Insight

The Patent Cliff and the Drug Market's Innovation Cycle

MICHAEL BAKER | AUGUST 4, 2026

Executive Summary

- The U.S. biopharmaceutical market has strong, structural incentives to innovate new products, anchored by robust intellectual property (IP) protections; these IP protections, however, can occasionally create windows where patent exclusivity expires at the same time, colloquially called a "patent cliff."

- The "cliff" is not itself a structural problem but drives necessary decision-making in the pharmaceutical industry about where the next innovative product comes from, including mergers and acquisitions, in- and out-licensing of products, and research and development priorities.

- It is important to understand what the "patent cliff" is and how it acts within the biopharmaceutical market to incentivize innovation and maintain the development of next-generation therapeutics; policies that compress innovation incentives and increase costs – such as federal price-setting, overly broad prohibitions on deal-making, and tariffs – should be avoided to allow market forces to efficiently allocate resources and bring new therapies to market.

Introduction

The "patent cliff" is a familiar feature of the biopharmaceutical market, but its policy significance is often oversimplified. At its core, the term refers to the sharp revenue erosion that can occur when high-selling branded drugs lose market exclusivity and become open to generic or biosimilar competition. For the health care system, that transition is both a source of savings and an event horizon to inspire and identify the next sources of

innovation.

This dynamic reflects the basic bargain at the center of U.S. pharmaceutical policy. The market provides a period of patent protection and time-limited exclusivity to support investment in discovery, clinical development, regulatory approval, manufacturing scale-up, and commercialization. Once that protection expires, lower cost competitors are intended to enter the market, bringing down prices. The Hatch-Waxman Act, passed in 1984, established the modern generic drug framework for small-molecule drugs, and the Biologics Price Competition and Innovation Act from 2009 created the analogous pathway for biosimilars. Together, these processes reflect the basic mechanics of U.S. pharmaceutical policy: Incentivize and reward innovation for a defined period, then promote competition to generate system-wide savings.

The challenge is that this transition can create significant pressure when several major products lose exclusivity in a compressed period. A single loss-of-exclusivity event may be manageable through lifecycle planning or a successful new launch. A broader patent cliff creates a more difficult portfolio problem: Companies must replace maturing revenue quickly enough to sustain research and development (R&D) investment, support late-stage development, maintain manufacturing and commercial capacity, and continue financing the next generation of therapies.

That replacement will not come from one source. Manufacturers rely on internal R&D, new indications, follow-on products, U.S.-based mergers and acquisitions (M&A), licensing agreements, co-development partnerships, and innovation outside the United States (ex-U.S.). China's growing role in global biopharmaceutical licensing is relevant to this discussion, but it is not the organizing principle. It is one example of a broader reality. As the patent cliff increases pressure to refill pipelines, companies will look for credible replacement assets wherever promising science is being produced.

The policy stakes are therefore larger than any one company's revenue forecast. The United States should welcome post-exclusivity competition because it is one of the health care system's most important affordability mechanisms. But policymakers should avoid undermining the innovation cycle that begets that competition. Current policy trajectories have centered on pre-loss-of-exclusivity price setting, overbroad restrictions on legitimate dealmaking, including from ex-U.S. sources such as China, tariffs that raise supply-chain costs, and national security policies that fail to distinguish real risks from ordinary therapeutic development. A serious patent cliff strategy should also preserve competition after exclusivity while protecting the conditions that allow new medicines to be financed, developed, acquired, manufactured, and delivered to patients.

The Patent Cliff

In the biopharmaceutical industry, a "patent cliff" refers to the concentrated loss of revenue that occurs when major branded products lose market exclusivity and become open to generic or biosimilar competition. The phrase is often used as shorthand for patent expiration, but the commercial concept is broader. A drug product's effective exclusivity can depend on a mix of patent protection, Food and Drug Administration (FDA)-administered regulatory exclusivity, biologic reference-product exclusivity, patent litigation, and the practical timing of generic or biosimilar launch.

