SCIENTIFIC CULTURE
www.sci-cult.com

SCIENTIFIC CULTURE, Vol. 12, No. 4, (2026), pp. 10115-10129
Open Access. Online & Print

DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.21536056

ERYTHROPOIETIN AND ITS BIOSIMILARS: A REVIEW OF PRODUCTION TECHNIQUES, SAFETY, AND THERAPEUTIC EFFICACY

Mohammed Zeed Alzahrani[1]*, Mohammed Mustafa Oural Sharara[1], Rashad Mohammad Alghamdi[1], Noora Khaled Alkhurayef[1]

[1] Saudi Food and Drug Authority, Riyadh, Saudi Arabia

Received: 08/11/2025
Accepted: 04/03/2026

Corresponding Author: Mohammed Zeed Alzahrani

ABSTRACT

Erythropoietin (EPO) is a glycoprotein hormone essential for regulating red blood cell production, and recombinant human erythropoietin (rHuEPO) has become a cornerstone in the management of anemia, particularly in patients with chronic kidney disease (CKD) and those undergoing chemotherapy. The expiration of patents for originator epoetins has enabled the development of biosimilars—highly similar biological products that offer the potential for expanded patient access and reduced healthcare costs. This review provides a comprehensive analysis of the production techniques, safety, and therapeutic efficacy of EPO and its biosimilars. The manufacturing process relies on recombinant DNA technology using Chinese Hamster Ovary (CHO) cells, with rigorous emphasis on cell line development, upstream and downstream processing, and the critical quality attribute of glycosylation, which directly impacts in vivo stability, biological activity, and immunogenicity. The biosimilar development paradigm is built upon extensive analytical characterization (including primary, higher-order, and glycan structure comparisons) followed by abbreviated clinical pathways that include pharmacokinetic/pharmacodynamic studies, comparative equivalence trials, and immunogenicity assessments. Clinical evidence, supported by meta-analyses, demonstrates equivalent hemoglobin response rates and dose equivalence between biosimilars and reference products, enabling a 1:1 dose conversion in adult patients. Specific dosing guidelines for adult and pediatric CKD patients are reviewed, along with the role of the long-acting alternative darbepoetin alfa. The historical pure red cell aplasia (PRCA) crisis is examined as a cautionary tale, and extensive post-marketing surveillance confirms that modern EPO biosimilars do not carry an increased immunogenicity risk. The principle of indication extrapolation is scientifically justified based on a consistent mechanism of action, allowing biosimilar approval across all reference product indications. Overall, EPO biosimilars represent rigorously validated, therapeutically equivalent, and cost-effective alternatives that have been successfully integrated into global clinical practice.

KEYWORDS: Erythropoietin, Biosimilars, Production Techniques, Chronic Kidney Disease, Recombinant DNA Technology.

INTRODUCTION

Erythropoietin (EPO) is a quintessential example of how the application of recombinant DNA technology can revolutionize clinical medicine. This glycoprotein hormone, primarily synthesized in the renal cortex in adults, is the principal regulator of erythropoiesis, acting on bone marrow erythroid progenitors to promote their survival, proliferation, and differentiation into mature red blood cells [1]. The critical link between EPO deficiency and the anemia associated with chronic kidney disease (CKD) was established decades ago, but it was not until the successful cloning of the human EPO gene in 1985 that a therapeutic revolution began [2]. The subsequent development and approval of recombinant human erythropoietin (rHuEPO, epoetin alfa) in the late 1980s marked a paradigm shift, effectively liberating countless patients from the burdens of frequent blood transfusions and significantly improving their quality of life [3].

The clinical success of originator epoetins (alfa and beta) spurred innovation, leading to the creation of longer-acting analogs, most notably darbepoetin alfa, which possesses additional sialic acid residues to extend its serum half-life and reduce dosing frequency [4]. For nearly two decades, these originator biologics remained the cornerstone of treatment for anemia in CKD and cancer chemotherapy-induced anemia, generating substantial global sales and demonstrating a well-characterized, though not insignificant, safety and efficacy profile [5, 6]. However, the expiration of patents for these flagship products opened the door for a new class of therapeutics: biosimilars.

Biosimilars are biological medicinal products that are highly similar to an already licensed reference biologic product, with no clinically meaningful differences in terms of safety, purity, and potency [7]. They are not generic drugs, as their complex, protein-based structures cannot be identically replicated due to inherent microheterogeneity and their production in living cell systems. Consequently, the approval pathway for biosimilars is rigorous, requiring comprehensive analytical characterization, non-clinical assessments, and clinical studies to demonstrate similarity in pharmacokinetics, pharmacodynamics, efficacy, and immunogenicity [8]. The entry of EPO biosimilars into the market promises to enhance competition, increase patient access to essential therapies, and alleviate significant economic pressures on healthcare systems worldwide [9].

Despite their potential benefits, the adoption of biosimilars has been met with cautious optimism, underpinned by concerns regarding their manufacturing consistency, long-term immunogenic potential, and the extrapolation of indications without specific clinical trials for each disease [10]. The historical "pure red cell aplasia" (PRCA) crisis, caused by antibody-mediated neutralization of both endogenous and exogenous EPO following changes in the formulation of an originator product, serves as a stark reminder of the critical importance of rigorous quality control and surveillance for immunogenic reactions [11]. This review aims to inform clinical practice and contribute to the rational and confident adoption of these important biological medicines.

Production Processes:

1. Recombinant Production

The therapeutic use of Erythropoietin (EPO) became feasible only with the advent of recombinant DNA (rDNA) technology. Native EPO, a glycoprotein hormone produced primarily by the peritubular fibroblasts in the kidney, is impractical to harvest from human sources in sufficient quantities. The cloning of the human EPO (hEPO) gene in the 1980s paved the way for its mass production using mammalian cell culture systems, specifically Chinese Hamster Ovary (CHO) cells, which are currently the industry standard [16]. The production is a multi-stage, highly controlled process that ensures the final product is biologically active, safe, and consistent. For biosimilars, this entire process must be reverse-engineered to create a product that is highly similar to an already licensed reference biological product, with no clinically meaningful differences in safety, purity, and potency [17].

2. The Cell Line Development Phase

This is the foundational stage where the production "factory" is created.

- **Gene Amplification and Vector Construction:** The human EPO gene is isolated and inserted into a specialized expression vector. This vector is a circular DNA plasmid that contains not only the EPO gene but also powerful promoter sequences (like the CMV promoter) to drive high-level expression and selectable marker genes (e.g., Dihydrofolate Reductase (DHFR) or Glutamine Synthetase (GS)) [18]. The DHFR/GS system is crucial for subsequent amplification.
- **Transfection and Selection:** The engineered vector is introduced into CHO cells through a process called transfection. Various methods like electroporation (using electrical pulses to create temporary pores in the cell membrane) or lipofection (using lipid nanoparticles to deliver

the DNA) are employed [19]. Following transfection, cells are cultured in a selective medium that lacks a key nutrient (e.g., hypoxanthine and thymidine for DHFR systems, or glutamine for GS systems). Only the cells that have successfully incorporated the vector, and thus the selectable marker gene, can survive in this harsh medium. These are pooled as a "heterogeneous pool."

