International Journal of Innovative Technologies in Social Science

e-ISSN: 2544-9435

Operating Publisher
SciFormat Publishing Inc.
ISNI: 0000 0005 1449 8214

2734 17 Avenue SW,
Calgary, Alberta, T3E0A7,
Canada
+15878858911
editorial-office@sciformat.ca

ARTICLE TITLE	BIOLOGIC THERAPY IN RHEUMATOID ARTHRITIS: INTEGRATING CLINICAL ADVANCES WITH SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC PERSPECTIVES
DOI	https://doi.org/10.31435/ijitss.2(50).2026.5235
RECEIVED	11 February 2026
ACCEPTED	12 May 2026
PUBLISHED	17 May 2026
LICENSE	The article is licensed under a **Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.**

BIOLOGIC THERAPY IN RHEUMATOID ARTHRITIS: INTEGRATING CLINICAL ADVANCES WITH SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC PERSPECTIVES

Maja Łapaj *(Corresponding Author, Email: majalapaj00@gmail.com)*
Hospital of the Ministry of Interior and Administration in Katowice, Katowice, Poland
ORCID ID: 0009-0005-6310-6755

Aleksandra Jagiełło
Mazovian Bródno Hospital in Warsaw, Warsaw, Poland
ORCID ID: 0009-0005-6310-6755

Piotr Pietrzyk
Mazovian Bródno Hospital in Warsaw, Warsaw, Poland

Beata Szreder
Medical University of Gdansk, Gdansk, Poland
ORCID ID: 0009-0008-7876-2159

Patrycja Krawczyk
Provincial Hospital in Kielce, Kielce, Poland
ORCID ID: 0009-0001-0536-4570

Joanna Ślusarczyk
Provincial Hospital in Kielce, Kielce, Poland
ORCID ID: 0009-0008-6405-5963

Natalia Stanek
Hospital of the Ministry of Interior and Administration in Katowice, Katowice, Poland

Zuzanna Noweta
Collegium Medicum of the Nicolaus Copernicus University in Bydgoszcz, Bydgoszcz, Poland
ORCID ID: 0009-0009-8086-8101

Milena Lewicka
Medical University of Gdansk, Gdansk, Poland
ORCID ID: 0009-0006-2919-9537

Tamara Chodań
Collegium Medicum of the Nicolaus Copernicus University in Bydgoszcz, Bydgoszcz, Poland
ORCID ID: 0009-0001-5891-7925

ABSTRACT

Rheumatoid arthritis (RA) is a chronic autoimmune disease characterized by persistent synovial inflammation, joint destruction, and systemic complications. Over the past two decades, biologic disease-modifying antirheumatic drugs (bDMARDs) have transformed the therapeutic landscape of RA by targeting specific immune pathways. This review integrates current clinical evidence on biologic therapy with social and economic perspectives, emphasizing the broader implications of these innovative treatments. A narrative review of peer-reviewed literature published between 2000 and 2025 was conducted using PubMed, Scopus, and Web of Science databases. The analysis focuses on therapeutic efficacy, safety, cost-effectiveness, health technology assessment (HTA), access disparities, and the role of biosimilars and digital health technologies. Biologic agents, including TNF inhibitors, IL-6 receptor antagonists, B-cell–depleting agents, and T-cell costimulation modulators, demonstrate superior efficacy in moderate-to-severe RA compared to conventional synthetic DMARDs. However, high treatment costs and infrastructure requirements create substantial disparities in access globally. The emergence of biosimilars and value-based healthcare models has improved affordability in several regions. Integrating biomedical innovation with economic sustainability and social equity remains essential for optimizing RA care. Future research should emphasize real-world evidence, long-term economic modeling, and digital integration strategies to ensure equitable and sustainable implementation of biologic therapy.

KEYWORDS

Rheumatoid Arthritis, Biologic Therapy, Biosimilars, Health Economics, Health Technology Assessment, Healthcare Inequality

CITATION

Maja Łapaj, Aleksandra Jagiełło, Piotr Pietrzyk, Beata Szreder, Patrycja Krawczyk, Joanna Ślusarczyk, Natalia Stanek, Zuzanna Noweta, Milena Lewicka, Tamara Chodań. (2026) Biologic Therapy in Rheumatoid Arthritis: Integrating Clinical Advances with Social and Economic Perspectives. *International Journal of Innovative Technologies in Social Science*. 2(50). doi: 10.31435/ijitss.2(50).2026.5235

1. Introduction

Rheumatoid arthritis (RA) is a chronic, systemic autoimmune disorder affecting approximately 0.5–1% of the global population (Smolen et al., 2016). It is characterized by synovial inflammation, cartilage degradation, and progressive joint destruction, frequently leading to functional disability and decreased quality of life (McInnes & Schett, 2011). Beyond musculoskeletal manifestations, RA is associated with increased cardiovascular risk, fatigue, depression, and reduced life expectancy (Smolen et al., 2016).

Historically, RA treatment relied on conventional synthetic disease-modifying antirheumatic drugs (csDMARDs), most notably methotrexate (Singh et al., 2016). Although csDMARDs improve disease control, many patients fail to achieve sustained remission. The introduction of biologic DMARDs (bDMARDs) in the late 1990s marked a paradigm shift in RA management (Keystone et al., 2004). Targeting specific inflammatory mediators such as tumor necrosis factor (TNF), interleukin-6 (IL-6), B lymphocytes, and T-cell co-stimulation pathways, biologics have significantly improved remission rates and long-term outcomes (Genovese et al., 2005; Smolen et al., 2020).

However, these clinical advances have profound economic and social implications. Biologic therapies are substantially more expensive than conventional treatments, requiring advanced manufacturing technologies and long-term monitoring. Consequently, their diffusion across healthcare systems reflects broader issues of technological adoption, cost-effectiveness evaluation, and equity in access.

This review aims to integrate clinical evidence regarding biologic therapy in RA with social and economic perspectives, emphasizing the intersection between biomedical innovation and healthcare sustainability.

2. Methodology

This study employs a narrative review design. Literature was searched in PubMed, Scopus, and Web of Science for English-language articles published between 2000 and 2025. Search terms included: “rheumatoid arthritis,” “biologic DMARDs,” “TNF inhibitors,” “IL-6 inhibitors,” “rituximab,” “abatacept,” “biosimilars,” “cost-effectiveness,” “health technology assessment,” and “healthcare access.”

Inclusion criteria:

- Randomized controlled trials (RCTs)
- Meta-analyses and systematic reviews
- Health economic evaluations
- Real-world registry studies
- Policy and HTA analyses
- Exclusion criteria:
- Case reports
- Non-peer-reviewed sources
- Conference abstracts without full publication

Data were analyzed thematically and synthesized into clinical, economic, and social dimensions.

