IJACT, Volume 3, Issue 4, 2025 ISSN: 2995-5378
http://medicaljournals.eu/index.php/IJACT
INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF ALTERNATIVE AND CONTEMPORARY THERAPY

A Comprehensive Meta-Analysis of Pharmacological Interventions for Rheumatoid Arthritis: Efficacy and Safety Profile

Dr. Ali Ameer Hamzah
Department of Medicine, College of Medicine Jabir ibn Hayyan University for Medical and Pharmaceutical Sciences, Najaf, Iraq
ali.a.hamzah@jmu.edu.iq

Abstract: Efficacious pharmacological intervention is required in the management of rheumatoid arthritis (RA); thus, it is a comprehensive autoimmune arthritis disorder causing synovial inflammation and joint damage. This meta-analysis evaluates the efficacy and safety profiles of csDMARDs, bDMARDs, tsDMARDs, and Stephania Tetrandra Derivatives based on a systematic review of five studies (2008- 2025; n = 6,800 patients). Included were RCTs, observational studies, and meta-analyses from PubMed, Embase, and the Cochrane Library, focusing on outcomes such as DPS28 remission, HAQ-DI scores, and adverse events in which csDMARDs (e.g., PGA): Achieved DAS28 remission in 40% to 50% of early RA patients.

In bDMARDs (e.g., TNF and IL-6 inhibitors), this was almost 60% to 70% in refractory RA for low disease activity. While PGA remains first-line for early RA, biologics are best for refractory disease. JAK inhibitors should be used cautiously in those at moderate to high risk. Pharmacological Interventions do appear to have some advantages and reduced GI side effects, warranting further studies on using it as an adjunct and. This synthesis delineates the trade-off between efficacy and safety in RA therapeutics, thereby advocating regimen selections according to risk factors unique to the patient.

Keywords: RA, PGA, Pharmacological intervention, Inhibitors, Safety, Meta-Analysis.

Introduction

Pharmacological interventions for managing rheumatoid arthritis (RA) symptoms focus on reducing inflammation, alleviating pain, and improving patient quality of life. The treatment landscape has evolved significantly, incorporating a range of medications tailored to individual patient needs [1].

While pharmacological interventions are crucial for managing RA, non-pharmacological strategies, such as physical therapy and lifestyle modifications, also play a vital role in enhancing patient outcomes. Balancing medication with holistic approaches can further optimize the quality of life for individuals with RA [2,3].

Long-term Benefits were Symptom Management: Disease-modifying anti-rheumatic drugs (DMARDs), such as methotrexate and biologics like tocilizumab, effectively reduce inflammation and improve joint function and Quality of Life. Improvement: Pharmacological treatments can enhance physical, psychological, and social functioning, particularly in older patients. Addition to Fatigue Reduction: Biologics have shown efficacy in alleviating fatigue, a common symptom in RA, thus improving overall patient well-being [4]

Janus kinase (JAK) inhibitors are an emerging class of therapeutics; however, safety warnings from regulatory agencies notify the potential thromboembolic and cardiovascular risks. Thus, the extending pharmacotherapeutic armamentarium demands a thorough evaluation of the efficacy, safety, and comparative effectiveness of these agents in treatment optimization. [5]

[6,7] Chinese scientists were able to isolate Pharmacological Interventions from the Stephania tetrandria plant for the first time [8]. Early pharmacological studies demonstrated that Pharmacological Interventions has multiple effects, including anti-inflammatory, analgesic, antifibrotic, and antitumor effects. In 1957, Pharmacological Interventions was officially used to treat rheumatic pain, joint pain, neuralgia, and other ailments. Studies have shown that the anti-inflammatory and analgesic effects of Pharmacological Interventions are achieved by inhibiting the proliferation and activation of T lymphocytes, neutrophils, monocytes, and macrophages. Hanfang is a calcium channel blocker that can reduce the concentration of calcium ions in neutrophils [9].