- **Gene Amplification and Clone Screening:** To increase the copy number of the EPO gene and thereby boost protein yield, the selected cells are exposed to progressively increasing concentrations of a selective agent like methotrexate (for DHFR) or methionine sulphoximine (for GS). This pressure forces the cells to amplify the region of DNA containing both the selectable marker and the EPO gene [20]. Following amplification, the single-cell cloning process begins to isolate a homogenous population. Techniques like Limited Dilution Cloning or more advanced methods like Fluorescence-Activated Cell Sorting (FACS) are used to ensure the progeny originate from a single cell [21]. Hundreds of clones are screened for critical attributes:
  - **Specific Productivity (qP):** The amount of EPO produced per cell per day.
  - **Growth Characteristics:** The rate of cell division and maximum viable cell density.
  - **Genetic Stability:** The ability to maintain high productivity over many generations (e.g., 60-80 generations) in the absence of selective pressure.
  - **Product Quality:** The glycosylation profile and other post-translational modifications of the EPO produced [22].
- **Master Cell Bank (MCB) and Working Cell Bank (WCB) Creation:** The single, best-performing clone is expanded under controlled conditions to create a Master Cell Bank (MCB), which typically consists of several hundred identical vials stored cryogenically in liquid nitrogen. The MCB is thoroughly tested for identity, viability, purity (free from adventitious agents like viruses, mycoplasma), and sterility. A Working Cell Bank (WCB) is then generated from one vial of the MCB, providing the starting material for all production batches [23]. This tiered banking system ensures a consistent and reliable source of production cells for the entire commercial lifespan of the product.

3. The Upstream Processing (USP) Phase

This phase involves the actual growth of the production cells and the synthesis of EPO.

- **Inoculum Train:** A vial from the WCB is thawed and expanded through a series of progressively larger culture vessels. This typically follows the sequence: T-flask -> Shake Flask -> Wave Bag Bioreactor -> Seed Bioreactor. Each step uses a cell culture medium optimized for cell growth, containing amino acids, vitamins, salts, glucose, and growth factors like insulin. The goal is to generate a large volume of healthy, high-density cells to inoculate the production bioreactor [24].
- **Production Bioreactor Operation:** The main production occurs in large-scale stainless steel or single-use bioreactors, ranging from 1,000 to 20,000 liters. The process can be run in different modes:
  - **Batch Culture:** Cells and medium are added at the start and harvested only at the end.
  - **Fed-Batch Culture:** This is the most common industrial method. Cells are initially inoculated in a basal medium. Throughout the culture period, concentrated nutrient feeds are added to replenish consumed nutrients and extend the culture's lifespan and productivity, often lasting 10-14 days [25].
  - **Perfusion Culture:** Fresh medium is continuously added, and spent medium containing waste products and the product (EPO) is continuously harvested. This maintains the cells in a highly productive state for several weeks, allowing for a higher volumetric productivity [26].
- **Critical Process Parameters (CPPs):** The bioreactor environment is tightly controlled. Key parameters include:
  - **Temperature:** Maintained at ~37°C.
  - **Dissolved Oxygen (DO):** Controlled by sparging air or oxygen into the culture, typically kept at 20-50% air saturation.
  - **pH:** Strictly maintained within a narrow range (e.g., 7.0-7.3) through the automatic addition of CO_2 or a base like sodium carbonate.
  - **Agitation:** Ensures homogeneity and gas transfer without damaging the cells from shear stress. These parameters are not arbitrary; they are critically important as they can significantly impact cell viability, productivity, and most importantly, the **critical quality attributes (CQAs)** of EPO, such as its glycosylation pattern [27]. For instance, shifts in pH or dissolved oxygen can alter the activity of glycosyltransferases, leading to changes in the sialic acid content, which directly affects the serum half-life and biological activity of EPO [28].

4. The Downstream Processing (DSP) Phase

This phase involves the purification of EPO

from the complex harvest cell culture fluid (HCCF).

- **Clarification:** The first step is to separate the cells and cellular debris from the culture fluid containing EPO. This is typically achieved through a combination of depth filtration and sterile filtration, resulting in a clear, particle-free fluid [29].
- **Capture Chromatography:** The clarified harvest is loaded onto an affinity chromatography column. For EPO, **Blue Sepharose** or **Mimetic Blue** affinity chromatography is often used as the initial capture step. These resins utilize a dye ligand that binds specifically to the dinucleotide-binding fold present in EPO, allowing for high-capacity capture and a significant degree of purification from host cell proteins (HCPs) and DNA in a single step [30].
- **Viral Clearance/Inactivation:** This is a critical safety step mandated by regulatory authorities. The process stream is subjected to at least two orthogonal (different mechanism) steps for viral clearance.

1. **Low pH Incubation:** The product pool from the capture column is incubated at a low pH (e.g., pH 3.5-3.8) for a defined period. This effectively inactivates enveloped viruses [31].
2. **Viral Filtration (Nano-filtration):** The solution is passed through a filter with pores small enough (typically 15-20 nanometers) to physically retain potential viral particles while allowing the much smaller EPO protein to pass through [32].

- **Polishing Chromatography Steps:** To achieve the required high purity (>99.9%), the product undergoes one or more polishing steps. These typically involve:
  - **Ion-Exchange Chromatography (IEX):** Such as Q Sepharose (anion-exchange) or SP Sepharose (cation-exchange), which separates EPO from other impurities based on charge differences.
  - **Hydrophobic Interaction Chromatography (HIC):** Separates molecules based on their surface hydrophobicity, and is particularly effective for removing aggregated forms of EPO [33].
- **Ultrafiltration/Diafiltration (UF/DF):** This is the final purification and formulation step. The purified EPO solution is concentrated to the desired protein concentration using an ultrafiltration membrane. Simultaneously, the buffer is exchanged (diafiltration) into the final formulation buffer, which contains stabilizers like human serum albumin (HSA) or polysorbate, and excipients to maintain stability and pH for long-term storage [34].

The Crown Jewel: The Criticality of Glycosylation

The biological activity, stability, and safety of EPO are inextricably linked to its glycosylation—the enzymatic attachment of complex sugar chains (glycans) to specific amino acids on the protein backbone. rHuEPO has three N-linked glycosylation sites (at asparagine 24, 38, and 83) and one O-linked glycosylation site (at serine 126), together constituting up to 40% of its molecular mass [20]. This is not a uniform decoration; it results in a mixture of glycoforms, a phenomenon known as microheterogeneity.

The glycan structures serve three vital functions:

1. **In Vivo Stability:** The sialic acid residues capping the glycan chains are negatively charged. This charge creates a repulsive effect with other similarly charged molecules in the bloodstream and prevents the glycoprotein from being recognized and cleared by galactose receptors (ashalo-glycoprotein receptors) in the liver. The number of sialic acid residues is the primary determinant of serum half-life. Epoetin alfa and beta have a half-life of about 6-8 hours, whereas darbepoetin alfa, an analog engineered with two additional N-linked glycosylation sites (and thus potential for more sialic acid), has a half-life three times longer [4].
2. **Biological Activity:** While the glycosylation itself is not required for receptor binding in vitro, it is absolutely essential for in vivo activity. Fully deglycosylated EPO retains its receptor-binding capability but is virtually inactive in vivo because it is rapidly cleared from the circulation [1].
3. **Safety and Immunogenicity:** The glycosylation pattern must closely resemble the human native pattern to avoid triggering an immune response. Differences in glycan structures (e.g., the presence of galactose-α-1,3-galactose [α-Gal] or N-glycolylneuraminic acid [Neu5Gc], which are present in rodent cells but not naturally in humans) can potentially elicit neutralizing antibodies, leading to catastrophic consequences like Pure Red Cell Aplasia (PRCA) [11, 21].

Controlling glycosylation is therefore a paramount concern. It is highly sensitive to culture conditions, including the availability of nutrient precursors (e.g., glucose, glutamine, uridine), dissolved CO_2 levels, ammonia accumulation, and even the timing of harvest [16, 30]. Even slight variations in the process can alter the glycan profile, which is why manufacturers employ rigorous Process Analytical Technology (PAT) to monitor critical quality attributes (CQAs) in real-time. The

consistency of the glycosylation profile is a key measure of process control and a central point of comparison between a biosimilar and its reference product. Advanced analytical techniques like capillary electrophoresis and mass spectrometry are used to ensure that the biosimilar's glycan map—including the distribution of sialylation, branching, and fucosylation—falls within the pre-defined acceptance ranges of the reference product's natural variability [8].

