GEORGE BROWN PRESS
JOURNALS, BOOKS & PROCEEDINGS

Journal of Medicine and Life Sciences

Article

Navigating the Next Patent Cliff: Strategic Lessons from Historical Events and Implications for Current Blockbusters

Weisen Feng [1,*]

[1] Charles River Associates, London, United Kingdom
* Correspondence: Weisen Feng, Charles River Associates, London, United Kingdom

Abstract: Background: Loss of exclusivity (LOE) has increasingly reshaped the biopharmaceutical industry by accelerating revenue erosion, encouraging generic or biosimilar replacement, and forcing companies to alter their portfolio allocation before the protected revenue base is halved. LOE represents a broader strategic challenge where pricing power, payer preference, patient loyalty, brand recognition, and clinical differentiation are rigorously tested. Major historical LOE events, including atorvastatin in cardiovascular disease, adalimumab in immunology, and imatinib in oncology, provide critical insights into the impending patent cliff expected between 2028 and 2030. These precedents demonstrate that the depth and speed of revenue erosion depend on product modality, therapeutic background, market access structure, competition intensity, and clinically meaningful successor assets. Methods: This paper retrospectively tracks representative LOE events from 2005 to 2023, comparing revenue decline, competition, payer behavior, biosimilar uptake, and lifecycle management. Results: Three primary strategic imperatives emerge. First, evidence-driven lifecycle management—encompassing indication expansion, real-world evidence, biomarker stratification, and combination therapies—can optimize clinical presence prior to exclusivity loss. Second, proactive portfolio reallocation is essential to replace declining blockbuster revenues with next-generation assets and novel therapeutic platforms. Third, market access redesign, including innovative payer contracting and value demonstration, fundamentally shapes post-LOE competition. Conclusion: Future industry leaders will not merely defend single blockbusters through litigation, but will proactively restructure portfolios around clinical differentiation, real-world evidence, payer-based value demonstration, and timely succession planning.

Keywords: patent cliff; loss of exclusivity; biosimilars; market access; lifecycle management; portfolio strategy

Received: 10 May 2026
Revised: 18 June 2026
Accepted: 02 July 2026
Published: 06 July 2026

1. Introduction

The patent cliff is not caused by a single patent expiration date, but rather by a comprehensive revenue restructuring process. This phenomenon occurs as the benefits associated with patent protection, regulatory exclusivity, brand loyalty, market preference, and market access for originator drugs diminish with the arrival of new products. When a new blockbuster product reaches its loss of exclusivity (LOE) period, the competitive landscape shifts dramatically. The market transitions from innovation-driven premium pricing to a more price-sensitive environment characterized by substitution, payer negotiations, and portfolio-level risk management. For biopharmaceutical companies heavily reliant on blockbuster products, LOE events can significantly impact not only product revenue but also research and development budgets, investor confidence, capital market expectations, and future innovation capabilities [1]. Over the past three decades, several therapeutic domains have experienced similar disruptions, with cardiovascular, oncology, and immunology drugs serving as critical case studies for the industry. The urgency of addressing this issue is underscored by the looming patent cliff projected for 2028–2031, which will affect multiple blockbuster drugs in cardiovascular, immunology, and other therapeutic markets. Key players in these

markets, such as direct oral anticoagulants, interleukin inhibitors, and checkpoint inhibitors, have become central to the growth trajectories of many companies. Once these products enter their LOE periods, the resulting impact will not only drive down the price of individual products but may also necessitate a reevaluation of pipeline prioritization, combination therapy strategies, payer access dynamics, lifecycle management decisions, and global launch sequencing. Consequently, understanding historical LOE patterns is essential for assessing whether current blockbuster companies are adequately prepared to navigate revenue losses, heightened competition, and the need for portfolio transformation.