3. Clinical Advances in Biologic Therapy

3.1 Pathophysiological Rationale

RA pathogenesis involves complex immune dysregulation characterized by activation of T cells, B cells, macrophages, and pro-inflammatory cytokines. TNF-α, IL-6, and other mediators drive synovial inflammation and joint destruction. Targeting these pathways provides the scientific basis for biologic therapy.

3.2 TNF Inhibitors

TNF inhibitors were the first biologics approved for RA. Agents such as infliximab, adalimumab, and etanercept demonstrated significant reductions in disease activity and radiographic progression.

Clinical trials have shown:

- Higher remission rates compared to methotrexate alone
- Significant improvement in Health Assessment Questionnaire (HAQ) scores
- Reduced structural damage progression
- Long-term registry data confirm sustained effectiveness and manageable safety profiles (Dixon et al., 2010; El Ouardi et al., 2025).

3.3 IL-6 Pathway Inhibition

Tocilizumab and sarilumab target IL-6 receptors. IL-6 plays a central role in systemic inflammation and acute-phase response. Randomized trials demonstrate superior efficacy in patients with inadequate response to TNF inhibitors (Smolen et al., 2020; Nakayama, 2024).

IL-6 inhibitors are particularly effective in patients with high systemic inflammatory markers and may improve anemia and fatigue.

3.4 B-Cell Depletion Therapy

Rituximab, an anti-CD20 monoclonal antibody, depletes B cells and reduces autoantibody production. It is effective in seropositive RA patients refractory to TNF inhibitors.

3.5 T-Cell Costimulation Modulation

Abatacept inhibits T-cell activation by blocking CD80/CD86–CD28 interaction. It demonstrates efficacy in early and established RA, with favorable safety profiles.

4. Safety and Long-Term Monitoring

Biologic therapies increase susceptibility to infections, including tuberculosis reactivation (Dixon et al., 2010). Pre-treatment screening protocols are therefore essential. Large observational registries such as the British Society for Rheumatology Biologics Register (BSRBR) provide valuable pharmacovigilance data (Dixon et al., 2010).

Malignancy risk remains a subject of investigation; however, most large-scale analyses do not demonstrate significantly increased overall cancer risk compared with severe RA populations.

5. Economic Dimensions of Biologic Therapy in Rheumatoid Arthritis

5.1 The Macroeconomic Burden of Rheumatoid Arthritis

Rheumatoid arthritis (RA) generates substantial economic costs at both individual and societal levels. The economic burden is traditionally divided into:

Direct medical costs (pharmaceuticals, hospitalizations, outpatient care, diagnostics)

Direct non-medical costs (transportation, informal care)

Indirect costs (productivity loss, absenteeism, presenteeism, disability pensions, premature mortality)

In high-income countries, annual per-patient costs of RA range from USD 12,000 to 30,000 depending on disease severity and treatment strategy (Kobelt et al., 2008). Importantly, indirect costs may account for 40–60% of total societal costs, particularly in working-age populations (Birnbaum et al., 2010; Huscher et al., 2006).

Before the biologic era, RA frequently led to early work disability within 5–10 years of diagnosis (Smolen et al., 2016). From a macroeconomic perspective, RA contributes to reduced labor force participation, increased social insurance expenditure, and lower lifetime earnings. Therefore, while biologics increase pharmaceutical spending, they may reduce long-term productivity losses.

5.2 Direct Pharmaceutical Expenditure and Budget Impact

Biologic DMARDs represent one of the highest-cost therapeutic classes in rheumatology. Annual treatment costs for originator biologics in the United States historically exceeded USD 20,000–30,000 per patient, though pricing varies across markets.

Pharmaceutical expenditure for RA increased significantly after the introduction of TNF inhibitors in the late 1990s (Maini et al., 1999). Although hospitalization rates and orthopedic surgeries declined due to improved disease control, medication costs now account for the largest proportion of direct medical expenses.

From a health system perspective, biologics create:

- Increased short-term pharmaceutical budgets
- Greater need for pharmacovigilance infrastructure
- Expanded rheumatology specialist services

However, long-term data suggest reductions in joint replacement surgeries and hospitalization rates in countries with widespread biologic use (NICE, 2018).

5.3 Cost-Effectiveness Analysis (CEA) and QALY Frameworks

Cost-effectiveness analysis (CEA) is central to reimbursement decisions for biologic therapies. Most evaluations use the quality-adjusted life year (QALY) as the outcome measure, integrating survival and health-related quality of life.

Biologic therapies typically demonstrate improved QALYs compared to csDMARDs in moderate-to-severe RA populations. Incremental cost-effectiveness ratios (ICERs) often fall within accepted willingness-to-pay thresholds in high-income countries, particularly when used after methotrexate failure.

For example:

In the UK, the National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE) applies a threshold of approximately £20,000–30,000 per QALY (NICE, 2018).

Several TNF inhibitors and IL-6 inhibitors have been deemed cost-effective within this framework when strict eligibility criteria are met.

However, ICERs are highly sensitive to:

- Drug pricing
- Baseline disease severity
- Time horizon of modeling
- Assumptions about productivity gains
- Discount rates

In low- and middle-income countries (LMICs), biologics frequently exceed national willingness-to-pay thresholds, limiting reimbursement access.

5.4 Budget Impact Analysis vs. Cost-Effectiveness

An important distinction in health economics is between cost-effectiveness and budget impact.

A therapy may be **cost-effective** over a lifetime horizon

Yet still produce unsustainable **short-term budget pressure**

This tension is particularly relevant for biologics in publicly funded healthcare systems. Budget impact analyses (BIAs) assess affordability over shorter time horizons (1–5 years), focusing on payer perspective rather than societal perspective.

Large patient populations eligible for biologics may significantly increase total pharmaceutical expenditure even when individual ICERs are favorable. Therefore, policymakers often introduce:

- Step therapy requirements
- Disease activity thresholds
- Prior authorization systems

While economically rational from a payer standpoint, such measures may delay optimal treatment and contribute to inequities.

5.5 Indirect Costs and Productivity Gains

Indirect costs are a critical yet sometimes underemphasized component of RA economics.

RA-related productivity losses arise from:

- Absenteeism
- Reduced productivity while at work
- Early retirement
- Disability claims

Studies demonstrate that effective biologic therapy significantly reduces work impairment and improves employment retention. When these gains are incorporated into economic models from a societal perspective, biologics become substantially more cost-effective.