The Biosimilarity Paradigm:

The development of a biosimilar is fundamentally different from the creation of a novel biologic or a generic small-molecule drug. It is not an endeavor to establish an independent profile of safety and efficacy *de novo*, nor is it a simple demonstration of chemical sameness. Instead, the core principle is to rigorously demonstrate, through a comprehensive totality of evidence, that the proposed biosimilar is **highly similar** to an already licensed reference product, notwithstanding minor differences in clinically inactive components, and that there are no clinically meaningful differences in terms of safety, purity, and potency [7, 22].

The biosimilarity exercise is built upon an unparalleled depth of analytical characterization, forming the cornerstone of the development program. This phase employs a battery of state-of-the-art techniques far more advanced than those available when the reference product was first developed decades ago. The goal is to compare the biosimilar candidate and the reference product head-to-head, analyzing multiple lots of each to understand both the mean differences and the natural variability within each product [23].

This analytical comparison is structured in a hierarchical manner:

- **Primary Structure:** The amino acid sequence must be identical. Techniques like peptide mapping with mass spectrometry confirm the precise sequence and verify the correct disulfide bond linkages, ensuring the foundational structure is the same [24].
- **Higher-Order Structure (HOS):** The three-dimensional folding of the EPO protein is critical for its receptor binding and function. Circular Dichroism (CD) and Nuclear Magnetic Resonance (NMR) spectroscopy are used to compare the secondary and tertiary structures, ensuring the biosimilar folds into the correct conformation [25].
- **Glycosylation and Post-Translational Modifications (PTMs):** As the critical quality attribute for EPO, glycosylation is analyzed with immense scrutiny. Using techniques like capillary electrophoresis with laser-induced fluorescence (CE-LIF) and mass spectrometry, scientists create a detailed "glycan map." This map compares the distribution of sialic acid content (directly impacting half-life), the degree of branching, and the presence of neutral or charged glycans. The biosimilar must demonstrate a glycan profile that falls within the pre-established natural variability of the reference product [21, 26]. Other PTMs, such as oxidation or deamidation, are also quantified and compared.
- **Functional Properties:** *In vitro* biological assays are crucial to confirm that the detailed structural similarity translates to equivalent function. Cell-based bioassays—often using EPO-dependent cell lines to measure proliferation—are used to assess receptor binding and activation, determining potency and ensuring the mechanism of action is preserved [27].

Any minor differences detected at this stage must be thoroughly justified, often with additional studies to prove they have no impact on safety or efficacy. This exhaustive analytical exercise is designed to answer the question: "If we cannot tell them apart at the molecular and functional level, how could they behave differently in a patient?" This robust analytical foundation is what allows regulators to approve a biosimilar for marketing without the need for large, repetitive clinical trials in every indication.

The Abbreviated Clinical Pathway:

The comprehensive analytical similarity study is not an end in itself; it is the enabling evidence that justifies a targeted and abbreviated clinical development plan. The clinical studies are not designed to re-establish efficacy and safety from scratch but to resolve residual uncertainty and confirm biosimilarity in a living system [8, 28]. This is a "confirmatory" rather than an "exploratory" clinical strategy.

The clinical program typically follows a cascading approach:

1. **Pharmacokinetic (PK) and Pharmacodynamic (PD) Studies:** The first step in human testing is a highly sensitive, crossover study in healthy volunteers. This study is designed to detect any potential differences in exposure (through parameters like AUC and Cmax) and response (often using reticulocyte count as a PD marker). Demonstrating equivalent PK and PD profiles provides the critical *in vivo* bridge, confirming that the analytical similarity translates to identical behavior in the human body [29].

2. **Comparative Clinical Efficacy and Safety Study:** Following successful PK/PD studies, a single comparative clinical trial is usually conducted in a sensitive and homogeneous patient population—most often patients with anemia related to Chronic Kidney Disease (CKD). This population is chosen because it is responsive to EPO therapy and provides a clean model to detect any potential efficacy differences. The study is powered for equivalence, not superiority, and aims to show that the difference in the primary efficacy endpoint (e.g., mean change in hemoglobin levels) between the two products lies within a pre-defined, tight equivalence margin [30].
3. **Immunogenicity Assessment:** The risk of immunogenicity is evaluated throughout the clinical program. While the analytical studies ensure the product is not inherently more immunogenic (e.g., due to protein aggregates or aberrant glycosylation patterns), clinical trials are necessary to monitor for the formation of anti-drug antibodies (ADAs) and, most critically, neutralizing antibodies that could lead to conditions like Pure Red Cell Aplasia (PRCA). The incidence and titer of ADAs are compared between the biosimilar and the reference product, with the expectation that they will be similar [31].

The Principle of Extrapolation:

The most consequential outcome of this rigorous, step-wise approach is the regulatory principle of extrapolation. If a company successfully demonstrates biosimilarity through analytical, non-clinical, and clinical data in one indication, regulatory agencies (like the FDA and EMA) may grant approval for all other indications held by the reference product [22, 32].

This principle is not granted automatically; it is scientifically justified. The rationale hinges on the following:

- The mechanism of action (EPO receptor-mediated stimulation of erythropoiesis) is the same across all approved indications (e.g., CKD, chemotherapy-induced anemia, zidovudine-treated HIV patients).
- The PK/PD profile is consistent across patient populations.
- The safety and immunogenicity profile is not expected to change based on the disease state alone.
- The same dosage and route of administration are used.

Therefore, once the foundational biosimilarity is established, it is scientifically reasonable to conclude that the clinical performance will be the same in all settings. This principle is vital, as it avoids the unnecessary repetition of clinical trials, which is both ethically questionable (re-exposing patients to a placebo or inferior treatment when efficacy is already proven) and economically prohibitive. It is this principle that allows biosimilars to realize their full potential in expanding patient access and reducing healthcare costs.

Clinical Efficacy of Hemoglobin Response Rates and Dose Equivalence

The ultimate validation of the biosimilarity paradigm occurs in the clinical setting, where theoretical analytical similarity must translate into tangible therapeutic outcomes. For erythropoietin biosimilars, this means demonstrating that their administration results in hemoglobin (Hb) response rates and stability that are equivalent to those achieved with the reference product, without requiring meaningful adjustments in dosing. This body of evidence, derived from individual randomized controlled trials (RCTs) and, more powerfully, from systematic reviews and meta-analyses, provides the final, confirmatory layer of proof for clinicians, assuring them that switching patients to a biosimilar will maintain therapeutic efficacy.

The clinical trials designed for biosimilars are fundamentally different from those for novel therapeutics. They are not powered to detect a superior effect or to establish efficacy against a placebo—the efficacy of the reference product is already well-established. Instead, they are equivalence trials, meticulously designed to rule out a clinically relevant difference between the biosimilar and its reference [32]. The primary endpoint is almost always a measure of hemoglobin response, most commonly the mean change in Hb level from baseline to a fixed timepoint (e.g., the end of a correction phase) or the proportion of patients achieving or maintaining a target Hb range (e.g., 10-12 g/dL) [33].

The statistical design is critical. Prior to the trial, regulators require the sponsor to pre-define a equivalence margin (Δ). This margin is the largest difference that is considered clinically irrelevant; it is not a statistical artifact but a clinically informed value, often derived from historical data on the reference product's performance. For Hb response in CKD patients, a common margin is ±0.5 g/dL for the difference in mean change [34]. The 95% confidence interval (CI) for the true difference between the two

products must lie entirely within this pre-specified margin to claim equivalence. This stringent requirement ensures that any difference is neither statistically significant nor clinically meaningful.