This analysis will not merely frame patent cliffs as issues of patent law but will also examine them through the lens of asset and portfolio strategy. The study is structured to review historical LOE events and analyze their implications for current blockbuster drugs facing patent erosion. Three critical aspects will be explored in detail. First, the factors that have historically influenced the rate of revenue decline during LOE periods will be examined. Second, the impact of lifecycle management and portfolio reallocation strategies employed by originator companies will be analyzed. Third, strategies for existing blockbuster drugs to prepare their portfolios in anticipation of competition from biosimilars, emerging evidence, and payer cost controls will be discussed. By addressing these dimensions, the study aims to provide a comprehensive understanding of how companies can mitigate the challenges posed by patent cliffs and strategically position themselves for sustained growth in a competitive market environment [2, 3].

The patent cliff should be viewed as a timing issue rather than a terminal one. Before formal exclusivity expires, payers begin to develop scenarios, pharmacists and other stakeholders prepare preferred formularies, and competitors accelerate the development of evidence packages for substitute products. After exclusivity ends, the erosion curve is shaped by factors such as clinical inertia, contracting leverage, manufacturing capacity, and the supply of treatment options. Companies often require several years before the LOE period to prepare for the approval of the first generic or biosimilar product. In the current era of blockbuster drugs, the companies most vulnerable to the patent cliff are those with a limited number of indications and follow-on assets that are still primarily driven by results, convenience, or cost considerations [4]. The critical question is not only whether revenue will be lost but also whether the company has developed a credible strategy to maintain clinical efficacy, payer interest, and physician engagement after the original product faces lower-cost competition. Addressing these challenges requires a proactive approach to lifecycle management, strategic portfolio diversification, and the development of innovative solutions that can sustain market relevance and competitive advantage in the face of evolving industry dynamics.

2. Methods

We propose a retrospective strategic case study that incorporates representative loss of exclusivity (LOE) events spanning the years 2005 to 2023. This study is structured around three key criteria: the drug must be a blockbuster, generating over $1 billion in annual revenue, and must have experienced significant market shifts following patent or exclusivity expiration; the selected cases should encompass a diverse range of modalities, including small molecule drugs, biologics, cancer therapies, and monoclonal antibodies; and the market shifts must be supported by a robust public research base, enabling comparisons across four dimensions such as revenue loss, competitive dynamics, payer policies, and portfolio strategies. To illustrate these criteria, atorvastatin, adalimumab, and imatinib were chosen as historical examples for analysis [1, 5].

Our assessment operates on two distinct levels. The first level involves analyzing historical events, focusing on the speed at which generics or biosimilars entered the market post-LOE, the extent of price reductions, the behavior of payers, prescribing patterns among physicians, and the lifecycle management strategies employed by the original drug manufacturers. The second level is a forward-looking strategic outlook, where implications and strategies are distilled from key historical LOE events to inform

preparations for the next wave of patent expirations [6, 7]. This dual-level approach ensures a comprehensive understanding of both past trends and future opportunities.

This study does not aim to provide quantitative revenue projections during the LOE period. Instead, it focuses on qualitatively assessing trends and strategic applications [7, 8]. Revenue changes following an LOE event are influenced by multiple factors, including patent expiry dates, regulatory approvals, insurance accessibility, clinical guidelines, real-world evidence, and the pace of competing innovations. Consequently, a comparative approach is employed to extract strategic lessons that can be applied to future assets facing LOE. By emphasizing qualitative insights, the study aims to offer actionable strategies rather than predictive financial models.

To enhance comparability across cases, each LOE event is evaluated based on four strategic aspects. The first aspect, product substitutability, examines factors such as molecule type, administration method, clinical equivalence, convenience, risks associated with switching for physicians, market-access pressures, tendering intensity, payer concentration, substitution rules, step-therapy requirements, and the willingness of health systems to prioritize budget savings. The second aspect, lifecycle-management depth, considers strategies like new indications, formulation changes, device improvements, combination requirements, long-term safety data, and real-world outcomes. The third aspect, portfolio resilience, evaluates the availability of successor assets, the speed of their launch, and the degree of commercial overlap between legacy products and next-generation offerings [2, 9]. Historical examples are analyzed not merely in terms of sales decline but through mechanisms of erosion, making the study more relevant for drawing strategic implications for assets facing LOE between 2028 and 2031. For instance, a simple molecule that is automatically substituted at pharmacies may incur lower costs compared to a complex biologic used in advanced settings. However, biologics lacking strong payer contracts or successor products may still face significant long-term revenue pressures. Case comparisons focus on these nuanced mechanisms rather than treating all patent cliffs as identical events.

