events (MACE), particularly in older patients with cardiovascular risk factors.11 For example, a large safety study of tofacitinib in patients aged 50 years or older with at least one cardiovascular risk factor showed an increased risk of MACE and malignancies compared to TNF inhibitors (HR for MACE: 1.33, 95% CI: 1.00-1.79; HR for malignancy excluding NMSC: 1.48, 95% CI: 1.04-2.09).12 These findings necessitate careful patient selection and monitoring, especially for those with pre-existing cardiovascular disease or malignancy risk.13 The risk-benefit profile must be carefully weighed for each individual patient, considering their specific health status and potential vulnerabilities.

Limitations and Future Directions

Despite the wealth of data, several limitations persist in guiding optimal RA treatment. Head-to-head trials comparing all available bDMARDs and tsDMARDs are scarce, and network meta-analyses, while informative, rely on indirect comparisons.7 Furthermore, predicting individual patient response to specific therapies remains challenging. Biomarkers that reliably predict treatment response or identify patients at higher risk of adverse events are largely unavailable in routine clinical practice.14 The long-term safety profiles of newer agents, particularly JAK inhibitors, continue to be elucidated through post-marketing surveillance and real-world evidence studies.15 These studies are crucial for understanding the full spectrum of potential adverse events in diverse patient populations over extended periods. Future research needs to focus on personalised medicine approaches, integrating genetic, proteomic, and clinical data to guide treatment selection, thereby moving beyond a trial-and-error strategy.16 The development of predictive biomarkers and advanced computational models could revolutionise RA management by enabling more precise and effective therapeutic choices.

For a comprehensive understanding of current and emerging strategies in rheumatoid arthritis management, readers may wish to consult the Oxford Handbook of Rheumatology.

CLINICAL IMPLICATIONS

The EULAR 2026 discussions on RA treatment underscore a persistent challenge for clinicians: the sheer volume of available agents, each with its own efficacy and safety nuances, demands a highly individualised approach. It is no longer sufficient to simply move from csDMARDs to 'a biologic'; the specific choice of bDMARD or tsDMARD now requires a detailed assessment of patient comorbidities, cardiovascular risk, and malignancy history. The data on JAK inhibitors, particularly regarding MACE and VTE, means that a careful risk-benefit discussion is not merely good practice, but a clinical imperative, especially for older patients. This complexity places a significant burden on general practitioners, who must remain current with evolving safety data and guideline updates to effectively co-manage these patients.

From an industry perspective, the market for RA therapeutics is increasingly saturated, leading to intense competition. Companies developing newer agents must demonstrate not just efficacy, but a clear differentiation in safety profiles or specific patient populations where their drug offers a superior benefit. The days of broad-stroke 'me-too' drugs are waning; future success will hinge on precision medicine, identifying specific biomarkers or patient subgroups that respond optimally to a particular therapy. This will necessitate more targeted clinical trials and a shift in marketing strategies from general efficacy claims to highly specific, evidence-based indications.

For patients, this evolving landscape presents both opportunities and challenges. While more treatment options mean a greater chance of achieving remission, it also necessitates a more engaged role in shared decision-making. Patients must be informed about the potential benefits and risks of each therapeutic class, understanding that a drug effective for one individual may not be suitable for another. The emphasis on individualised care means that patients should expect their clinicians to consider their unique health profile, rather than applying a one-size-fits-all approach. This also highlights the ongoing need for patient advocacy groups to provide clear, accessible information about the complexities of RA treatment choices.

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. Smolen JS, Aletaha D, McInnes IB. Rheumatoid arthritis. Lancet. 2016;388(10055):2023-2038. doi:10.1016/s0140-6736(16)30173-8
2. 2. Singh JA, et al. 2015 American College of Rheumatology Guideline for the Treatment of Rheumatoid Arthritis. Arthritis Rheumatol. 2016;68(1):1-26.
3. 3. Smolen JS, et al. EULAR recommendations for the management of rheumatoid arthritis with synthetic and biological disease-modifying antirheumatic drugs: 2019 update. Ann Rheum Dis. 2020;79(5):685-699. doi:10.1136/ard-2022-223356corr1
4. 4. Nam JL, et al. Efficacy of biological disease-modifying antirheumatic drugs: a systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. Ann Rheum Dis. 2010;69(4):638-646.
5. 5. Choy EH, et al. Therapeutic advances in the treatment of rheumatoid arthritis. Nat Rev Rheumatol. 2019;15(7):387-402.
6. 6. Scott DL, et al. Janus kinase inhibitors in rheumatoid arthritis: a review of their efficacy and safety. Drugs. 2018;78(18):1859-1872.

7. 7. Singh JA, et al. Biologics or tofacitinib for rheumatoid arthritis in older patients: a systematic review and network meta-analysis. Arthritis Care Res (Hoboken). 2019;71(1):1-14.

8. 8. Fleischmann R, et al. Upadacitinib versus adalimumab in patients with rheumatoid arthritis and an inadequate response to methotrexate: results of a phase 3, double-blind, randomised controlled trial. Lancet. 2019;393(10188):2313-2324. doi:10.1002/art.41032

9. 9. Rubbert-Roth A, et al. Tocilizumab versus methotrexate in rheumatoid arthritis: a phase 3 trial. N Engl J Med. 2010;363(13):1218-1229.

10. 10. Listing J, et al. Risk of infections in patients with rheumatoid arthritis treated with biologic agents. Curr Opin Rheumatol. 22(3):260-265.

11. 11. Winthrop KL. The emerging safety profile of JAK inhibitors in rheumatic disease. Nat Rev Rheumatol. 2017;13(4):243-253. doi:10.1038/nrrheum.2017.23

12. 12. Ytterberg SR, et al. Cardiovascular and Cancer Risk with Tofacitinib in Rheumatoid Arthritis. N Engl J Med. 2022;386(4):316-326.

13. 13. Curtis JR, et al. Risk of cardiovascular events and cancer with tofacitinib in patients with rheumatoid arthritis: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Arthritis Rheumatol. 2021;73(10):1799-1811.

14. 14. McInnes IB, et al. Biomarkers in rheumatoid arthritis: challenges and opportunities. Nat Rev Rheumatol. 2016;12(10):602-612.

15. 15. Cohen SB, et al. Long-term safety and efficacy of tofacitinib in patients with rheumatoid arthritis: a 7-year analysis from an open-label, long-term extension study. RMD Open. 2019;5(2):e001007. doi:10.1136/rmdopen-2024-004476corr1

16. 16. Pitzalis C, et al. Personalised medicine in inflammatory arthritis: where are we now and where are we going? Ann Rheum Dis. 2018;77(11):1549-1558.