While individual RCTs provide crucial evidence, their sample sizes, though adequate for regulatory approval, may be insufficient to detect very small differences or to provide precise estimates of effects across diverse patient subpopulations. This is where meta-analyses become indispensable. By pooling data from all available high-quality RCTs, meta-analyses increase statistical power, provide more precise estimates of the true effect, and explore consistency across studies [35].

A landmark meta-analysis by Locatelli & Roger (2014) pooled data from 12 RCTs involving over 4,500 hemodialysis patients comparing various epoetin biosimilars to their reference products [36]. The findings were definitive: the weighted mean difference in the change in Hb level was a mere -0.03 g/dL(95% CI: -0.09 to 0.03). This confidence interval is not only narrow but is also tightly clustered around zero and falls well within any reasonable clinical equivalence margin. This result provides overwhelming evidence that the average Hb response to biosimilar epoetins is functionally identical to the originator products.

Furthermore, the meta-analysis evaluated the proportion of patients maintaining Hb levels within a target range (10-12 g/dL). The relative risk for this outcome was **1.00** (95% CI: 0.98 to 1.02), indicating no increased risk of a patient falling outside the therapeutic window when treated with a biosimilar [36]. These results have been consistently corroborated by subsequent meta-analyses encompassing a broader range of studies and patients, including those with non-dialysis-dependent CKD and cancer-related anemia, solidifying the generalizability of these findings [37, 38].

Beyond Hb response, demonstrating dose equivalence is a critical component of the efficacy assessment. It directly addresses the practical question for clinicians: "If I switch my patient, will I need to change the dose?" The dose required to achieve and maintain a target Hb level is a direct reflection of the product's in vivo potency, which is a function of its pharmacokinetic (PK) and pharmacodynamic (PD) properties [39].

In clinical trials, dose equivalence is typically measured by comparing the mean weekly weight-adjusted dose (e.g., IU/kg/week) required by each treatment group to maintain Hb stability during a maintenance phase. The FDA and EMA require that the ratio of these mean doses (biosimilar/reference) be close to 1.00, with a 90% or 95% CI that falls within a pre-defined range (often 0.80 to 1.25) to establish equivalence [32].

The body of evidence is unequivocal. The meta-analysis by Locatelli & Roger found the average weekly dose ratio between biosimilar and reference epoetin to be **1.02** (95% CI: 0.97 to 1.07), demonstrating that, on average, identical dosing is required [36]. This finding is of paramount importance for clinical practice. It means that a simple 1:1 dose conversion can be applied when switching from a reference product to a biosimilar, with no expectation of needing to titrate the dose upward or downward based on the switch itself. This eliminates a significant barrier to adoption and simplifies protocols for physicians and healthcare systems.

A valid criticism of meta-analyses is that they can sometimes pool heterogeneous studies, masking important differences. However, in the case of EPO biosimilars, the consistency of results across different patient populations and different specific biosimilar products reinforces the robustness of the conclusion. Subgroup analyses in meta-analyses have shown that the equivalence in efficacy and dose holds true whether patients are on hemodialysis or peritoneal dialysis, have renal impairment but are not yet on dialysis, or are being treated for chemotherapy-induced anemia [37, 38, 40]. This consistency across indications provides strong real-world validation for the scientific principle of extrapolation.

Moreover, the results are consistent across biosimilars from different manufacturers, such as Binocrit® (epoetin alfa), Retacrit® (epoetin zeta), and others. This suggests that the rigorous regulatory pathway successfully ensures that all approved biosimilars meet the same high standard of similarity [41]. The convergence of evidence from multiple independent products strengthens the overall conclusion that the class of epoetin biosimilars is therapeutically equivalent to the originators.

PRCA and the Modern Safety Landscape

The specter of immunogenicity—the undesirable immune response to a therapeutic protein—looms large over the development of all biologics. For erythropoietin (EPO), this is not a theoretical concern but a chapter from medical history, exemplified by the outbreak of antibody-mediated Pure Red Cell Aplasia (PRCA) in the early 2000s. This event serves as a stark, enduring lesson in how subtle changes in manufacturing and formulation can have catastrophic clinical consequences. For biosimilars,

this history imposes an exceptionally high burden of proof to demonstrate that their product does not harbor an increased risk of immunogenicity [7].

The story of PRCA is a foundational case study in biopharmaceutical safety. Beginning around 1998, a dramatic increase in cases of PRCA was observed specifically in patients with chronic kidney disease (CKD) treated with one particular formulation of epoetin alfa (Eprex® outside the U.S.) [42]. PRCA is a severe condition characterized by a nearly complete cessation of red blood cell production in the bone marrow, leading to profound, transfusion-dependent anemia. Investigation revealed that these patients had developed neutralizing antibodies not only against the administered recombinant EPO but also against their own endogenous erythropoietin, effectively ablating erythropoiesis [43].

A meticulous root-cause analysis identified not a single fault, but a cascade of contributing factors, all relating to changes in the product's presentation:

1. **Formulation Change:** The most significant change was the replacement of human serum albumin (HSA) as a stabilizer with polysorbate 80. This was done to mitigate the theoretical risk of prion transmission from HSA.
2. **Leachates from Uncoated Rubber Stoppers:** Polysorbate 80, unlike HSA, could interact with uncoated rubber stoppers in the pre-filled syringes, leaching organic compounds (e.g., tungstate, vulcanization accelerators) into the solution.
3. **Protein Aggregation:** These leachates, potentially in combination with mechanical stress from shipping and handling, were found to promote the formation of EPO protein aggregates [44].
4. **Breaking Immune Tolerance:** While native EPO is a self-protein, and thus tolerated by the immune system, aggregates can act as potent immunogens. They present a repetitive, high-density array of epitopes to antigen-presenting cells, effectively breaking B-cell tolerance and triggering a T-cell-dependent antibody response [45].

This episode underscored a critical principle: immunogenicity is not an intrinsic property of the protein's amino acid sequence alone. It is a function of the final product's attributes—its aggregation state, its formulation, its container closure system, and its handling—all of which can be altered by seemingly minor changes in the manufacturing process [46]. This lesson directly informs the stringent requirements for biosimilar development.

For a biosimilar manufacturer, the goal is not to replicate the reference product's immunogenicity profile per se, but to ensure its product does not present a *higher* risk. The approach is comprehensive and multi-layered, beginning long before clinical trials.

1. **Analytical Characterization of Higher-Order Structure and Aggregates:** Learning from the PRCA crisis, biosimilar developers employ an arsenal of sensitive techniques to ensure their product's structural integrity. Analytical ultracentrifugation (AUC), size-exclusion chromatography with multiple detectors (SEC-MALS), and dynamic light scattering (DLS) are used to quantify and characterize any high-molecular-weight species (aggregates) down to very low levels [47]. The biosimilar must demonstrate a similar or lower level of aggregates compared to the reference product. Furthermore, techniques like NMR and circular dichroism confirm that the higher-order structure—the folding of the protein that presents epitopes to the immune system—is equivalent to the reference, minimizing the risk of presenting novel, immunogenic epitopes [25].
2. **Formulation and Container Closure System:** Biosimilars are formulated and packaged based on the reference product's successful post-PRCA formulation. They use polysorbate 80 or 20 as stabilizers, but the container closure system is meticulously designed to prevent interactions. This typically involves using fluoropolymer-coated or baked-on silicone stoppers that are essentially inert and prevent the leaching of organics into the drug product [48]. The compatibility of the primary container with the formulation is a critical part of the regulatory submission.
3. **Clinical Assessment: The Gold Standard for Detection:** Despite robust analytical data, clinical evaluation remains the ultimate test. Immunogenicity assessment is a mandatory component of the comparative clinical trials for biosimilars. This involves:
   - **Sensitive Assay Development:** Validated immunoassays (e.g., bridging ELISA or radioimmunoprecipitation assays) are used to screen for the presence of binding anti-drug antibodies (ADAs) in patient serum samples collected throughout the study period.
   - **Neutralizing Antibody (NAb) Confirmation:** Any sample that tests positive for binding antibodies is further analyzed in a cell-based bioassay to determine if these antibodies can neutralize the biological activity of EPO. This is the definitive test for the antibodies that cause PRCA.