3. Results

3.1. Common Patterns in Historical LOE Events

Case studies reveal significant differences in the loss of exclusivity (LOE) trajectories between small molecule drugs and biologics. Atorvastatin serves as a classic example of a small molecule patent cliff. Once generic drugs enter the market, prices experience a sharp decline. Even when the original brand retains strong recognition, it faces substantial challenges in resisting the substitution effect over time. This scenario underscores that companies heavily reliant on a single blockbuster drug often find that strategies such as brand extension, channel maintenance, and short-term promotional efforts can only delay the inevitable impact. These measures fail to alter the fundamental dynamics of low-price competition that dominate the generic drug market. The case of atorvastatin highlights the critical need for pharmaceutical companies to diversify their portfolios and develop robust strategies to mitigate the financial risks associated with LOE events.

Adalimumab demonstrates a more gradual and policy-influenced LOE trajectory. The introduction of biosimilars is initially moderated by the high level of recognition and trust that physicians and patients place in the originator brand Humira. This is particularly evident in dermatology indications, where patient experience plays a pivotal role in treatment decisions. Observations from European markets reveal that the manufacturer employed a tailored payer strategy that accounted for market-specific characteristics. For instance, in tender-driven markets such as the Nordics, Humira strategically reduced its price to secure tenders and maintain market volume. Conversely, in markets like Germany, where price has a limited influence on physician prescribing behavior, Humira was able to sustain its pricing for a longer period. Additionally, the manufacturer reinvested revenue generated from Humira into advancing its pipeline candidates, such as Skyrizi and Rinvoq, which have since achieved dominance in key

immunology indications [10]. This portfolio reallocation was executed with precision, leveraging existing sales capabilities in rheumatology and dermatology to ensure rapid uptake. The case of adalimumab underscores that the impact of the patent cliff for biologics can be more nuanced and effectively managed through proactive and market-specific LOE mitigation strategies.

The experience of imatinib further illustrates that the LOE dynamics of oncology drugs extend beyond mere price competition and are significantly influenced by clinical perceptions. The advent of second- and third-generation tyrosine kinase inhibitors (TKIs) shifted the competitive landscape from a direct contest between originator and generic drugs to one involving different generations of therapies [11, 12]. The uptake of imatinib generics was notably slower compared to other therapeutic areas. This slower adoption was driven by the strong emphasis on clinical value within oncology, which encouraged physicians to transition patients to next-generation TKIs offering enhanced therapeutic benefits. Consequently, in the oncology sector, companies aiming to mitigate the effects of LOE should prioritize investments in next-generation therapies that deliver clinically meaningful improvements over originator treatments. This approach not only addresses the evolving needs of the market but also ensures sustained relevance and competitiveness in a rapidly advancing therapeutic landscape.

3.2. Implications for Current Blockbusters Facing LOE Erosion

The first implication highlights the growing significance of evidence-driven lifecycle management in the pharmaceutical industry [13]. Historical examples demonstrate that lifecycle management strategies lacking genuine clinical value often fail to provide sustainable protection for products. In the field of oncology, companies are encouraged to focus on developing and defending new indications, advancing early diagnosis and treatment methods, and exploring innovative approaches such as combination therapies and biomarker stratification prior to the loss of exclusivity (LOE). These strategies are far more effective than relying solely on dosage modifications or engaging in patent litigation. Particularly in areas with high unmet medical needs, drugs that achieve guideline status and establish robust, long-term clinical evidence may continue to enjoy strong brand loyalty even after their exclusivity period has ended. This underscores the importance of creating a solid foundation of clinical value to ensure enduring market presence.