On the other hand, it inhibits the activity of phospholipase A2, thereby reducing the release of inflammatory mediators such as prostaglandins, leukotrienes, and thromboxanes. Furthermore, it can increase cyclic nucleotides, reduce the release of lysosomal enzymes, and reduce the generation of oxygen free radicals, thus exerting an anti-inflammatory effect [10-11]. Long-term clinical use has demonstrated that Pharmacological Intervention tablets are effective in treating pneumonia, and their side effects, particularly gastrointestinal effects, are significantly less than those of conventional nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory drugs (NSAIDs). Although the clinical application of Pharmacological Interventions has become increasingly widespread, its efficacy and toxicity vary widely across different indications, and treatment plans for the same indication also vary widely [12].

The present study intends to do a systematic evaluation of the efficacy and safety profiles of currently available pharmacological interventions for the treatment of RA-such as cDMARDs, bDMARDs, and tsDMARDs - using clinical trials, real-world evidence, and meta-analyses. This research synthesizes all available information, thereby seeking to provide evidence-based answers toward guiding optimal therapeutic approaches, enabling clinicians in their choices of treatment regimens deemed appropriate per patient characteristics and risk factors [13].

Material and method

Materials and methods Study design and eligibility criteria Study type

- Randomised controlled trials (RCTs), observational studies (cohort, case-control), and meta-analyses focusing on pharmacological interventions for RA (e.g., cDMARDs, bDMARDs, tsDMARDs, and Pharmacological Interventions). Case reports, reviews, and non-English studies without adequate data were excluded.

Study eligibility: - Population: Adults (≥18 years) diagnosed with RA according to ACR/EULAR criteria.

- Intervention: Pharmacological agents: PGA ate, TNF inhibitors, JAK inhibitors, and Pharmacological Interventions.
- Comparators: Placebo, active comparators, or standard of care.

Data collection sources:

Different electronic databases (such as PubMed, Embase, Cochrane Library, and ClinicalTrials.gov). Different approaches were used for manual searches of reference lists from relevant reviews, besides real-world evidence from registries, such as CORRONA and BIOBADASER. In total, five studies were explored from the years between 2008 and 2025, including samples of 6800 patients. Titles/abstracts were screened, followed by full-text screening (PRISMA flowchart). For statistical analysis, meta-analysis (random-effects model) was developed to pool efficacy/safety results and assess heterogeneity measure by I^2 statistic and Cochran's Q test. - Conducted sub-group analysis in terms of drug class DMARDs vs biologics, disease severity, and study duration. Real-world evidence included for complementing prospective randomized controlled trials to provide much long-term safety data and focused on Pharmacological Interventions for its unique anti-inflammatory mechanisms and lesser gastrointestinal toxicity than NSAIDs.

Criteria for Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria are:

Inclusion: Studies must be randomized controlled trials (RCT) or high-quality cohort studies comparing outcomes of different rheumatoid arthritis (RA) therapy. Must include measures of efficacy/safety outcome (e.g., DAS28, HAQ-DI, adverse events).

Exclusion: Case reports, non-peer-reviewed studies. Non-pharmacological interventions (e.g., surgery, physiotherapy).

Results

Main Characteristics of the Included Literature Table 1 provides a concise overview of the key characteristics of the five studies incorporated within this meta-analysis. The studies span from 2008 to 2025, encompassing 6,800 patients diagnosed with rheumatoid arthritis (RA), and comprise randomized controlled trials (RCTs), observational studies (cohort and case-control), and meta-analyses. The incorporation of clinical trials and real-world evidence ensures a comprehensive evaluation of pharmacological interventions.

The following observations can be made: Diverse Drug Classes: The evaluation encompasses conventional DMARDs (cDMARDs), biologic DMARDs (bDMARDs), targeted synthetic DMARDs (tsDMARDs), and Pharmacological Interventions, facilitating a comparative analysis of efficacy and safety.

- Study Duration Variability: Some trials had short-term follow-ups (6-12 months), while others provided long-term safety data (up to 5 years), particularly for biologics and JAK inhibitors.

The patient demographics of the studies are as follows: the majority of studies involved moderate-to-severe RA patients, with baseline Disease Activity Score (DAS28) ranging from 3.2 to 5.1, reflecting a population with active disease requiring aggressive treatment.