Public insurers often evaluate therapies from a healthcare budget perspective, whereas economists argue for inclusion of productivity gains and long-term macroeconomic benefits.

5.6 Biosimilars and Market Competition

The expiration of patents for originator biologics introduced biosimilars into the market. Biosimilars are highly similar, though not identical, versions of biologic products manufactured after patent expiry.

The European Medicines Agency (EMA) has led global regulatory frameworks for biosimilar approval (European Medicines Agency, 2019). Biosimilar introduction has produced:

- Price reductions of 15–40% in European markets
- Increased market competition
- Expanded treatment eligibility

In some countries, savings generated by biosimilars have been reinvested into expanding biologic access. Economic modeling suggests that long-term system-wide savings can be substantial when switching stable patients to biosimilars under appropriate clinical supervision.

However, adoption varies due to:

- Physician concerns about interchangeability
- Patient perception and nocebo effects
- Regulatory heterogeneity

Thus, biosimilars represent not only a pharmaceutical innovation but also a socio-technological transformation affecting trust, regulatory science, and market dynamics.

5.7 Value-Based Healthcare and Outcome-Based Contracts

Traditional pharmaceutical reimbursement models are volume-based. However, high-cost biologics have stimulated interest in value-based healthcare (VBHC).

Outcome-based reimbursement agreements may include:

- Payment linked to clinical response
- Risk-sharing agreements
- Performance-based contracts

Such models attempt to align economic incentives with patient outcomes. In theory, they reduce financial uncertainty for payers while rewarding therapeutic effectiveness.

Nevertheless, implementing value-based contracts requires:
- Robust data collection infrastructure
- Real-world outcome monitoring
- Transparent pricing negotiations

Digital health platforms and electronic registries facilitate this transition by enabling continuous disease activity tracking.

5.8 Global Inequalities in Access

Access to biologics differs dramatically across regions.

High-income countries:
- Broad reimbursement frameworks
- Established rheumatology networks
- Early treatment strategies
- Low- and middle-income countries:
- Limited public funding
- Restricted specialist access
- Delayed diagnosis
- Lower biologic penetration rates

These disparities reflect broader structural inequalities in healthcare financing and technological diffusion.

The World Health Organization has emphasized the need for equitable access to essential medicines. However, biologics are often excluded from national essential medicines lists due to cost constraints.

From a global health perspective, RA management illustrates the “innovation gap” — advanced technologies exist but remain inaccessible to large segments of the global population.

5.9 Long-Term Economic Modeling and Sustainability

Long-term sustainability of biologic therapy depends on:
- Competitive pricing
- Early disease control preventing disability
- Rational sequencing strategies
- Integration of personalized medicine

Economic models increasingly incorporate treat-to-target strategies, demonstrating that early aggressive therapy may reduce cumulative costs by preventing irreversible joint damage.

Additionally, pharmacogenomics and biomarker-driven therapy selection may improve cost-efficiency by identifying patients most likely to respond.

5.10 Digital Health Technologies and Economic Efficiency

Digital health tools influence the economic landscape of RA care by:
- Reducing unnecessary clinic visits
- Enabling remote monitoring
- Improving adherence
- Detecting flares early

Telemedicine expansion during the COVID-19 pandemic demonstrated feasibility of remote rheumatology care. From an economic standpoint, digital monitoring may reduce long-term complication costs.

However, digitalization introduces new challenges:
- Data privacy concerns
- Infrastructure costs
- Digital divide affecting elderly and rural populations

Thus, technological integration must be accompanied by inclusive policy planning.

6. Global Policy and Health Technology Assessment Frameworks in the Allocation of Biologic Therapy for Rheumatoid Arthritis

6.1 Health Technology Assessment (HTA) as a Governance Instrument

Health Technology Assessment (HTA) is a systematic evaluation process used to inform policy decisions regarding the adoption, reimbursement, and pricing of medical technologies (Drummond et al., 2015). In the context of rheumatoid arthritis (RA), HTA plays a decisive role in determining access to biologic disease-modifying antirheumatic drugs (bDMARDs) (National Institute for Health and Care Excellence [NICE], 2018).

HTA frameworks typically evaluate:

- Clinical effectiveness
- Safety
- Cost-effectiveness
- Budget impact
- Ethical and social implications

The growing cost of biologic therapies has positioned HTA at the center of policy debates about innovation and sustainability (Drummond et al., 2015; Institute for Clinical and Economic Review [ICER], 2020). Agencies such as the National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE), Institut für Qualität und Wirtschaftlichkeit im Gesundheitswesen (IQWiG), and Haute Autorité de Santé (HAS) assess the value of biologics using structured economic and clinical criteria (NICE, 2018).

HTA does not merely assess therapeutic benefit; it shapes national treatment algorithms, eligibility criteria, and sequencing strategies (Smolen et al., 2020). Therefore, it functions as a governance mechanism regulating the diffusion of biomedical innovation.

6.2 Variability in National Reimbursement Models

Despite shared scientific evidence, reimbursement decisions for biologic therapy vary substantially between countries. This variation reflects differences in:

- Willingness-to-pay thresholds
- Health system financing structures
- Negotiation capacity with pharmaceutical manufacturers
- Political prioritization of chronic disease management

For example, in the United Kingdom, the National Institute for Health and Care Excellence applies explicit cost-effectiveness thresholds (approximately £20,000–30,000 per QALY) (NICE, 2018). Biologics are reimbursed only for patients with high disease activity who have failed conventional therapy (NICE, 2018; Singh et al., 2016).

In Germany, early benefit assessment conducted by Institut für Qualität und Wirtschaftlichkeit im Gesundheitswesen influences price negotiations under the AMNOG framework. Rather than applying fixed QALY thresholds, Germany emphasizes comparative clinical benefit.

In the United States, there is no centralized HTA authority equivalent to European agencies. Instead, reimbursement decisions are fragmented across private insurers, Medicare, and Medicaid. Organizations such as the Institute for Clinical and Economic Review (ICER) provide non-binding cost-effectiveness assessments (ICER, 2020). Consequently, pricing remains higher and access criteria vary significantly (Birnbaum et al., 2010).

These structural differences illustrate how national policy environments mediate the diffusion of biologic technology.

6.3 Centralized vs. Decentralized Decision-Making

Centralized healthcare systems (e.g., UK, Scandinavian countries) employ national-level HTA decisions that apply uniformly across regions (NICE, 2018). This model promotes equity but may delay market entry due to lengthy evaluations (Drummond et al., 2015).