The second implication emphasizes the critical role of portfolio reallocation in helping companies navigate the challenges posed by the patent cliff. Historical LOE events have consistently shown that the most successful companies are not necessarily those that excel at defending their existing products, but rather those that proactively develop and implement the next generation of assets. For companies facing LOE erosion, it is essential to adopt a strategic approach to asset succession. This involves not merely increasing the number of candidate drugs but also ensuring that these assets serve distinct and complementary roles. Some assets should be designed to replace key drugs nearing LOE, others should target new patient populations, and additional assets should aim to establish a robust combination therapy franchise. Emerging technologies such as bispecific antibodies, antibody-drug conjugates (ADCs), and radioligand therapies hold significant promise in oncology. However, their ultimate value will depend on their ability to demonstrate differentiated mechanisms that translate into tangible clinical benefits, thereby justifying their role as successors in the therapeutic landscape [14].

The third implication underscores the importance of redesigning pricing and market access strategies to mitigate the impact of LOE. A deep understanding of market-specific payer archetypes is essential for determining where to adjust or defend pricing strategies, as these decisions can significantly influence revenue outcomes. In the future, originator companies should prioritize investments in generating real-world evidence to substantiate the long-term value of their branded products [3, 7]. This evidence can be instrumental in crafting targeted payer value propositions that effectively differentiate originator brands from generic or biosimilar competitors. By demonstrating sustained clinical and economic benefits, originators can strengthen their market position and

maintain a competitive edge even in the face of increasing competition from lower-cost alternatives.

3.3. Strategic Response Framework for the 2028-2031 Patent Cliff

Based on historical cases, a practical response could be divided into three stages: pre-LOE preparation, transition-period defense, and post-LOE portfolio renewal. In the pre-LOE stage, originators should prioritize evidence generation and portfolio sequencing. Evidence production should extend beyond registration trials, as payers and clinicians increasingly demand proof of durable value in real-world applications. For immunology products, this includes persistence data, switching data, patient demographics, and comorbidity data. For oncology products, critical evidence encompasses biomarker-defined benefits, sequencing data, combination-regimen performance, and possession outcomes. For cardiovascular and metabolic drugs, long-term event reduction, adherence metrics, and health-economic evaluations are essential. These evidence packages should be meticulously developed before LOE to enable originators to present a compelling value proposition to payers, emphasizing the product's real-world benefits rather than relying solely on brand reputation to defend pricing.

The transition-period defense is increasingly complex and cannot rely on a simplistic global discount strategy. A uniform global discount may not be effective in markets where physician trust, supply reliability, or differentiated evidence still favor brand preference. Overemphasis on price reductions in tender-driven or highly centralized payer markets may inadvertently accelerate the removal of products from formularies. A flexible access approach, tailored to align with local payer behaviors, can mitigate erosion. Therefore, market segmentation is critical, dividing markets into tender-dominant markets, physician-led specialist markets, pharmacy-substitution markets, and private-insurance markets [2, 11]. Each market type demands a unique combination of pricing strategies, contracting approaches, educational initiatives, and evidence communication. In tender-driven systems, preserving volume and ensuring supply reliability may take precedence over maintaining high list prices. In physician-led specialist markets, clinical confidence, device familiarity, and patient support programs can significantly influence treatment choices, even when biosimilars are available. In pharmacy-substitution markets, defensive efforts should focus on contracting and formulary positioning, as prescribers lose control once a generic becomes interchangeable.