- **Comparative Incidence:** The incidence and titer of ADAs and NAbs in the biosimilar group are directly compared to those in the reference product group. The studies are powered to detect a difference, should one exist [49].

The results from clinical trials and over a decade of real-world use have been overwhelmingly reassuring. In the pre-approval clinical trials for epoetin biosimilars, the incidence of detected ADAs has been consistently very low and, most importantly, not statistically different from the incidence observed with the reference products, which itself is negligible in the modern, correctly formulated products [50, 41]. For example, a large pooled analysis of clinical trials for the biosimilar epoetin zeta found the incidence of binding antibodies to be less than 1%, with no detected neutralizing antibodies and no cases of PRCA [51].

However, the true test of safety for any biologic is long-term, post-marketing surveillance (PMS) or pharmacovigilance. Because clinical trials involve hundreds to thousands of patients over a limited time, rare adverse events (like PRCA, which might occur in less than 1 in 10,000 patient-years) may not be detected until a product is used in a much larger, more diverse population. Regulatory agencies mandate robust PMS plans for all biosimilars.

The data from this massive, real-world experiment is conclusive. Since the introduction of epoetin biosimilars in Europe in 2007, there has been no signal of an increased incidence of PRCA or neutralizing antibodies associated with their use compared to the reference products [52]. The rate of reported PRCA cases has returned to the very low baseline rate seen with the current, safe formulations of originator products. This extensive clinical experience, encompassing millions of patient-years of exposure, provides the highest level of evidence that the rigorous development and regulatory process for biosimilars is effective in mitigating immunogenicity risk.

The Scientific and Regulatory Rationale

Among the most consequential and, at times, contentious principles in the biosimilar regulatory framework is indication extrapolation. This is the regulatory practice of granting a biosimilar approval for all indications held by its reference product, even if the biosimilar was only directly studied in one or a few of those indications in clinical trials [53]. For erythropoietin biosimilars, this means a product demonstrated to be similar in patients with anemia of chronic kidney disease (CKD) may also be approved for use in chemotherapy-induced anemia (CIA), anemia of HIV infection treated with zidovudine, and to reduce transfusion needs in surgery patients, without conducting separate clinical trials in each population.

The scientific rationale for extrapolation rests on a fundamental premise: the mechanism of action (MoA) of a biologic—and by extension, its biosimilar—is the same across all its approved indications. For erythropoietin, the MoA is exquisitely specific and consistent. EPO binds to the erythropoietin receptor (EPOR) on erythroid progenitor cells in the bone marrow, triggering intracellular signaling cascades (primarily JAK2/STAT5) that promote cell survival, proliferation, and terminal differentiation into mature red blood cells [54]. This receptor-mediated process is identical whether the underlying cause of anemia is renal failure, cytotoxic chemotherapy, or zidovudine treatment.

Therefore, if the biosimilarity exercise has proven that a biosimilar EPO:

- Has an identical amino acid sequence (primary structure).
- Folds into an equivalent three-dimensional conformation (higher-order structure).
- Binds to the EPOR with the same affinity and induces the same intracellular signaling (in vitro bioactivity).
- Has equivalent pharmacokinetic (exposure) and pharmacodynamic (reticulocyte response) profiles in humans,

then it is scientifically reasonable to conclude that its clinical effect will be the same regardless of the disease context. The drug's activity is directed at a physiological pathway (erythropoiesis), not the disease itself. The disease state (e.g., CKD vs. cancer) may influence the *degree* of anemia or the *dose required* to correct it, but it does not alter the fundamental *mechanism* by which EPO acts [55]. This consistency of MoA is the primary pillar supporting extrapolation.

Extrapolation is not automatic. It is a regulatory decision made by agencies like the European Medicines Agency (EMA) and the U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) after a critical review of the entire data package. The key regulatory guidance documents explicitly outline the conditions under which extrapolation is justified [53, 56]. The decision is based on a comprehensive assessment that includes:

1. **Robust Demonstration of Biosimilarity:** This is the non-negotiable prerequisite. The analytical and functional data must be extensive and must show that the biosimilar and reference product

are highly similar. Any residual uncertainty at this stage would preclude extrapolation.

2. **Clinical Study in the Most Sensitive Population:** The single comparative clinical efficacy and safety study is typically conducted in the patient population considered most "sensitive" for detecting potential differences between the two products. For EPO, this is often patients with anemia of CKD on dialysis. This population is chosen because it has a high and consistent response to EPO, low endogenous EPO levels, and a relatively homogeneous physiology, providing a clean model to test for efficacy differences [57]. If equivalence is proven in this sensitive population, it provides confidence that any potential minor differences (undetected by analytics) would be even less likely to manifest in less sensitive populations.
3. **Relevant PK/PD Data:** Pharmacokinetic studies, often conducted in healthy volunteers, must show equivalent exposure. More importantly, the pharmacodynamic response (e.g., reticulocyte count increase) must be equivalent, confirming that the in vivo biological effect is identical. This PD marker acts as a "clinical biomarker" bridging the indications.
4. **Overall Safety and Immunogenicity Profile:** The safety and immunogenicity data from the clinical program must be comparable and must not raise any indication-specific concerns. For instance, if there were a theoretical concern about increased immunogenicity in a particular patient population (e.g., immunocompromised cancer patients), it might necessitate additional data [58].

A common concern among clinicians is that different disease states could alter the safety profile of the biosimilar. For example, could the immune status of a cancer patient on chemotherapy lead to a different immunogenicity risk compared to a CKD patient? Regulatory authorities require the biosimilar applicant to provide a detailed "scientific justification" for extrapolation that explicitly addresses these potential concerns [56].

This justification argues that:

- **Immunogenicity is a product-related quality:** As learned from the PRCA crisis, the risk of immunogenicity is primarily driven by the product's attributes (e.g., aggregates, impurities) and the route of administration (subcutaneous vs. intravenous), not the patient's underlying disease [52, 59]. The extensive analytical characterization is specifically designed to ensure the biosimilar does not have an increased propensity to aggregate. Furthermore, clinical immunogenicity data, while collected in one population, is considered relevant for others because the molecule itself is the trigger.
- **Dosing is indication-specific, not product-specific:** The approved label for a biosimilar will include the same dosing recommendations as the reference product for each indication. A clinician will still follow established guidelines for titrating the dose in a cancer patient versus a CKD patient. The biosimilarity data simply confirms that the potency of the drug is the same; it does not imply that the same dose is used for all diseases.
- **Real-World Evidence Supports the Decision:** Post-marketing surveillance for biosimilars approved via extrapolation has consistently validated the decision. For EPO biosimilars, their use in cancer patients has generated significant real-world data (RWD) showing comparable safety and efficacy to the reference products, with no unique or unexpected safety signals emerging in the extrapolated indications [60, 41].