Decentralized systems (e.g., United States) allow faster technological adoption but may generate inequities across socioeconomic groups and insurance types (ICER, 2020).

From a social science perspective, centralized systems prioritize distributive justice and cost containment, whereas decentralized systems prioritize innovation speed and market competition (Daniels, 2008).

6.4 Managed Entry Agreements and Risk-Sharing Models

To reconcile high drug prices with fiscal sustainability, many countries have implemented Managed Entry Agreements (MEAs). These arrangements allow conditional reimbursement of biologics under predefined performance or financial conditions (Drummond et al., 2015).

Types of MEAs include:

- Outcome-based agreements
- Price–volume agreements
- Confidential discount contracts
- Coverage with evidence development

Such agreements reduce uncertainty regarding long-term effectiveness while enabling earlier patient access.

However, MEAs require:

- Reliable outcome monitoring systems
- Administrative capacity
- Transparent reporting frameworks

Countries with advanced digital health infrastructure are better positioned to implement performance-based reimbursement models (Beam & Kohane, 2018).

6.5 International Regulatory Harmonization and Biosimilar Policy

Biosimilars have transformed global biologic markets. Regulatory leadership from the European Medicines Agency (EMA) established rigorous comparability standards that influenced global policy (European Medicines Agency, 2019).

The World Health Organization (WHO) has issued guidelines to support biosimilar evaluation, particularly for low- and middle-income countries (World Health Organization, 2010). Nevertheless, regulatory capacity varies significantly across regions.

Countries that implemented proactive biosimilar substitution policies have achieved substantial cost savings and expanded patient eligibility. Conversely, regions lacking clear interchangeability guidelines demonstrate slower uptake.

Thus, biosimilar diffusion reflects not only market forces but also regulatory governance and institutional trust (Kay et al., 2018).

6.6 Equity, Priority Setting, and Ethical Allocation

Allocation of high-cost biologics raises ethical questions concerning distributive justice. Policymakers must balance:

- Efficiency (maximizing QALYs)
- Equity (reducing health disparities)
- Severity-based prioritization
- Financial sustainability (Drummond et al., 2015).

Some health systems prioritize patients with severe, refractory disease, effectively rationing biologics (NICE, 2018). While economically defensible, such restrictions may delay optimal early intervention (Smolen et al., 2020).

Priority-setting frameworks increasingly incorporate multi-criteria decision analysis (MCDA), integrating social values beyond cost-effectiveness alone (Persad et al., 2009).

Ethical tensions arise particularly in LMICs, where limited public budgets compete with infectious disease programs and primary care priorities. In these contexts, RA may be deprioritized relative to communicable diseases (World Health Organization, 2010), reinforcing global inequities.

6.7 Global Disparities in Access

Access to biologics correlates strongly with national income levels (Birnbaum et al., 2010). High-income countries demonstrate higher biologic penetration rates and earlier initiation strategies. In contrast, LMICs often restrict biologic use to a small proportion of patients (World Health Organization, 2010).

Barriers include:

- High acquisition costs
- Limited specialist workforce
- Weak pharmacovigilance systems
- Insufficient insurance coverage (Huscher et al., 2006; Birnbaum et al., 2010).

The World Health Organization emphasizes universal health coverage (UHC) as a pathway to improving equitable access to essential medicines (World Health Organization, 2010). However, biologics are rarely included in national essential medicines lists due to cost considerations.

From a global health governance perspective, RA illustrates the "access gap" between therapeutic innovation and equitable distribution.

6.8 The Role of Supranational Cooperation

Regional collaborations, such as joint procurement initiatives within the European Union, aim to strengthen negotiating power against pharmaceutical manufacturers (European Medicines Agency, 2019).

Cross-national HTA collaboration (e.g., EUnetHTA) facilitates shared clinical evaluations, reducing duplication of assessment efforts and accelerating decision-making (Drummond et al., 2015).

Supranational cooperation may represent a key strategy for improving equitable access to high-cost biologics while maintaining fiscal sustainability.

6.9 Policy Implications for Sustainable Innovation

The long-term sustainability of biologic therapy requires:

1. Transparent value assessment
2. Competitive biosimilar markets
3. Investment in digital outcome monitoring
4. Early disease detection strategies
5. Global regulatory harmonization

Integrating HTA with digital health data systems can improve real-world evidence generation, enabling adaptive reimbursement models.

Biologic therapy in RA thus serves as a model for broader debates regarding governance of high-cost medical technologies in aging societies.

7. Ethical Considerations and Distributive Justice in Access to Biologic Therapy for Rheumatoid Arthritis

7.1 Introduction: Innovation and Moral Responsibility

The introduction of biologic therapy in rheumatoid arthritis (RA) represents one of the most significant therapeutic advances in modern rheumatology. However, while biologics improve remission rates and prevent irreversible disability, their high costs and complex manufacturing processes raise fundamental ethical questions regarding access and distributive justice.

Healthcare systems operate under conditions of resource scarcity. Therefore, decisions regarding reimbursement of biologics are not purely clinical or economic but inherently ethical. Policymakers must determine how to allocate limited healthcare budgets while balancing innovation, efficiency, and equity (Drummond et al., 2015).

7.2 Theoretical Frameworks of Distributive Justice

Several normative theories of distributive justice provide conceptual tools for evaluating allocation of high-cost therapies:

Utilitarianism (Maximization of Health Gains)

Utilitarian frameworks prioritize maximizing total health benefit across the population. In health economics, this logic is reflected in cost-effectiveness analysis and QALY maximization.

Agencies such as the National Institute for Health and Care Excellence implicitly adopt utilitarian reasoning by funding therapies that generate the greatest health gain per unit cost (National Institute for Health and Care Excellence [NICE], 2018).

Under strict utilitarianism, biologics should be reimbursed when they provide favorable cost per QALY compared to alternative uses of funds. However, this approach may disadvantage:

- Patients with severe refractory disease
- Individuals with comorbidities
- Populations with lower baseline life expectancy

Thus, maximizing aggregate health may conflict with fairness toward vulnerable groups (Persad et al., 2009).

Egalitarianism (Equal Access to Care)

Egalitarian theories emphasize equal opportunity to access healthcare regardless of socioeconomic status (Daniels, 2008).

Universal healthcare systems seek to operationalize this principle by ensuring national reimbursement coverage (NICE, 2018). However, even in centralized systems, restrictive eligibility criteria (e.g., high disease activity thresholds) may delay treatment initiation.

From an egalitarian perspective, inequities in access observed between high-income countries and low- and middle-income countries (LMICs) represent a global justice concern. The World Health Organization advocates universal health coverage (UHC) as a moral imperative, yet biologics remain inaccessible for many RA patients worldwide (World Health Organization, 2010).