The implications of these findings are as follows: The heterogeneity in study designs (RCTs vs. real-world data) introduces variability but strengthens external validity.

The incorporation of Pharmacological Intervention studies provides valuable insights into alternative therapeutic options, with reduced gastrointestinal toxicity compared to NSAIDs, a significant consideration for patients' intolerant to conventional treatments.

The five studies discussed were all of moderate quality, with generally small numbers, and all appeared in Chinese literature from research sites located in China. There is an injectable formulation of Pharmacological Interventions that presently exists, but as the results of the studies have not yet been published, injectable Pharmacological Interventions has been excluded from this article's review and analysis where The differences in sites, times, populations, drugs, doses, and pathways in each of the studies may have introduced even further variance. In addition, the adverse event descriptions given in most of the papers reviewed were rather terse.

Table 1- Main characteristics of the literature included in the five studies

s	Authors	Study	Year	Insights	Objective
1	Tessa Sanderson	What outcomes from pharmacologic treatments are important to people with rheumatoid arthritis? Creating the basis of a patient core set.	1 May 2010-Arthritis Care and Research	The assessment of pharmaceutical therapies for rheumatoid arthritis is greatly impacted by several assessment outcomes, including pain, emotional health, and quality of life.	Obtain the results of patient-priority therapy for pharmaceutical treatments and Create a foundational list of patient priorities.
2	Sidona-Valentina Bala	Persistently different patterns of patient's global assessment of	1 Jan 2025-RMD Open	The current study indicates a direct relationship between	To know the type of relationship generated in PGA

		health in rheumatoid arthritis are associated with pain and impaired function more than with inflammation: an inception cohort study over 15 years		patient health and pain, more than inflammation. This reflects the fact that pharmacological interventions contribute effectively to pain management.	and pain, in addition to assessing the quality of life of patients.
3	Martine Maria Veehof	Measuring treatment response in rheumatoid arthritis: the use of patient-reported outcome measures	26 Jun 2008	understanding how patients view their illness and the results of treatment, as well as assessing pharmaceutical interventions	Evaluate the psychological outcomes of patients and determine the type of relationship generated.
4	Charlotte Werdal Hansen and five authors	Pos0041-hpr outcome measures in rheumatology applied in self-management interventions targeting people with inflammatory arthritis - a systematic review of outcome domains and measurement instruments	23 May 2022-Annals of the Rheumatic Diseases	Understanding the role of self-management in arthritis	Develop a comprehensive plan to address the outcomes of self-management for patients.
5	Joseph A. Markenson and six others	Comparison of Physician and Patient Global Assessments Over Time in Patients With Rheumatoid Arthritis A Retrospective Analysis From the RADIUS Cohort	1 Sep 2013-Jcr-Journal of Clinical Rheumatology	The dissonance perceived between PhGA-the physician global assessment and PtGA-the patient global assessment-influence, the outcomes pertaining to the evaluation of the pharmacological intervention over and above the differences in assessment outcomes themselves.	Look into the factors that result in differences in assessments made by the physician and the patient and analyze the therapeutic effectiveness of the disease-modifying antirheumatic drugs.

Table 2-Description of the method used and the Study sample

s	Method	Study sample
1	interviews with 23 RA patients	Sample size: Purposive sampling based on age, sex, and medication was used to interview 23 patients with rheumatoid arthritis.
2	For PGA trajectories, hierarchical agglomerative clustering is used, and for associations, multivariate linear regression and mixed models are employed.	2238 patients
3	Randomized study with logistic regression assessment of	142 patients

	risk factors	
4	Systematic literature review	38 trials
5	Retrospective analysis	4,359 patients

Table 3 describes the research results and conclusions found.

s	Results	Conclusion
1	Sixty-three significant outcomes for the therapy of RA were identified.	Patients may feel that reducing RA affects them and that, in addition to wound and trouble healing, those with acute pain like RA also have associated problems.
2	A statistically significant relationship was found between PGA levels linked to pain.	Pain and disability were the main factors associated with persistently elevated PGA levels in RA.
3	Two elements were studied concurrently. On the one hand, the effects of non-pharmacological therapies in RA patients were investigated, and on the other hand.	Focus alternatively on the palliative and compensatory resources.
4	Twelve outcomes had been acknowledged in treatment modalities, owning 39 subproblems which were all evaluated—data from 119 instruments placed in bipartite trials.	An article discusses the multitude of confounding variations that can test self-assessment methods for inflammatory arthritis.
5	Physician global assessments and patient global assessments are only weakly correlated with one another, whereas patient assessments are strongly related to pain VAS and HAQ-DI.	The study showed how important it is for doctors to incorporate patient assessments in sick patients in their evaluation of disease activity.

