Bioequivalence Studies: Role In Enhancing the Quality of Pharmaceutical Pro Ducts

Bioequivalence studies play a crucial role in enhancing the quality of pharmaceutical products. These studies compare the performance of a test product with a reference product, ensuring no clinically significant difference in their bioavailability. These studies assess drug substance release, absorption, and concentration, providing insights into formulation equivalence. They serve as indicators of generic drug effectiveness and safety, avoiding the need for extensive clinical trials.[1] Bioequivalence studies apply not only to generics but also to innovator drugs in specific cases. Maintaining high manufacturing standards contributes to consistent quality, efficacy, and safety. The importance of these studies has grown with the increase in generic product production and usage.[2]

The rise of generic medications aims to reduce healthcare costs. However, healthcare professionals and pharmaceutical companies need help with interchangeability and bioequivalence. Quality differences due to manufacturing and technological variations raise concerns among medical practitioners. Therefore, conducting bioequivalence studies is crucial to ensure the safety and effectiveness of generic drugs. However, these studies may differ across countries.[3] To gain approval, Generic drugs must demonstrate "essential comparability" to the brand-name drug. This means having the same active ingredient, amount, form, route of administration, and therapeutic effectiveness. It is important to note that bioequivalence and therapeutic effectiveness are not interchangeable terms.[4,5]

Evidence on pharmacokinetics, effectiveness, and safety is gathered during the development of innovative drugs. In such instances, bioequivalence studies typically focus on healthy volunteers. The outcomes can be extrapolated to approved population groups, including the elderly, children, and patients with organ impairments.[6] Moreover, the effectiveness and safety of generic drugs have been debated since their introduction. Some physicians question the ability of regulatory authorities to ensure their quality. Concerns about interchangeability between brand-name and generic drugs arise in specific cases.[7] Regulatory authorities only approve generic drugs if they have a positive risk-benefit ratio and are similar to the pioneer product. Bioequivalence, which implies therapeutic equivalence, is used as a proxy for clinical outcomes. Most drugs can be substituted with generics, but critical dose therapeutic products with a narrow therapeutic range may not be suitable for substitution. However, when initiating a new treatment with any generic drug, its effectiveness, safety, and quality are ensured through bioequivalence studies. They act as substitutes for clinical trials and ensure similar concentration at the site of action.

Bioequivalence studies compare test and reference pharmaceutical products in vivo. A typical study design involves administering both products to volunteers with a washout period in between. Blood and/or urine samples are collected and analyzed to measure drug concentration and metabolites. The concentration-time curves provide insights into drug release and absorption. Bioequivalence metrics or calculated using these curves for product comparisons.[8]

When plasma concentration-time data is insufficient for evaluating bioequivalence, pharmacodynamic studies can provide comparability. However, a clinical trial is needed to demonstrate equivalence if relevant parameters cannot be measured. The statistical principles employed in bioequivalence studies apply to clinical trials as well. The number of patients in these trials depends on parameter variability and acceptance range, typically exceeding the number in bioequivalence studies.[8]

The requirement of bioequivalence studies applies to oral fast-release formulations with systemic effects, meeting criteria such as treating serious conditions, having a narrow therapeutic window, or exhibiting complex pharmacokinetics. Here, factors like variable absorption, nonlinear kinetics, and unfavourable physicochemical properties are also considered. However, there are certain instances where bioequivalence between a new drug and the reference product is unnecessary. These cases involve parenteral administration in liquid formulations with matching active ingredients and similar excipient concentrations or oral solutions with identical active ingredient concentrations, excluding excipients that impact gastro-intestinal transit or absorption.

When a manufacturer intends to introduce a competitive generic product to the market to achieve therapeutic equivalence, conducting the full range of trials required for the original, innovative product is unnecessary. If similarity is demonstrated through these studies, the generic product is considered therapeutically equivalent to the innovative drug product. This assures healthcare professionals and patients that

the generic product can be substituted for the innovative product without compromising therapeutic outcomes.[8]

REFERENCES

1. Schütz H, Labes D, Wolfsegger MJ. Critical Remarks on Reference-Scaled Average Bioequivalence. J Pharm Pharmaceut Sci 2022; 25: 285–296. https://doi.org/10.18433/jpps32892
2. Charoo NA. Converging generic drug product development: bioequivalence design and reference product selection. Clin Pharmacokinet 2020; 59(11): 1335-1355. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40262-020-00912-z
3. 3.Howard JN, Harris I, Frank G, Kiptanui Z, Qian J, Hansen R. Influencers of generic drug utilization: a systematic review. Res Soc Admin Pharm 2018; 14: 619–627. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sapharm.2017.08.001
4. Kollipara S, Ahmed T, Bhattiprolu AK, Chachad S. In vitro and In silico biopharmaceutic regulatory guidelines for generic bioequivalence for oral products: Comparison among various regulatory agencies. Biopharm Drug Dispos 2021; 42(7): 297-318. https://doi.org/10.1002/bdd.2292.
5. Miranda M, Sousa JJ, Veiga F, Cardoso C, Vitorino C. Bioequivalence of topical generic products. Part 2. Paving the way to a tailored regulatory system. Eur J Pharm Sci 2018; 15 (122): 264-272. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejps.2018.07.011.
6. Sravika S, Bhavana R, Sharmila V, Anusha S, Mounica NVN, Nagarjuna Reddy D. A comprehensive study on regulatory requirements for development and filing of generic drugs globally. Pharm Innovat 2017; 6(1): 153-158. https://doi.org/10.4103/2230-973X.104392
7. 7.Huh KY, Kim E, Lee S, Yoo H, Yoon S, Yu K-S et al. Current Bioequivalence Study Designs in South Korea: A Comprehensive Analysis of Bioequivalence Study Reports Between 2013 and 2019. Front Pharmaco 2021; 12(1): 651790. https://doi.org/10.3389/fphar.2021.651790
8. Lechat P. Interchangeability between generic and reference products: limits of average bioequivalence methodology. Eur J Drug Metab Pharmacokinet 2022; 47(6): 777-787. https://doi.org/10.1007/s13318-022-00785-6.

Dr Kulsoom Farhat
Department of Pharmacology
Army Medical College/
National University of Medical Sciences
(NUMS) Rawalpindi Pakistan