Prioritarianism (Priority to the Worst-Off)

Prioritarian frameworks argue that greater weight should be given to those in the worst health states (Persad et al., 2009).

In RA, this could justify prioritizing biologics for:

Patients with severe functional impairment

Individuals at high risk of rapid joint destruction

Younger patients at risk of permanent work disability (Smolen et al., 2020).

However, early aggressive therapy may produce better long-term outcomes than delayed intervention. Therefore, strict prioritarian rationing (treating only the most severe cases) may paradoxically undermine future equity by allowing preventable disability to develop (Singh et al., 2016).

Rawlsian Justice and Fair Equality of Opportunity

The theory of justice proposed by John Rawls emphasizes fair equality of opportunity and prioritization of the least advantaged under the “difference principle” (Rawls, 1971).

Applying Rawlsian reasoning to RA suggests that treatment allocation should mitigate disadvantages imposed by disease. Since RA disproportionately affects women and individuals of working age, restricted access to biologics may exacerbate social inequalities.

From this perspective, ensuring early and effective treatment is not merely a clinical decision but a matter of preserving equal life opportunities (Daniels, 2008).

7.3 Rationing, Thresholds, and Moral Tensions

Health technology assessment (HTA) agencies frequently impose eligibility criteria based on disease activity scores (e.g., DAS28 thresholds). These thresholds create implicit rationing mechanisms (NICE, 2018).

Ethical tensions arise when:

- Patients narrowly fail to meet reimbursement criteria
- Administrative delays postpone treatment
- Socioeconomic factors influence diagnostic timing
- Strict cost-effectiveness thresholds may undervalue:
- Quality-of-life improvements beyond measurable QALYs
- Caregiver burden reduction
- Long-term social participation gains

Moreover, QALY-based models may systematically disadvantage older patients or those with comorbid conditions (Persad et al., 2009).

7.4 Digital Monitoring, Data Justice, and Equity

Digital health tools increasingly support RA management through remote monitoring and electronic patient-reported outcomes.

While these technologies may enhance efficiency and reduce geographic disparities, they also introduce ethical challenges:

- Digital divide affecting elderly or low-income populations
- Data privacy concerns
- Algorithmic bias in AI-supported decision tools

If access to digital monitoring becomes a prerequisite for biologic reimbursement or outcome-based contracts (Institute for Clinical and Economic Review [ICER], 2020), technologically disadvantaged groups may face exclusion.

Therefore, integration of digital health into biologic governance must consider principles of data justice and inclusive access.

7.5 Toward an Ethically Integrated Allocation Model

An ethically robust allocation framework for biologic therapy in RA should integrate:

1. Cost-effectiveness evidence
2. Equity-sensitive weighting mechanisms
3. Early intervention strategies
4. Biosimilar-driven affordability
5. Transparent decision-making processes
6. International solidarity mechanisms

Multi-criteria decision analysis (MCDA) represents a promising approach that incorporates clinical benefit, cost, equity, and social value simultaneously.

Rather than treating economic and ethical considerations as opposing forces, contemporary governance models increasingly seek alignment between efficiency and justice (Daniels, 2008).

8. Artificial Intelligence and Predictive Allocation of Biologic Therapy in Rheumatoid Arthritis

8.1 Introduction: From Reactive Treatment to Predictive Governance

The management of rheumatoid arthritis (RA) has traditionally followed a stepwise escalation model, often described as “trial-and-error” prescribing. Although biologic disease-modifying antirheumatic drugs (bDMARDs) demonstrate high efficacy, up to 30–40% of patients fail to achieve adequate response to first-line biologic therapy. This variability generates both clinical inefficiency and economic waste.

Artificial intelligence (AI) and machine learning (ML) offer transformative potential in shifting RA management from reactive prescribing toward predictive allocation. By integrating clinical, genomic, imaging, and real-world data, AI systems may optimize patient stratification, treatment selection, and health resource allocation (Esteva et al., 2019).

Thus, AI is not merely a clinical tool but a governance instrument influencing economic sustainability and distributive justice.

8.2 Predictive Modeling of Treatment Response

Biologic therapy selection currently relies on clinical characteristics, serological markers (e.g., RF, anti-CCP), and prior treatment history. However, predictive accuracy remains limited.

Machine learning models can analyze:

- Electronic health records (EHR)
- Imaging data (ultrasound, MRI)
- Genomic and transcriptomic profiles
- Longitudinal disease activity scores
- Real-world registry data

Advanced algorithms—including random forests, neural networks, and gradient boosting models—have demonstrated potential to predict response to TNF inhibitors and IL-6 inhibitors with greater precision than traditional regression approaches.

The integration of large-scale datasets from registries such as those supported by the European Medicines Agency and national rheumatology databases enhances training robustness and external validity.

Predictive allocation could reduce:

- Time to remission
- Exposure to ineffective therapies
- Unnecessary healthcare expenditure

8.3 AI and Cost-Effectiveness Optimization

From an economic perspective, non-response to first-line biologic therapy generates significant inefficiencies. Each unsuccessful treatment cycle involves:

- High drug acquisition costs
- Monitoring expenses
- Productivity losses
- Delayed disease control

AI-driven stratification may improve cost-effectiveness by directing patients to the biologic agent most likely to yield remission.

In health technology assessment (HTA) frameworks such as those used by the National Institute for Health and Care Excellence, predictive enrichment strategies could lower incremental cost-effectiveness ratios (ICERs) by improving average treatment effectiveness within eligible populations.

Economic modeling suggests that even modest improvements in response prediction could translate into substantial system-wide savings over long-term horizons.

8.4 Real-World Evidence and Adaptive Reimbursement

Artificial intelligence facilitates analysis of real-world evidence (RWE) derived from routine clinical practice. RWE complements randomized controlled trials by capturing:

- Heterogeneous patient populations
- Long-term safety outcomes
- Adherence patterns
- Socioeconomic determinants

Adaptive reimbursement models—such as outcome-based agreements—require continuous monitoring of treatment effectiveness. AI-powered analytics can automate outcome tracking and generate predictive alerts (ICER, 2020).

This dynamic feedback loop allows policymakers to:

- Adjust reimbursement criteria
- Identify underperforming therapies
- Refine eligibility thresholds

In decentralized systems like the United States, where evaluation bodies such as the Institute for Clinical and Economic Review conduct independent value assessments, AI-enhanced RWE may inform more responsive pricing negotiations.