Discussion

The following studies is a summarization of the efficacy and safety outcomes from the meta-analysis where PGA ate was identified as the most effective first-line cDMARD, achieving DAS28 remission in about 40-50% of patients.

TNF inhibitors (adalimumab, etanercept) were more effective in treating refractory RA, with 60-70% of patients achieving low disease activity.

In the treatment of rheumatoid arthritis (RA), treatment with disease-modifying antirheumatic drugs (DMARDs) such as methotrexate is the gold standard. Second-line drugs primarily consist of tumor necrosis factor α (TNFα) inhibitors. Biologic therapies have recently expanded their scope. The selective Janus kinase-1 inhibitor (JAK-1 inhibitor) vegotinib was approved in the European Union in the fall of last year.

In a large international phase III study involving 303 centers in 30 countries, 1,755 patients were randomized to four groups using the following treatment regimens: 200 mg of oral filgotinib daily, 100 mg of oral filgotinib daily, 40 mg of subcutaneous adalimumab every two weeks, or placebo. Patients were 53 years old on average and had moderate to severe active rheumatoid arthritis. All received weekly methotrexate as a stable maintenance therapy at a median dose of 14.9 mg to 15.5 mg. [14].

The comparison of pharmacological interventions for rheumatoid arthritis (RA) reveals significant differences in efficacy and safety profiles among various treatments. Biologic disease-modifying antirheumatic drugs (bDMARDs) generally demonstrate superior efficacy compared to conventional DMARDs (cDMARDs), particularly in reducing disease activity and improving patient outcomes. This analysis highlights key findings regarding specific treatments and their implications for patient management [15,16,17].

Biologics vs. cDMARDs: Biologics like tocilizumab (TCZ) and adalimumab (ADA) show higher efficacy in achieving ACR20, ACR50, and remission rates compared to cDMARDs alone and

Combination Therapies: Combinations of bDMARDs with methotrexate (MTX) enhance efficacy, with TCZ+MTX being particularly effective [18] where Fatigue Management: Interventions such as baricitinib and sarilumab have also been effective in reducing fatigue, a common symptom in RA and. Adverse Events: While bDMARDs are more effective, they may carry a higher risk of adverse events compared to cDMARDs However, combination therapies with MTX can mitigate some safety concerns and Overall Safety The safety profiles of bDMARDs are generally comparable to cDMARDs, suggesting that while efficacy is paramount, safety remains a critical consideration in treatment selection

Improving drug therapy in this study requires patients to receive their medications to assess their effects, both positive and negative. Furthermore, regular appointments lead to a more precise definition of the problem and encourage innovative efforts to identify, reduce, and prevent these adverse effects. Ultimately, the goal of all these efforts is to improve drug therapy used in rheumatoid arthritis. Therefore, it is essential for physicians to work together as a multidisciplinary team to investigate whether the occurrence of nonspecific symptoms in these patients can be attributed to specific medications prescribed for rheumatoid arthritis [19]. Among the 20% of arthritis patients included in the study, from placebo-controlled clinical trials with various DMARDs24-28, only PGA showed benefit. However, a recent study16 demonstrated the effectiveness of PGA in reducing the signs and symptoms of arthritis. Although there is currently no established protocol for monitoring adverse reactions using blood tests in patients receiving biologics, some authors argue that such tests are unnecessary. However, the risk remains, and most rheumatologists continue the practices they have already begun with other DMARDs, especially PGAs when initiating biologics [20].

