Journal of Chemical Health Risks

www.jchr.org

JCHR (2018) 8(2), 183-185 | ISSN:2251-6727

Patent Cliffs: What Happens When a Drug Patent Expires?

Pranali P. Paradkar,

Research Scholar, M. Pharmacy, Maharashtra, India

(Received: 16 May 2018 Revised: 11 June 2018 Accepted: 11 July 2018)

KEYWORDS

patent cliff, patent expiry, generics, pharmaceutical industry, lifecycle management, Hatch-Waxman Act, drug innovation, R&D.

ABSTRACT: This review explores the concept of "patent cliffs," a critical juncture in the pharmaceutical industry where the expiration of drug patents results in abrupt revenue losses for innovator companies. When blockbuster drugs lose patent protection, generic competitors rapidly enter the market with significantly lower-priced alternatives, causing sharp declines in brand drug sales. The study delves into the multifaceted implications of this phenomenon, examining its economic, regulatory, and strategic dimensions. It highlights the role of legislation such as the Hatch-Waxman Act in accelerating generic entry and discusses how regulatory frameworks both support generic competition and enable brand protection tactics. The review also evaluates pharmaceutical companies' strategic responses—including lifecycle management, authorized generics, mergers, and Rx-to-OTC switches—to extend product profitability. Importantly, the paper emphasizes how patent cliffs expose vulnerabilities in drug development pipelines and can either constrain or catalyze innovation. The analysis concludes by advocating for balanced policy reforms that protect innovation incentives while promoting market competition and public health access.

1. INTRODUCTION

Pharmaceutical patents grant companies market exclusivity, allowing them to recoup high R&D costs. However, when these patents expire—often after 20 years—a dramatic decline in sales typically follows. This phenomenon, termed the *patent cliff*, has challenged the financial stability of many major pharmaceutical companies. The risk is particularly high for firms relying on a few blockbuster drugs generating over $1 billion annually.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Economic Impact of Patent Expiry

Patent cliffs cause immediate revenue losses. For instance, the expiration of Pfizer's Lipitor led to a significant sales drop from $12.9 billion in 2006 to less than half that by 2012. Generics typically enter at prices 40–80% lower than branded versions, capturing significant market share quickly.

2.2 Regulatory and Legislative Framework

The 1984 Hatch-Waxman Act significantly accelerated the entry of generics by allowing Abbreviated New Drug Applications (ANDAs), which bypass full clinical trials by demonstrating bioequivalence. his reduced the average delay between patent expiration and generic entry from three years to three months.

2.3 Generic Competition Dynamics

Generics now fill over 85% of prescriptions in the U.S., although they account for a smaller proportion of sales in dollar terms. The economic incentive for first-to-file generics is bolstered by 180-day market exclusivity, making early patent challenges attractive.

2.4 R&D Challenges and Innovation Gaps

The loss of exclusivity exposes weaknesses in pharma pipelines. Several companies—including Pfizer, Sanofi, and Eli Lilly—have struggled to replace revenues lost to generics. R&D costs continue to rise while success rates decline. For example, R&D spending increased from $16 billion in 1996 to $55 billion in 2007, yet approvals fell dramatically.

3. DISCUSSION

3.1 Strategic Responses to the Patent Cliff

Pharmaceutical companies have employed several strategies to mitigate patent cliff effects:

Journal of Chemical Health Risks

www.jchr.org

JCHR (2018) 8(2), 183-185 | ISSN:2251-6727

- **Lifecycle Management:** This includes formulation changes, new indications, and chiral switching.
- **Authorized Generics:** Brand companies launch their own generics to retain market share.
- **Mergers and Acquisitions:** Companies like Pfizer have acquired firms (e.g., Wyeth) to refill depleted pipelines.

Rx-to-OTC Switching: Transitioning prescription drugs to over-the-counter can extend product life.

3.2 The Role of Policy and Regulation

Policy frameworks play a dual role—while facilitating generic access, they also provide tools for brand protection. The Hatch-Waxman Act, Medicare Modernization Act, and European competition policies have shaped the timing and scale of generic competition .

3.3 Innovation Incentives and Risks

Patent cliffs, paradoxically, spur innovation. They encourage firms to explore biologics, niche therapies, and personalized medicine. However, the reduced effective patent life—often only 7–8 years due to lengthy development—poses profitability challenges.