After LOE, the renewal of an asset determines whether a patent cliff results in a temporary revenue shift or a long-term structural downturn. Historically, successful firms have used cash flow generated before LOE to build new franchises rather than merely extending the lifecycle of older products. In immunology, renewal strategies should explore alternative mechanisms and patient groups, such as IL-23 inhibition, JAK inhibition, and other pathway-specific therapies. In oncology, renewal efforts can transition from single-agent dependence to platform-based competition, incorporating antibody drugs, bispecific antibodies, radioligand therapies, cell therapies, and rational combinations. For cardiovascular and metabolic diseases, renewal strategies may involve broad risk-factor control, fixed-dose combinations, injectable therapies, digital adherence support, and outcomes-based contracting. The critical factor is ensuring that successor products are commercially connected to the original asset while being clinically distinct enough to avoid being perceived as mere extensions. If the new asset offers no measurable improvement over its predecessor, payers may view it as a defensive tactic rather than genuine innovation.

Another important consideration is that LOE strategies must integrate manufacturing and supply chain readiness. The market share of generics and biosimilars does not solely depend on price but also on the ability of competitors to provide products consistently. Manufacturers with strong relationships, robust patient support programs, and reliable pharmacovigilance systems can maintain trust in sensitive areas where clinical challenges persist. However, this trust must be substantiated with documented evidence of service continuity and product quality. This is particularly critical in biologics

and oncology supportive treatments, where supply interruptions can significantly impact patient confidence and physician willingness to switch. Consequently, LOE preparation should be viewed as a strategic advantage rather than a mere operational task, emphasizing the importance of reliability and quality in maintaining market position.

The next patent cliff is likely to intensify the need for increased R&D investment. As major products lose exclusivity, companies must simultaneously address competing priorities, such as maintaining legacy cash flow, funding late-stage trials, and investing in external new technologies [14]. Poorly timed acquisitions can exacerbate financial stress if they succeed only after significant revenue erosion has occurred. A more effective approach involves scenario-based planning three to five years before LOE, prioritizing assets based on their potential to replace revenue, support recovery, and enable strategic partnerships. Portfolio decisions should also consider the alignment of sales teams, medical staff, and payer relationships. Assets that complement existing capabilities are likely to scale more rapidly than technically advanced products requiring the development of new commercial infrastructures. A robust LOE strategy integrates scientific innovation, market access, and organizational alignment, ensuring the development of clinically meaningful successors, the provision of payer-specific evidence, and the optimization of internal capabilities to mitigate revenue declines.

4. Conclusion

This study provides a comprehensive analysis of representative patent expiration events spanning from 2005 to 2023, focusing on their broader implications for current blockbuster drugs. It emphasizes that loss of exclusivity (LOE) events are not merely isolated occurrences but represent a systemic transformation influenced by a confluence of factors, including competition from generic and biosimilar drugs, evolving payer behaviors, shifting clinical perceptions, and strategic decisions by pharmaceutical companies. The findings underscore the necessity for firms to proactively prepare for the anticipated patent cliff projected between 2028 and 2030. To navigate this impending challenge, companies are advised to implement robust lifecycle management strategies that prioritize clinical value. This includes accelerating the development of successor assets and innovative platforms, as well as leveraging real-world evidence to substantiate the value of their products. Additionally, firms must refine their payer contracting strategies and restructure market access frameworks to effectively counter competitive pressures. The study concludes that future competitive advantages will be derived not from prolonged exclusivity of individual molecules but from sustained innovation and the strategic alignment of diverse portfolios to create synergistic value.

For this reason, the forthcoming patent cliff should be viewed as a critical test of strategic foresight and adaptability. Larger pharmaceutical firms that rely predominantly on defensive tactics, such as litigation, minor formulation modifications, or short-term pricing strategies, may achieve temporary mitigation of market erosion. However, these approaches fail to address the underlying competitive dynamics and are unlikely to secure long-term market leadership. In contrast, companies that adopt proactive measures, such as early evidence generation, the development of differentiated successor assets, and the establishment of reliable local access frameworks, are better positioned to transform LOE challenges into opportunities for portfolio renewal. The analysis presented here suggests that the pivotal question is not whether exclusivity will eventually erode—since all mature products inevitably reach this stage—but whether firms have adequately prepared a foundation for sustained clinical and economic value. Future research could build upon this work by conducting a detailed examination of actual market erosion trajectories post-2028 and comparing them against the strategic readiness indicators proposed in this study. Such analyses would provide valuable insights into the effectiveness of various strategies and further refine the framework for addressing LOE challenges in the pharmaceutical industry.