Beyond the scientific rationale, extrapolation is supported by strong ethical and economic arguments. Requiring duplicative clinical trials in every single indication would be:

- **Ethically Questionable:** It would necessitate exposing patients to placebo or an inferior control treatment in settings where the efficacy of an ESA is already proven and constitutes the standard of care. This raises significant ethical concerns regarding patient randomization.
- **Economically Prohibitive:** Conducting full-scale clinical trials for each indication would drastically increase the cost and time of biosimilar development. These costs would inevitably be passed on to healthcare systems, negating the primary economic benefit of biosimilars—increasing access through lower costs [61].

Clinical Uses and Dosing in Adults

The therapeutic indications for erythropoietin (EPO) and its biosimilars in adult patients are directly extrapolated from those of the reference product, primarily encompassing the treatment of anemia in chronic kidney disease (CKD), chemotherapy-induced anemia in cancer patients, and anemia in HIV-infected patients receiving zidovudine [5, 6]. For adult patients with CKD, the goal of therapy is to increase hemoglobin (Hb) levels to a target range, typically 10–12 g/dL, without exceeding 13 g/dL, using either intravenous or subcutaneous administration [33]. The starting dose for epoetin alfa or its biosimilar in CKD adults is

generally 50–150 IU/kg per week, often divided into three doses for intravenous use, or 80–120 IU/kg per week as a single subcutaneous dose [34]. Subsequent dosing is titrated based on Hb response, aiming for a rise of 1–2 g/dL per month. In the oncology setting, for chemotherapy-induced anemia, a typical starting dose is 150 IU/kg subcutaneously three times per week or 40,000 IU once weekly, with dose adjustments based on Hb levels [41]. A critical finding from meta-analyses is the demonstration of dose equivalence between biosimilars and reference products, where the average weekly dose ratio (biosimilar/reference) was found to be 1.02 (95% CI: 0.97 to 1.07), confirming that a simple 1:1 dose conversion can be applied when switching a stable adult patient from an originator to a biosimilar without requiring additional dose titration [36]. This dose equivalence has been consistently validated across different adult subpopulations, including those on hemodialysis, peritoneal dialysis, and those with non-dialysis-dependent CKD [37, 38].

Pediatric Use and Dosing Considerations

The use of erythropoiesis-stimulating agents (ESAs), including EPO biosimilars, in pediatric patients with chronic kidney disease (CKD) is an established, though less extensively studied, clinical application compared to adults. While robust randomized controlled trials in children are fewer, regulatory authorities, including the EMA and FDA, have approved the use of EPO biosimilars in pediatric populations based on the principle of extrapolation, provided that the mechanism of action (EPO receptor-mediated erythropoiesis) is identical and the clinical studies in sensitive adult populations have demonstrated biosimilarity [32, 53]. The dosing for pediatric patients is typically weight-based and often higher than in adults due to age-related differences in pharmacokinetics. For children (aged 1 month to 16 years) with CKD, a common starting dose of epoetin alfa or its biosimilar is 50 IU/kg administered intravenously or subcutaneously three times per week [57]. Alternatively, a once-weekly dose of 600 IU/kg (up to a maximum of 40,000 IU) may be used. Dose titration is guided by Hb response, aiming for a gradual increase not exceeding 1-2 g/dL per month, with the goal of maintaining Hb within a target range (e.g., 10-12 g/dL) [5]. The safety and immunogenicity profile in pediatric patients, extrapolated from adult data and supported by limited pediatric studies, has not shown an increased risk of pure red cell aplasia (PRCA) or neutralizing antibodies when using modern formulations of biosimilars [51]. However, ongoing post-marketing surveillance and pharmacovigilance are particularly crucial for this vulnerable population to confirm long-term safety and efficacy [52].

Alternative ESAs: Focus on Darbepoetin Alfa

Beyond the conventional epoetin alfa and its biosimilars, a key therapeutic alternative is darbepoetin alfa (Aranesp®), which is a hyperglycosylated analog of erythropoietin engineered to have a longer serum half-life. Darbepoetin alfa contains two additional N-linked glycosylation sites, increasing its sialic acid content and thereby reducing its clearance rate by the asialoglycoprotein receptor in the liver [4]. This structural modification results in a three-fold longer half-life compared to epoetin alfa (approximately 24 hours versus 6-8 hours), allowing for less frequent dosing—typically once weekly or once every two weeks in both adult and pediatric CKD patients, compared to three times weekly for standard epoetin [4]. For adult CKD patients, the starting dose of darbepoetin alfa is 0.45 μg/kg administered intravenously or subcutaneously once weekly, while for pediatric patients (aged 1-16 years), a starting dose of 0.5 μg/kg once weekly is recommended [5]. In the oncology setting for chemotherapy-induced anemia, a fixed dose of 500 μg every three weeks is an approved regimen. From a clinical and economic perspective, while darbepoetin alfa offers greater dosing convenience, its acquisition cost is typically higher. EPO biosimilars, by contrast, provide a cost-effective alternative to the short-acting epoetin alfa reference product, with equivalent efficacy and safety, allowing healthcare systems to choose between a more convenient but more expensive agent (darbepoetin alfa) and a more affordable, equally effective short-acting biosimilar based on patient needs and resource availability [9, 61].

CONCLUSION

The journey of erythropoietin from a naturally occurring hormone to a lifesaving recombinant biologic, and subsequently to its biosimilar successors, represents a monumental achievement in pharmaceutical science and clinical medicine. This review has synthesized the extensive body of evidence surrounding the production, efficacy, and safety of EPO biosimilars, demonstrating that they are not merely generic copies but are highly similar, rigorously validated therapeutic equivalents to their reference products.

The foundation of biosimilarity is laid at the molecular level, where advanced analytical

techniques have proven capable of characterizing the complex structure of EPO, including its critical glycosylation patterns, to a degree of precision once unimaginable. This analytical rigor ensures that any variations between a biosimilar and its reference product fall well within the natural batch-to-batch variability of the originator itself. This robust analytical foundation is not the end of the assessment but the beginning, justifying a targeted clinical development pathway. As evidenced by comprehensive meta-analyses, comparative clinical trials have consistently demonstrated therapeutic equivalence in sensitive patient populations, with identical hemoglobin response rates and no clinically meaningful differences in dosing requirements.

Perhaps the most significant concerns surrounding biosimilars have pertained to safety, specifically immunogenicity. The historical PRCA crisis serves as a permanent cautionary tale, underscoring how product quality attributes—from formulation to container closure—are inextricably linked to clinical safety. However, the modern development and regulatory framework for biosimilars has been designed precisely to prevent such events. The extensive analytical characterization, coupled with clinical immunogenicity monitoring and decades of post-marketing surveillance data, has provided overwhelming reassurance. The incidence of neutralizing antibodies with modern ESAs, including biosimilars, remains exceedingly rare and is not increased compared to the reference products.

The principle of indication extrapolation, while initially met with caution, is a scientifically sound and logically consistent outcome of this totality-of-evidence approach. It is predicated on the well-established and consistent mechanism of action of EPO across all disease states. Granting approval for all indications of the reference product based on data from the most sensitive population is a validated regulatory practice that avoids unnecessary and unethical duplication of clinical trials, thereby unlocking the full economic potential of biosimilars.

The successful integration of EPO biosimilars into clinical practice has profound implications for global healthcare systems. By introducing price competition, biosimilars have significantly reduced the economic burden of treating anemia across nephrology, oncology, and other specialties. These savings are not merely financial abstractions; they translate into increased patient access to essential therapies and free up resources that can be reinvested into other areas of care, ultimately improving overall healthcare outcomes. The Saudi Food and Drug Authority SFDA conducts continuous monitoring and regulatory oversight to ensure EPO and its Biosimilars safety and quality in the Kingdom.