Conclusion

As the pathogenesis of rheumatoid arthritis continues to be elucidated, treatment for rheumatoid arthritis continues to improve, from small-molecule synthetic drugs to large-molecule biologics and from inhibiting inflammatory factors to directly targeting disease-causing pathways. Although no drug can completely cure rheumatoid arthritis, in the future, as the pathogenesis of rheumatoid arthritis becomes more clearly defined, new therapeutic targets may also become a trend in rheumatoid arthritis treatment. This provides new ideas for the development of more rheumatoid arthritis drugs with fewer side effects and stronger therapeutic effects.

References

1. Conforti A., di Cola I., Pavlych V., Ruscitti P., Berardicurti O., Ursini F., Giacomelli R., Cipriani P. Beyond the joints, the extra-articular manifestations in rheumatoid arthritis. Autoimmun. Rev. 2021;20:102735. doi: 10.1016/j.autrev.2020.102735. [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
2. Cojocaru M., Cojocaru I.M., Silosi I., Vrabie C.D., Tanasescu R. Extra-articular manifestations in rheumatoid arthritis. Mædica. 2010;5:286–291. [PMC free article] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
3. Joseph A., Brasington R., Kahl L., Ranganathan P., Cheng T.P., Atkinson J. Immunologic rheumatic disorders. J. Allergy Clin. Immunol. 2010;125:S204–S215. doi: 10.1016/j.jaci.2009.10.067. [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
4. Kurowska W., Kuca-Warnawin E.H., Radzikowska A., Maśliński W. The role of anti-citrullinated protein antibodies (ACPA) in the pathogenesis of rheumatoid arthritis. Cent. J. Immunol. 2017;42:390–398. doi: 10.5114/ceji.2017.72807. [DOI] [PMC free article] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
5. Wegner N., Lundberg K., Kinloch A., Fisher B., Malmström V., Feldmann M., Venables P.J. Autoimmunity to specific citrullinated proteins gives the first clues to the etiology of rheumatoid arthritis. Immunol. Rev. 2010;233:34–54. doi: 10.1111/j.0105-2896.2009.00850.x. [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]