References

1. S. Malakar, E. N. Gontor, M. Y. Dugbaye, K. Shah, S. Sinha, P. Sutaoney, and N. S. Chauhan, "Cancer treatment with biosimilar drugs: A review," *Cancer Innovation*, vol. 3, no. 2, p. e115, 2024.
2. E. Moorkens, B. Godman, I. Huys, I. Hoxha, A. Malaj, S. Keuerleber, et al., "The expiry of Humira® market exclusivity and the entry of adalimumab biosimilars in Europe: an overview of pricing and national policy measures," *Frontiers in Pharmacology*, vol. 11, p. 591134, 2021.
3. L. Burns, N. Le Roux, R. Kalesnik-Orszulak, J. Christian, M. Hukkelhoven, F. Rockhold, and J. O'Donnell, "Real-world evidence for regulatory decision-making: guidance from around the world," *Clinical Therapeutics*, vol. 44, no. 3, pp. 420–437, 2022.
4. D. K. Mroczek, K. Hauner, G. J. Greene, K. Kaiser, J. D. Peipert, M. Golf, et al., "Obstacles to biosimilar acceptance and uptake in oncology: a review," *JAMA Oncology*, vol. 10, no. 7, pp. 966–972, 2024.
5. B. Oronsky, S. Caroen, F. Brinkhaus, T. Reid, M. Stirn, and R. Kumar, "Patent and marketing exclusivities 101 for drug developers," *Recent Patents on Biotechnology*, vol. 17, no. 3, pp. 257–270, 2023.
6. M. Peeters, D. Planchard, M. Pegram, J. Gonçalves, F. Bocquet, and H. Jang, "Biosimilars in an era of rising oncology treatment options," *Future Oncology*, vol. 17, no. 29, pp. 3881–3892, 2021.
7. S. M. Eskola, H. G. Leufkens, A. Bate, M. L. De Bruin, and H. Gardarsdottir, "The role of real-world data and evidence in oncology medicines approved in EU in 2018–2019," *Journal of Cancer Policy*, vol. 36, p. 100424, 2023.
8. D. Joshi, R. Khursheed, S. Gupta, D. Wadhwa, T. G. Singh, S. Sharma, et al., "Biosimilars in oncology: latest trends and regulatory status," *Pharmaceutics*, vol. 14, no. 12, p. 2721, 2022.
9. M. T. Sabatini and M. Silva, "Patent cliffs in the era of complex therapies and biologics," *Pharmaceutical Medicine*, vol. 34, no. 4, pp. 271–278, 2020.
10. P. R. Holmen-Jensen and O. Åsmoen, "Navigating the Patent Cliff," 2024.
11. A. K. Kakkar, "Patent cliff mitigation strategies: giving new life to blockbusters," *Expert Opinion on Therapeutic Patents*, vol. 25, no. 12, pp. 1353–1359, 2015.
12. F. Shin, "Leaping from the 'Patent Cliff' into the 'Global Drug Gap': Overcoming Exclusivity to Provide Affordable Biosimilars," *Loy. LA Int'l & Comp. L. Rev.*, vol. 37, p. 419, 2015.
13. C. H. Song and J. W. Han, "Patent cliff and strategic switch: exploring strategic design possibilities in the pharmaceutical industry," *SpringerPlus*, vol. 5, no. 1, p. 692, 2016.
14. S. A. Lines, "Drug patent expirations and the 'patent cliff'," *US Pharm*, vol. 37, no. 6, pp. 12–20, 2012.