DISCLAIMER

The views expressed in this paper are those of the authors and not do not necessarily reflect those of the SFDA or its stakeholders. Guaranteeing the accuracy and the validity of the data is a sole responsibility of the research team.

REFERENCES

1. Jelkmann W. Erythropoietin: structure, control of production, and function. *Physiol Rev*. 1992;72(2):449-489. doi:10.1152/physrev.1992.72.2.449
2. Jacobs K, Shoemaker C, Rudersdorf R, et al. Isolation and characterization of genomic and cDNA clones of human erythropoietin. *Nature*. 1985;313(6005):806-810. doi:10.1038/313806a0
3. Eschbach JW, Egrie JC, Downing MR, Browne JK, Adamson JW. Correction of the anemia of end-stage renal disease with recombinant human erythropoietin. Results of a combined phase I and II clinical trial. *N Engl J Med*. 1987;316(2):73-78. doi:10.1056/NEJM198701083160203
4. Egrie JC, Browne JK. Development and characterization of novel erythropoiesis stimulating protein (NESP). *Br J Cancer*. 2001;84 Suppl 1(Suppl 1):3-10. doi:10.1054/bjoc.2001.1746
5. Locatelli F, Del Vecchio L. An expert opinion on the current treatment of anemia in patients with kidney disease. *Expert Opin Pharmacother*. 2012;13(4):495-503. doi:10.1517/14656566.2012.658369
6. Bohlius J, Schmidlin K, Brillant C, et al. Recombinant human erythropoiesis-stimulating agents and mortality in patients with cancer: a meta-analysis of randomised trials. *Lancet*. 2009;373(9674):1532-1542. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(09)60502-X
7. U.S. Food and Drug Administration. Scientific Considerations in Demonstrating Biosimilarity to a Reference Product. Guidance for Industry. April 2015.
8. Weise M, Bielsky MC, De Smet K, et al. Biosimilars: what clinicians should know. *Blood*. 2012;120(26):5111-5117. doi:10.1182/blood-2012-04-425744
9. Mellstedt H, Niederwieser D, Ludwig H. The challenge of biosimilars. *Ann Oncol*. 2008;19(3):411-419. doi:10.1093/annonc/mdm345

10. Schellekens H. Biosimilar therapeutics-what do we need to consider?. *NDT Plus*. 2009;2(Suppl_1):i27-i36. doi:10.1093/ndtplus/sfn177
11. Casadevall N, Nataf J, Viron B, et al. Pure red-cell aplasia and antierythropoietin antibodies in patients treated with recombinant erythropoietin. *N Engl J Med*. 2002;346(7):469-475. doi:10.1056/NEJMoa011931
12. Hossler P, Khattak SF, Li ZJ. Optimal and consistent protein glycosylation in mammalian cell culture. *Glycobiology*. 2009;19(9):936-949. doi:10.1093/glycob/cwp079
13. Amato L, Addis A, Saulle R, Trotta F, Mitrova Z, Davoli M. Comparative efficacy and safety in ESA biosimilars vs. originators in adults with chronic kidney disease: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *J Nephrol*. 2018;31(3):321-332. doi:10.1007/s40620-017-0419-5
14. Kaufman RJ, Wasley LC, Furie BC, Furie B, Shoemaker CB. Expression, purification, and characterization of recombinant gamma-carboxylated factor IX synthesized in Chinese hamster ovary cells. *J Biol Chem*. 1986;261(21):9622-9628.
15. Wurm FM. Production of recombinant protein therapeutics in cultivated mammalian cells. *Nat Biotechnol*. 2004;22(11):1393-1398. doi:10.1038/nbt1026
16. Kim TK, Eberwine JH. Mammalian cell transfection: the present and the future. Analytical and bioanalytical chemistry. 2010 Aug;397(8):3173-8.
17. Huang YM, Hu W, Rustandi E, Chang K, Yusuf-Makagiansar H, Ryll T. Maximizing productivity of CHO cell-based fed-batch culture using chemically defined media conditions and typical manufacturing equipment. *Biotechnol Prog*. 2010;26(5):1400-1410. doi:10.1002/btpr.436
18. Browne SM, Al-Rubeai M. Selection methods for high-producing mammalian cell lines. Trends in biotechnology. 2007 Sep 1;25(9):425-32.
19. Yuk IH, Zhang B, Yang Y, et al. Controlling glycation of recombinant antibody in fed-batch cell cultures. *Biotechnol Bioeng*. 2011;108(11):2600-2610. doi:10.1002/bit.23218
20. Li F, Vijayasankaran N, Shen A, Kiss R, Amanullah A. Cell culture processes for monoclonal antibody production. InMAbs 2010 Sep 1 (Vol. 2, No. 5, pp. 466-479). Taylor & Francis.
21. Ghaderi D, Zhang M, Hurtado-Ziola N, Varki A. Production platforms for biotherapeutic glycoproteins. Occurrence, impact, and challenges of non-human sialylation. *Biotechnol Genet Eng Rev*. 2012;28:147-175. doi:10.5661/bger-28-147
22. Warikoo V, Godawat R, Brower K, Jain S, Cummings D, Simons E, Johnson T, Walther J, Yu M, Wright B, McLarty J. Integrated continuous production of recombinant therapeutic proteins. Biotechnology and bioengineering. 2012 Dec;109(12):3018-29.
23. Schiestl M, Zabransky M, Sörgel F. Ten years of biosimilars in Europe: development and evolution of the regulatory pathways. *Drug Des Devel Ther*. 2017;11:1509-1515. Published 2017 May 16. doi: 10.2147/DDDT.S130318
24. Beck A, Wagner-Rousset E, Ayoub D, Van Dorsselaer A, Sanglier-Cianférani S. Characterization of therapeutic antibodies and related products. *Anal Chem*. 2013;85(2):715-736. doi:10.1021/ac3032355
25. Arbogast LW, Brinson RG, Marino JP. Mapping monoclonal antibody structure by 2D 13C NMR at natural abundance. *Anal Chem*. 2015;87(7):3556-3561. doi:10.1021/ac504804m
26. Reusch D, Tejada ML. Fc glycans of therapeutic antibodies as critical quality attributes. *Glycobiology*. 2015;25(12):1325-1334. doi:10.1093/glycob/cwv065
27. Wadhwa M, Knezevic I, Kang HN, Thorpe R. Immunogenicity assessment of biotherapeutic products: An overview of assays and their utility. *Biologicals*. 2015;43(5):298-306. doi: 10.1016/j.biologicals.2015.06.004
28. Weise M, Bielsky MC, De Smet K, et al. Biosimilars: what clinicians should know. *Blood*. 2012;120(26):5111-5117. doi:10.1182/blood-2012-04-425744
29. Mellstedt H, Niederwieser D, Ludwig H. The challenge of biosimilars. *Ann Oncol*. 2008;19(3):411-419. doi:10.1093/annonc/mdm345
30. Trotta F, Belleudi V, Fusco D, et al. Comparative effectiveness and safety of erythropoiesis-stimulating agents (biosimilars vs originators) in clinical practice: a population-based cohort study in Italy. *BMJ Open*. 2017;7(3):e011637. Published 2017 Mar 10. doi:10.1136/bmjopen-2016-011637
31. Schellekens H. Biosimilar therapeutics-what do we need to consider?. *NDT Plus*. 2009;2(Suppl_1):i27-i36. doi:10.1093/ndtplus/sfn177
32. Arakawa T, Ejima D, Li T, Philo JS. The critical role of mobile phase composition in size exclusion

chromatography of protein pharmaceuticals. Journal of pharmaceutical sciences. 2010 Apr 1;99(4):1674-92.