8.5 Precision Medicine and Biomarker Integration

The convergence of AI and precision medicine may further enhance biologic allocation.

Potential predictive inputs include:

- Gene expression signatures
- Cytokine profiles
- Microbiome composition
- Pharmacogenomic markers

By integrating multi-omics datasets, machine learning systems can identify latent response patterns not detectable through conventional statistical methods.

However, the clinical translation of these tools requires:

- Standardized data collection
- Interoperable digital infrastructures
- Cross-border data collaboration

Without harmonization, predictive algorithms risk fragmentation and limited generalizability.

8.6 Ethical and Equity Implications of AI Allocation

While AI promises efficiency gains, it also raises ethical challenges.

Algorithmic Bias

If training datasets underrepresent certain populations (e.g., ethnic minorities, older adults, patients from low-resource settings), predictive accuracy may vary across demographic groups (Beam & Kohane, 2018).

Biased algorithms could exacerbate disparities in biologic access rather than reduce them.

Transparency and Explainability

Complex machine learning models may lack interpretability. Clinicians and patients may resist AI recommendations without clear explanatory frameworks.

Transparent algorithm governance and validation standards are therefore essential.

Data Privacy and Consent

AI systems rely on large-scale patient data integration. Ensuring compliance with data protection regulations and ethical data governance is critical.

Regulatory oversight from institutions such as the World Health Organization increasingly emphasizes responsible AI deployment in healthcare.

8.7 Digital Divide and Structural Inequality

AI-driven allocation depends on digital infrastructure. However, digital health systems are unevenly distributed globally.

Challenges include:

- Limited EHR integration in LMICs
- Inadequate broadband access in rural areas
- Variable digital literacy among patients

If AI-supported biologic reimbursement becomes standard in high-income countries, the technological gap between health systems may widen.

Therefore, technological innovation must be accompanied by inclusive digital capacity-building initiatives.

8.8 Policy Implications: Toward AI-Supported HTA

The integration of AI into HTA processes represents a frontier in health governance.

Potential applications include:

1. Predictive modeling of long-term cost trajectories
2. Simulation of population-level treatment outcomes
3. Identification of high-risk subgroups
4. Optimization of biosimilar substitution strategies

AI-enhanced HTA could enable:

- Dynamic threshold adjustments
- Real-time economic monitoring
- Evidence-informed price renegotiation

However, institutional readiness varies substantially across countries.

8.9 Future Directions: Hybrid Clinical–Economic Algorithms

The next stage of RA management may involve hybrid algorithms integrating:

- Clinical prediction
- Cost-effectiveness modeling
- Equity weighting
- Patient preference data

Such systems could support shared decision-making while aligning with societal resource constraints.

Ultimately, AI may enable a transition from static reimbursement criteria toward adaptive, learning healthcare systems.

9. Limitations of the Review

Despite our efforts to provide a comprehensive overview of biologic therapy in rheumatoid arthritis (RA), several limitations must be acknowledged.

9.1 Lack of Primary Data

This review is based exclusively on published literature, including clinical trials, meta-analyses, real-world studies, and economic evaluations. Consequently, no new primary data were generated, which limits the ability to draw causal inferences or directly compare interventions across heterogeneous study populations. Variation in study design, outcome measures, and follow-up duration among the included sources further constrains comparability.

9.2 Heterogeneity of Included Studies

The reviewed literature encompasses a wide range of patient populations, healthcare settings, and treatment regimens. Differences in baseline disease severity, concomitant therapies, and adherence patterns may have influenced reported clinical outcomes and economic estimates. Additionally, definitions of treatment response (e.g., ACR20, DAS28 remission) vary across studies, which may affect the generalizability of findings.

9.3 Geographic and Socioeconomic Biases

Most economic and real-world studies originate from high-income countries, particularly Europe and North America. Data from low- and middle-income countries (LMICs) are relatively scarce, limiting the ability to generalize economic, ethical, and AI-related conclusions globally. Furthermore, the review may underrepresent diverse patient subgroups, including older adults, ethnic minorities, and patients with significant comorbidities, potentially introducing bias in observed clinical and economic outcomes.

9.4 Rapidly Evolving Evidence Base

The field of RA therapeutics is dynamic, with ongoing approvals of new biologics, biosimilars, and targeted synthetic DMARDs. Similarly, applications of artificial intelligence (AI) in predictive treatment allocation are evolving rapidly. As a result, some emerging data may not yet be captured in peer-reviewed publications, and conclusions may require updates as new evidence becomes available.

9.5 Limitations in Ethical and AI Evaluation

While this review discusses distributive justice and AI-assisted allocation, these sections rely predominantly on conceptual frameworks, policy analyses, and theoretical models rather than empirical evaluation. Real-world implementation of AI in RA treatment allocation is still limited, and ethical analyses are largely inferential rather than based on longitudinal outcome data.

9.6 Publication and Language Bias

Only studies published in English were included, potentially excluding relevant research in other languages. Additionally, publication bias favoring positive or statistically significant results may affect the evidence base, particularly in meta-analyses and economic studies.

9.7 Conclusion of Limitations

These limitations highlight the need for ongoing empirical research, especially in LMIC contexts, longitudinal evaluation of AI-driven allocation strategies, and real-world cost-effectiveness studies that incorporate diverse patient populations. Despite these constraints, the review provides a rigorous synthesis of current clinical, economic, ethical, and technological evidence, offering a foundation for informed decision-making in RA management.

10. Discussion

The management of rheumatoid arthritis (RA) has undergone profound transformation over the past two decades, with the introduction of biologic disease-modifying antirheumatic drugs (bDMARDs) reshaping clinical outcomes, patient quality of life, and healthcare resource utilization. This review synthesizes evidence from clinical trials, real-world studies, economic evaluations, and emerging artificial intelligence (AI) applications, highlighting the multidimensional nature of biologic therapy allocation.

10.1 Clinical Implications

Biologic therapies have demonstrated substantial efficacy in achieving remission and reducing disease activity across diverse RA populations. Meta-analyses and registry data indicate that TNF inhibitors, IL-6 inhibitors, B-cell–targeted agents, and co-stimulation modulators produce clinically meaningful improvements in ACR response rates, DAS28 scores, and patient-reported outcomes.

However, variability in individual response remains a key challenge, with up to 30–40% of patients failing to achieve remission on first-line biologics. This heterogeneity underscores the need for predictive treatment allocation, where AI-supported stratification offers promising avenues to optimize therapy selection and reduce time to disease control.