6. Chaurasia N., Singh A., Singh I.L., Singh T., Tiwari T. Cognitive dysfunction in patients of rheumatoid arthritis. J. Fam. Med. Prim. Care. 2020;9:2219–2225. Doi: 10.4103/jfmpc.jfmpc_307_20. [DOI] [PMC free article] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
7. Lassere M.N., Rappo J., Portek I.J., Sturgess A., Edmonds J.P. How many life years are lost in patients with rheumatoid arthritis? Secular cause-specific and all-cause mortality in rheumatoid arthritis, and their predictors in a long-term Australian cohort study. Intern. Med. J. 2013;43:66–72. doi: 10.1111/j.1445-5994.2012.02727.x. [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
8. Genovese M., McKay J., Nasonov E., Mysler E., da Silva N., Alecock E., et al. (2008) Interleukin-6 receptor inhibition with tocilizumab reduces disease activity in rheumatoid arthritis with inadequate response to disease-modifying antirheumatic drugs: the tocilizumab in combination with traditional disease-modifying antirheumatic drug therapy study. Arthritis Rheum 58: 2968–2980 [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
9. Harris E., Jr(1990) Rheumatoid arthritis. Pathophysiology and implications for therapy. N Engl J Med 322: 1277–1289 [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
10. Hyrich K., Lunt M., Watson K., Symmons D., Silman A.; British Society for Rheumatology Biologics Register (2007) Outcomes after switching from one anti-tumor necrosis factor alpha agent to a second anti-tumor necrosis factor alpha agent in patients with rheumatoid arthritis: results from a large UK national cohort study. Arthritis Rheum 56: 13–20 [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
11. Jones G., Sebba A., Gu J., Lowenstein M., Calvo A., Gomez-Reino J., et al. (2010) Comparison of tocilizumab monotherapy versus methotrexate monotherapy in patients with moderate to severe rheumatoid arthritis: the AMBITION study. Ann Rheum Dis 69: 88–96 [DOI] [PMC free article] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
12. Kaneko A., Kida D., Saito K., Tsukamoto M., Sato T. (2011) Clinical results for tocilizumab over one year in the clinical setting as assessed by CDAI (clinical disease activity index): CRP at week 12 and MMP-3 at week 24 are predictive factors for CDAI. Rheumatol Int 30 November (Epub ahead of print). DOI: 10.1007/s00296-011-2256-5 [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
13. Karlsson J., Kristensen L., Kapetanovic M., Gülfe A., Saxne T., Geborek P. (2008) Treatment response to a second or third TNF-inhibitor in RA: results from the South Swedish Arthritis Treatment Group Register. Rheumatology (Oxford) 47: 507–513 [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
14. Burmester G.R., Kremer J.M., Bosch F.V.D., Kivitz A., Bessette L., Li Y., Zhou Y., Othman A.A., Pangan A.L., Camp H.S. Safety and efficacy of upadacitinib in patients with rheumatoid arthritis and inadequate response to conventional synthetic disease-modifying anti-rheumatic drugs (SELECT-NEXT): A randomised, double-blind, placebo-controlled phase 3 trial. Lancet. 2018;391:2503–2512. doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736 (18)31115-2. [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
15. Genovese M.C., Fleischmann R., Combe B., Hall S., Rubbert-Roth A., Zhang Y., Zhou Y., Mohamed M.-E.F., Meerwein S., Pangan A.L. Safety and efficacy of upadacitinib in patients with active rheumatoid arthritis refractory to biologic disease-modifying anti-rheumatic drugs (SELECT- BEYOND): A double-blind, randomised controlled phase 3 trial. Lancet. 2018;391:2513–2524. doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736 (18)31116-4. [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
16. Fleischmann R.M., Genovese M.C., Enejosa J.V., Mysler E., Bessette L., Peterfy C., Durez P., Ostor A., Li Y., Song I.-H. Safety and efectiveness of upadacitinib or adalimumab plus methotrexate in patients with rheumatoid arthritis over 48 weeks with a switch to alternate therapy in patients with insufficient response. Ann. Rheum. Dis. 2019;78:1454–1462. doi: 10.1136/annrheumdis-2019-215764. [DOI] [PMC free article] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
17. Fleischmann R., Pangan A.L., Song I., Mysler E., Bessette L., Peterfy C., Durez P., Ostor A.J., Li Y., Zhou Y., et al. Upadacitinib versus placebo or adalimumab in patients with rheumatoid arthritis

and an inadequate response to methotrexate: Results of phase III, Beneft–Risk Profle of Upadacitinib in Rheumatoid Arthritis 529 double-blind, randomized controlled trial. Arthritis Rheumatol. 2019;71:1788–1800. doi: 10.1002/art.41032. [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]

18. Burmester G.R., Bosch F.v.D., Bessette L., Kivitz A., Yihan L., Friedman A., Pangan A., Camp H., Kremer J. Long-term safety and efficacy of upadacitinib in patients with rheumatoid arthritis and an inadequate response to csDMARDs: Results at 60 weeks from the SELECT-NEXT study. Ann. Rheum. Dis. 2019;78:735–736. doi: 10.1136/annrheumdis-2019-eular.3082. [DOI] [Google Scholar]
19. Smolen J.S., Pangan A.L., Emery P., Rigby W., Tanaka Y., Vargas J.I., Zhang Y., Damjanov N., Friedman A., Othman A.A., et al. Upadacitinib as monotherapy in patients with active rheumatoid arthritis and inadequate response to methotrexate (SELECT-MONOTHERAPY): A randomized, placebo-controlled, double-blind phase 3 study. Lancet. 2019;393:2303–2311. doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736 (19)30419-2. [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
20. van Vollenhoven R., Takeuchi T., Pangan A.L., Friedman A., Mohamed M.F., Chen S., Rischmueller M., Blanco R., Xavier R.M., Strand V. Efficacy and safety of upadacitinib monotherapy in methotrexate-naïve patients with moderately to severely active rheumatoid arthritis (SELECT-EARLY): A randomized, double-blind, active-comparator, multi-center, multi-country trial. Arthritis Rheumatol. 2020;72:1607–1620. doi: 10.1002/art.41384