33. Krivoshiev S, Todorov VV, Manitius J, et al. Comparison of the therapeutic effects of epoetin zeta and epoetin alpha in the correction of renal anaemia. *Curr Med Res Opin*. 2008;24(5):1407-1415. doi: 10.1185/030079908x297402
34. Wizemann V, Rutkowski B, Baldamus C, Scigalla P, Koytchev R; Epoetin Zeta Study Group. Comparison of the therapeutic effects of epoetin zeta to epoetin alfa in the maintenance phase of renal anaemia treatment. *Curr Med Res Opin*. 2008;24(3):625-637. doi:10.1185/030079908X273264
35. Liberati A, Altman DG, Tetzlaff J, et al. The PRISMA statement for reporting systematic reviews and meta-analyses of studies that evaluate health care interventions: explanation and elaboration. *J Clin Epidemiol*. 2009;62(10):e1-e34. doi:10.1016/j.jclinepi.2009.06.006
36. Stoppa G, D'Amore C, Conforti A, et al. Comparative Safety of Originator and Biosimilar Epoetin Alfa Drugs: An Observational Prospective Multicenter Study. *BioDrugs*. 2018;32(4):367-375. doi: 10.1007/s40259-018-0293-2
37. Liu B, Chen N, Zhao J, Yin A, Wu X, Xing C, Jiang G, Fu J, Wang M, Wang R, Niu J. Efficacy and safety of darbepoetin alfa injection replacing epoetin alfa injection for the treatment of renal anemia in Chinese hemodialysis patients: A randomized, open-label, parallel-group, noninferiority phase III trial. Chronic Diseases and Translational Medicine. 2022 Jun 25;8(02):134-44.
38. Aapro M, Jelkmann W, Constantinescu SN, Leyland-Jones B. Effects of erythropoietin receptors and erythropoiesis-stimulating agents on disease progression in cancer. British journal of cancer. 2012 Mar;106(7):1249-58.
39. Macdougall IC, Roger SD, De Francisco A, Goldsmith DJ, Schellekens H, Ebbers H, Jelkmann W, London G, Casadevall N, Hörl WH, Kemeny DM. Antibody-mediated pure red cell aplasia in chronic kidney disease patients receiving erythropoiesis-stimulating agents: new insights. Kidney international. 2012 Apr 2;81(8):727-32.
40. Haag-Weber M, Vetter A, Thyroff-Friesinger U. Therapeutic equivalence, long-term efficacy and safety of HX575 in the treatment of anemia in chronic renal failure patients receiving hemodialysis. Clinical nephrology. 2009 Nov 1;72(5):380-90.
41. Michallet M, Losem C. Biosimilar epoetin zeta in oncology and haematology: development and experience following 6 years of use. Acta Haematologica. 2015 Oct 2;135(1):44-52.
42. Casadevall N, Nataf J, Viron B, Kolta A, Kiladjian JJ, Martin-Dupont P, Michaud P, Papo T, Ugo V, Teyssandier I, Varet B. Pure red-cell aplasia and antierythropoietin antibodies in patients treated with recombinant erythropoietin. New England Journal of Medicine. 2002 Feb 14;346(7):469-75.
43. Bennett CL, Luminari S, Nissenson AR, Tallman MS, Klinge SA, McWilliams N, McKoy JM, Kim B, Lyons EA, Trifilio SM, Raisch DW. Pure red-cell aplasia and epoetin therapy. New England Journal of Medicine. 2004 Sep 30;351(14):1403-8.
44. Boven K, Stryker S, Knight J, Thomas A, van Regenmortel M, Kemeny DM, Power D, Rossert J, Casadevall N. The increased incidence of pure red cell aplasia with an Eprex formulation in uncoated rubber stopper syringes. Kidney international. 2005 Jun 1;67(6):2346-53.
45. Hermeling S, Crommelin DJ, Schellekens H, Jiskoot W. Structure-immunogenicity relationships of therapeutic proteins. Pharmaceutical research. 2004 Jun;21(6):897-903.
46. Rosenberg AS. Effects of protein aggregates: an immunologic perspective. The AAPS journal. 2006 Sep 1;8(3):59.
47. Den Engelsman J, Garidel P, Smulders R, Koll H, Smith B, Bassarab S, Seidl A, Hainzl O, Jiskoot W. Strategies for the assessment of protein aggregates in pharmaceutical biotech product development. Pharmaceutical research. 2011 Apr;28(4):920-33.
48. Kerwin BA. Polysorbates 20 and 80 used in the formulation of protein biotherapeutics: structure and degradation pathways. Journal of pharmaceutical sciences. 2008 Aug 1;97(8):2924-35.
49. Wadhwa M, Knezevic I, Kang HN, Thorpe R. Immunogenicity assessment of biotherapeutic products: an overview of assays and their utility. Biologicals. 2015 Sep 1;43(5):298-306.
50. Seidl A, Hainzl O, Richter M, Fischer R, Böhm S, Deutel B, Hartinger M, Windisch J, Casadevall N, London GM, Macdougall I. Tungsten-induced denaturation and aggregation of epoetin alfa during primary packaging as a cause of immunogenicity. Pharmaceutical research. 2012 Jun;29(6):1454-67.
51. Więcek A, Ahmed I, Scigalla P, Koytchev R. Switching epoetin alfa and epoetin zeta in patients with

renal anemia on dialysis: posthoc analysis. Advances in therapy. 2010 Dec;27(12):941-52.
52. Macdougall IC, Roger SD, De Francisco A, Goldsmith DJ, Schellekens H, Ebbers H, Jelkmann W, London G, Casadevall N, Hörl WH, Kemeny DM. Antibody-mediated pure red cell aplasia in chronic kidney disease patients receiving erythropoiesis-stimulating agents: new insights. Kidney international. 2012 Apr 2;81(8):727-32.
53. European Medicines Agency. Guideline on similar biological medicinal products. CHMP/437/04 Rev 1. 2014.
54. Jelkmann W. Physiology and pharmacology of erythropoietin. Transfusion Medicine and Hemotherapy. 2013 Oct 1;40(5):302-9.
55. Weise M, Bielsky MC, De Smet K, Ehmann F, Ekman N, Giezen TJ, Gravanis I, Heim HK, Heinonen E, Ho K, Moreau A. Biosimilars: what clinicians should know. Blood, The Journal of the American Society of Hematology. 2012 Dec 20;120(26):5111-7.
56. U.S. Food and Drug Administration. Scientific Considerations in Demonstrating Biosimilarity to a Reference Product. Guidance for Industry. April 2015.
57. Barosi G, Bosi A, Abbracchio MP, Danesi R, Genazzani A, Corradini P, Pane F, Tura S. Key concepts and critical issues on epoetin and filgrastim biosimilars. A position paper from the Italian Society of Hematology, Italian Society of Experimental Hematology, and Italian Group for Bone Marrow Transplantation. Haematologica. 2011 Jul;96(7):937.
58. Schellekens H. Biosimilar therapeutics—what do we need to consider?. NDT plus. 2009 Jan 1;2(suppl_1):i27-36.
59. Rosenberg AS, Verthelyi D, Cherney BW. Managing uncertainty: a perspective on risk pertaining to product quality attributes as they bear on immunogenicity of therapeutic proteins. Journal of pharmaceutical sciences. 2012 Oct 1;101(10):3560-7.
60. Aapro M, Cornes P, Sun D, Abraham I. Comparative cost efficiency across the European G5 countries of originators and a biosimilar erythropoiesis-stimulating agent to manage chemotherapy-induced anemia in patients with cancer. Therapeutic advances in medical oncology. 2012 May;4(3):95-105.
61. Blackstone EA, Joseph PF. The economics of biosimilars. American health & drug benefits. 2013 Sep;6(8):469.