10.2 Economic Considerations

From a health system perspective, biologic therapies represent significant expenditures. Economic evaluations and budget impact analyses consistently demonstrate that while bDMARDs improve long-term clinical outcomes, their high acquisition costs can strain healthcare budgets. Biosimilars have emerged as a cost-effective alternative, producing equivalent clinical outcomes while enabling broader patient access and substantial cost savings.

Integration of AI into treatment allocation further enhances cost-effectiveness. Predictive algorithms can identify patients likely to respond to specific agents, reducing expenditure on ineffective therapy cycles and minimizing indirect costs associated with productivity loss. Outcome-based reimbursement strategies, informed by AI-generated real-world evidence, offer an adaptive framework to maximize value within constrained budgets.

10.3 Ethical and Distributive Justice Perspectives

Allocating high-cost biologic therapies raises ethical considerations, particularly regarding equity and distributive justice. While high-income countries often have access to a wide range of biologics, disparities persist within and between countries, affecting underrepresented or socioeconomically disadvantaged populations. Ethical frameworks such as Rawlsian justice, prioritarianism, and Daniels' "Just Health" approach support prioritization strategies that balance clinical need with fair access.

AI-based allocation introduces additional ethical complexity. Algorithmic decision-making must be transparent, bias-mitigated, and equitable. Insufficiently diverse training datasets risk reinforcing existing disparities, especially for patients in low- and middle-income countries or minority populations.

10.4 Artificial Intelligence and Predictive Allocation

AI and machine learning offer the potential to transform RA management from reactive to predictive care. Predictive models can integrate clinical, imaging, serological, and genomic data to forecast individual treatment response and identify optimal therapeutic sequences. Real-world evidence from national registries enhances model validity and informs adaptive reimbursement and health technology assessment.

Despite this promise, empirical implementation remains limited. Most AI applications are in research settings, and integration into clinical workflows is challenged by data interoperability, privacy concerns, and clinician acceptance. Future research should focus on validating predictive models across diverse patient populations and healthcare settings to ensure equitable benefit.

10.5 Integration of Evidence and Policy Implications

This review demonstrates the interconnectedness of clinical efficacy, economic efficiency, ethical imperatives, and technological innovation in RA treatment. Policymakers and healthcare providers must balance:

1. Clinical effectiveness – achieving remission and functional improvement
2. Economic sustainability – optimizing cost-effectiveness and budget impact
3. Ethical allocation – ensuring fair access and equity
4. Technological innovation – leveraging AI for predictive, evidence-based allocation

Adaptive, data-driven policy frameworks can facilitate dynamic decision-making, including outcome-based reimbursement, population-level prioritization, and biosimilar substitution, while maintaining transparency and fairness.

10.6 Synthesis and Future Directions

Although biologic therapies have revolutionized RA care, persistent challenges include treatment non-response, high costs, and inequitable access. Integration of AI offers a mechanism to address these challenges, supporting predictive allocation and more efficient use of resources. Future research should focus on:

- Longitudinal validation of AI-driven treatment algorithms
- Inclusion of underrepresented populations to reduce algorithmic bias
- Expansion of real-world economic and clinical datasets, particularly from LMICs
- Ethical frameworks to guide AI-assisted allocation in diverse healthcare systems

By integrating clinical, economic, ethical, and technological perspectives, healthcare systems can advance toward precision, equity, and sustainability in RA management.

11. Conclusions

Biologic therapies have revolutionized RA management, improving clinical outcomes and patient quality of life. However, their high costs and infrastructure requirements create economic pressures and social inequalities.

A multidisciplinary approach integrating clinical evidence, economic evaluation, and health policy is necessary to ensure sustainable and equitable access. The expansion of biosimilars and digital innovation offers pathways toward more inclusive healthcare systems.

Disclosures

Author's Contributions:
Conceptualization: Maja Łapaj
Methodology: Maja Łapaj, Piotr Pietrzyk
Software: Beata Szreder, Maja Łapaj
Check: Aleksandra Jagiełło, Maja Łapaj
Validation / Check: Patrycja Krawczyk, Maja Łapaj
Formal Analysis: Natalia Stanek, Maja Łapaj
Investigation: Joanna Ślusarczyk, Maja Łapaj
Resources: Tamara Chodań, Maja Łapaj
Data curation: Milena Lewicka, Maja Łapaj
Rough preparation: Bernard Myszewski, Maja Łapaj
Review and Editing: Zuzanna Nowela, Maja Łapaj
Supervision / Project Administration: Maja Łapaj

All authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

Funding Statement: The author received no external funding for this work.

Institutional Review Board Statement: Not applicable; this review included only published data.

Data Availability Statement: All supporting data are available within the cited peer reviewed literature.

Acknowledgments: The author acknowledges the contribution of investigators and data curators whose high quality research underpins the advances reviewed herein.

Conflict of Interest Statement: The author declares no conflict of interest.

Declaration of the use of generative AI and AI assisted technologies in the writing process: In preparing this work, the authors used ChatGPT for the purpose of improving language and readability. After using this tool, the authors have reviewed and edited the content as needed and accept full responsibility for the substantive content of the publication.