4. CONCLUSION

Patent cliffs are a defining feature of the pharmaceutical industry's lifecycle. They represent both a risk to innovators and an opportunity for generic manufacturers and public health systems. While companies have developed multiple strategic responses to mitigate revenue loss, sustainable innovation remains the ultimate safeguard against the cliff's impact. Policies that balance market access with innovation incentives are crucial for long-term industry resilience.

5. REFERENCES

1. Kakkar A.K., Patent cliff mitigation strategies: giving new life to blockbusters, Expert Opin. Ther. Patents, 2015, 25(12), 1353-1356.
2. Song C.H., Han J., Patent cliff and strategic switch: exploring strategic design possibilities in the pharmaceutical industry, SpringerPlus, 2016, 5(692), 1-14.
3. Schacht W.H., Drug Patent Expirations: Potential Effects on Pharmaceutical Innovation, Congressional Research Service, March 2012.
4. Pearce J.A., How Companies can Preserve Market Dominance after Patents Expire, Long Range Planning 39, 2006, 71-87.
5. Bae J.P., Drug Patent Expirations and the Speed of Generic Entry, HSR: Health Services Research, April 1997, 32(1).
6. Granstrand O., IP strategies and policies for and against evergreening, European policy for intellectual property, Brussels, 2014.
7. Denoon A., Vollebregt E., Can Regenerative Medicine Save Big Pharma's Business Model from the Patent Cliff?, Regen. Med., 2010, 5(5), 687–690.
8. Pharmaceutical Patents Review, 2013.
9. Smith R.B., Repositioned drugs: integrating intellectual property and regulatory strategies, Drug Discovery Today: Therapeutic Strategies, 2011, 131-137.
10. Urbinati D., Rémuzat C., Kornfeld A., Vataire A., Cetinsoy L., Aballéa S., Mzoughi O., Toumi M., EU pharmaceutical expenditure forecast, Journal of Market Access & Health Policy, 2014, 1-9.
11. Raghavendra M.S., Raj J.R., Seetharaman A., A study of decrease in R&D spending in the pharmaceutical industry during post-recession, INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL of ACADEMIC RESEARCH, Sep 2012, 4(5), 29-47.
12. Investors unfazed by drug-patent expiry, Jan 2012, 481, 265.
13. Asian medicine: small species at risk, Jan 2012, 481, 265.
14. Evans I., Follow-on Biologics: A New Play for Big Pharma, YALE Journal of biology and medicine, 2010), 83, 97-100.
15. Rare day to highlight rare diseases, Jan 2012, 481, 265.
16. Law H., A Legal Test for the Pharmaceutical Company Practice of "Product Hopping", American Medical Association Journal of Ethics, August 2015, 17(8), 760-762.
17. Guo Y., Hu Y., Zheng M., Wang Y., Patent indicators: a window to pharmaceutical market success, Expert Opinion on Therapeutic Patents, 2013, 765-771.

Journal of Chemical Health Risks

www.jchr.org

JCHR (2018) 8(2), 183-185 | ISSN:2251-6727

18. Lee C., Chen X., Romanelli R.J., Segal J.B., Forces influencing generic drug development in the United States: a narrative review, Journal of Pharmaceutical Policy and Practice, 2016, 1-6.
19. Kaitin K.I., Deconstructing the Drug Development Process: The New Face of Innovation, Mar 2010, 87(3), 356-361.
20. Peikova L., Manova M., Georgieva S., Petrova G., Enantiomers Novelty Protection and its Influence on Generic Market: An Example with Escitalopram Patent Protection, Biotechnology & Biotechnological Equipment, 2013, 4044-4047.
21. Grabowski H., Brain C., Taub A., Guha R., Pharmaceutical patent challenges and their implicaitons for innovation and generic competion, AEA conference, Jan 2015, 1-51.
22. Garud S.S., Derle D.V., Derle N.D., Supergenerics – a cost saving paradigm, IJPRD, Jan 2014, 57-66.
23. Moorkens E., Jonker-Exler C., Huys I., Declerck P., Simoens S., Vulto A., Overcoming barriers to the market access of Biosimilars in the European Union: the case of Biosimilar Monoclonal Antiobdies, Frontiers in Pharmacology, Jun 2016, 7.
24. Mignani S., Huber S., Tomas H., Rodrigues J., Majoral J., Why and how have drug discovery strategies in pharma changed? What are the new mindsets?, Drug Discovery Today, Feb 2016, 21(2), 239-249.
25. Lo A.W., Naraharisetti S.V., Biopharma Industry: A Case Study of Royalty Pharma, Inc., MIT libraries, Dec 2013.