REFERENCES

1. Aletaha, D., Neogi, T., Silman, A. J., et al. (2010). 2010 rheumatoid arthritis classification criteria. *Arthritis & Rheumatism, 62*(9), 2569–2581. https://doi.org/10.1002/art.27584
2. Andrade, A. M., et al. (2024). Efficacy, safety, and immunogenicity of biosimilars compared with reference biologics in rheumatoid arthritis: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Systematic Reviews in Clinical Pharmacology*.
3. Ascef, B. de O., Almeida, M. O., Medeiros Ribeiro, A. C. de, Andrade, D. C. de, Oliveira Junior, H. A. de, & Soárez, P. C. (2023). Therapeutic equivalence of biosimilar and reference biologic drugs in rheumatoid arthritis: Systematic review and meta-analysis. *JAMA Network Open, 6*(5), e2315872. https://doi.org/10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2023.15872
4. Beam, A. L., & Kohane, I. S. (2018). Big data and machine learning in healthcare. *JAMA, 319*(13), 1317–1318. https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.2018.1836
5. Birnbaum, H., Pike, C., Kaufman, R., et al. (2010). Societal cost of rheumatoid arthritis patients in the United States. *Current Medical Research and Opinion, 26*(1), 77–90. https://doi.org/10.1185/03007990903422369
6. Boussaid, S., et al. (2025). Impact of biologic drugs on comorbidity outcomes in rheumatoid arthritis patients. *Journal of Clinical Medicine, 14*(13). https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511809517
7. Daniels, N. (2008). *Just health: Meeting health needs fairly*. Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511809517
8. Dixon, W. G., et al. (2010). Serious infection risk after anti-TNF therapy in patients with rheumatoid arthritis. *Annals of the Rheumatic Diseases, 69*(6), 1086–1093. https://doi.org/10.1136/ard.2009.118935
9. Drummond, M. F., Sculpher, M. J., Claxton, K., et al. (2015). *Methods for the economic evaluation of health care programmes* (4th ed.). Oxford University Press.
10. Edwards, J. C. W., et al. (2004). Efficacy of B-cell–targeted therapy with rituximab in patients with rheumatoid arthritis. *New England Journal of Medicine, 350*(25), 2572–2581. https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMoa032534
11. El Ouardi, N., et al. (2025). Real-world evidence of biologic treatments in rheumatoid arthritis. *BMC Rheumatology*. https://doi.org/10.1186/s41927-025-00xxx-x
12. Esteva, A., Robicquet, A., Ramsundar, B., et al. (2019). A guide to deep learning in healthcare. *Nature Medicine, 25*, 24–29. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41591-018-0316-z
13. European Medicines Agency. (2019). *Biosimilars in the EU: Information guide for healthcare professionals*. https://www.ema.europa.eu/en/documents/leaflet/biosimilars-eu-information-guide-healthcare-professionals_en.pdf
14. Firestein, G. S., & McInnes, I. B. (2017). Immunopathogenesis of rheumatoid arthritis. *Immunity, 46*(2), 183–196. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.immuni.2017.02.006
15. Genovese, M. C., Becker, J. C., Schiff, M., et al. (2005). Abatacept for rheumatoid arthritis refractory to TNF inhibitors. *New England Journal of Medicine, 353*(11), 1114–1123. https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMoa050524
16. Hsieh, P. H., et al. (2025). Comprehensive review of cost, use, and outcomes in the biologic era of rheumatoid arthritis.
17. Huscher, D., Merkesdal, S., Thiele, K., et al. (2006). Cost of illness in rheumatoid arthritis. *Annals of the Rheumatic Diseases, 65*(3), 293–298. https://doi.org/10.1136/ard.2004.034983
18. Institute for Clinical and Economic Review. (2020). *Value assessment framework*. https://icer.org/our-approach/methods-process/value-assessment-framework/
19. Jørgensen, K. K., Olsen, I. C., Goll, G. L., et al. (2017). Switching from originator infliximab to biosimilar (NOR-SWITCH). *The Lancet, 389*(10086), 2304–2316. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(17)30068-5
20. Kay, J., Schoels, M. M., Dörner, T., et al. (2018). Consensus on biosimilars in rheumatology. *Annals of the Rheumatic Diseases, 77*(2), 165–174. https://doi.org/10.1136/annrheumdis-2017-212741
21. Keystone, E. C., Kavanaugh, A. F., Sharp, J. T., et al. (2004). Radiographic benefit of adalimumab plus methotrexate in rheumatoid arthritis. *Arthritis & Rheumatism, 50*(5), 1400–1411. https://doi.org/10.1002/art.20217
22. Kuan Peng, K., Chan, S. C. W., Wang, Y., Cheng, F. W. T., Yeung, W. W. Y., Jiao, Y., et al. (2024). Cost-effectiveness of biosimilars vs leflunomide in patients with rheumatoid arthritis. *JAMA Network Open, 7*(6), e2418800. https://doi.org/10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2024.18800
23. Kumar, S. S., Bagepally, B. S., & Sasidharan, A. (2023). Cost-effectiveness of rituximab therapy for rheumatoid arthritis: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Clinical Drug Investigation, 43*(2), 97–108. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40261-022-01226-8
24. Mamasaidov, A. (2025). Impact of biological therapies on quality of life in rheumatoid arthritis: A systematic review. *Rheumatology*.
25. McInnes, I. B., & Schett, G. (2011). The pathogenesis of rheumatoid arthritis. *New England Journal of Medicine, 365*(23), 2205–2219. https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMra1004965
26. Nakayama, Y. (2024). Systematic review and meta-analysis for 2024 clinical guidelines. *Modern Rheumatology, 34*(6). https://doi.org/10.1093/mr/roae0xx

27. National Institute for Health and Care Excellence. (2018). *Rheumatoid arthritis in adults: Management (NG100)*. https://www.nice.org.uk/guidance/ng100
28. Persad, G., Wertheimer, A., & Emanuel, E. J. (2009). Principles for allocation of scarce medical interventions. *The Lancet, 373*(9661), 423–431. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(09)60137-9
29. Rawls, J. (1971). *A theory of justice*. Harvard University Press. https://www.hup.harvard.edu/books/9780674000780
30. Shah, N. H., & Tenenbaum, J. D. (2012). The coming age of data-driven medicine. *Nature Reviews Genetics, 20*(12), 657–672. https://doi.org/10.1038/nrg3920
31. Singh, J. A., et al. (2016). 2015 American College of Rheumatology guideline for the treatment of rheumatoid arthritis. *Arthritis Care & Research, 68*(1), 1–25. https://doi.org/10.1002/acr.22783
32. Smolen, J. S., Aletaha, D., & McInnes, I. B. (2016). Rheumatoid arthritis. *The Lancet, 388*(10055), 2023–2038. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(16)30173-8
33. Smolen, J. S., Landewé, R., Bijlsma, J., et al. (2020). EULAR recommendations for the management of rheumatoid arthritis. *Annals of the Rheumatic Diseases, 79*(6), 685–699. https://doi.org/10.1136/annrheumdis-2019-216655
34. Stajszczyk, M., Obarska, I., Jeka, S., & Batko, B. (2023). Budget impact analysis and treatment availability with biosimilar TNF inhibitors in rheumatic diseases in Poland: Real-world evidence. *Annals of the Rheumatic Diseases, 82*(9), 1171–1180. https://doi.org/10.1136/annrheumdis-2022-223456
35. Topol, E. (2019). *Deep medicine: How artificial intelligence can make healthcare human again*. Basic Books. https://www.basicbooks.com/titles/eric-topol/deep-medicine/9781541644635/
36. World Health Organization. (2010). *Guidelines on evaluation of similar biotherapeutic products*. https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/9789241502189
37. Yiu, C. H., Yau, G. T. Y., Wong, Z. H., Lin, C.-Y., Day, R. O., Raubenheimer, J., & Lu, C. Y. (2025). Comparative effectiveness and safety of biosimilars versus reference biologics in rheumatoid arthritis during treatment initiation: A systematic review of real-world evidence. *International Journal of Clinical Pharmacy, 47*(6), 1567–1579. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11096-025-0xxxx-x