For that reason, industry analysts often discuss the patent cliff through the lens of "loss of exclusivity," or LOE. LOE is the commercially relevant event: the point at which lower-cost competitors can enter the market in a way that materially changes the originator product's pricing power, market share, or both. A product may have multiple patents, staggered patent expirations, pending litigation, or formulation and method-of-use claims that complicate the exact timing. From a business perspective, however, the key question is when the product's protected revenue stream becomes contestable.

The "cliff" language reflects the fact that revenue erosion can be abrupt. Small-molecule drugs often face faster and steeper declines once multiple generic competitors enter, because pharmacy substitution and payer formulary management can shift volume quickly. Biologics may erode differently because biosimilars are more difficult to manufacture, switching dynamics are more complicated, and payer incentives can vary by site of care and channel. Still, the core concern is the same: A product that previously generated durable branded revenue can move into a materially lower revenue phase once meaningful competition arrives.

The patent cliff is therefore discussed at both the product level and the portfolio level. At the product level, LOE changes the economics of a specific franchise. At the portfolio level, a patent cliff emerges when several large products face LOE in a compressed period, creating a revenue-replacement problem for a company or for the sector as a whole.

Why the Patent Cliff Matters

The patent cliff produces two effects at once. The first is positive: Post-exclusivity competition lowers prices and thus reduces spending. Once generic or biosimilar competitors enter the market, the originator product generally loses market share, payers gain leverage, and net prices decline. For patients, the real effect depends on benefit design and formulary placement, but the system-level impacts are clear. Generic and biosimilar competition is one of the few proven mechanisms for reducing drug costs without relying on

government price-setting.

The savings are substantial. Generic and biosimilar medicines are estimated to have saved the U.S. health care system $467 billion in 2024 and $3.4 trillion over the prior decade. Biosimilars alone were estimated to have generated $20.2 billion in savings in 2024 and $56.2 billion since the first U.S. biosimilar launch in 2015. Those figures should be understood in context, but they underscore the basic point: The patent cliff is not a market failure. It is one of the primary ways the prescription drug market converts earlier innovation into later affordability.

The second effect is more difficult: The same event creates a revenue-replacement problem. Why does this matter? A successful drug finances not only its own lifecycle but also broader R&D portfolios, late-stage trials, manufacturing investment, business development, and commercial infrastructure. When that revenue declines sharply, companies must replace it through new product launches, expanded indications, lifecycle management, or external transactions.

Pharmaceutical R&D is capital-intensive, long-cycle, and failure-prone. The Congressional Budget Office has described expected global revenues, development costs, and federal policy as key factors influencing drug-company R&D decisions, and it has also noted that policies lowering drug prices and federal spending would probably reduce incentives to develop new drugs. That does not mean every dollar of branded-drug revenue is efficiently reinvested. Nor does it mean policymakers should oppose generic or biosimilar competition. But it does mean the policy discussion should distinguish between market-based competition after exclusivity and interventions that compress returns before that competitive cycle has run its course.

The current loss-of-exclusivity cycle is notable because of its scale. The most formidable LOE wave in more than a decade, patent losses at estimated net manufacturer prices are expected to exceed $90 billion from 2025 through 2029. Calculating the exposure more broadly, estimates indicate that more than $300 billion in prescription drug revenue will lose exclusivity between 2025 and 2030. Those estimates are not theoretical. They represent revenue streams that currently support commercial infrastructure, late-stage development, manufacturing investment, business development, and investor expectations.

The Pipeline-replacement Problem

The patent cliff creates a timing problem as much as a revenue problem. Companies cannot wait for exclusivity to expire before looking for replacement growth. By the time generic or

biosimilar competition begins, the next wave of products must already be moving through clinical development, regulatory review, launch planning, manufacturing scale-up, and commercial adoption.

Sequencing these actions efficiently is difficult because drug development does not produce revenue on demand. A manufacturer may have a scientifically promising pipeline and still face a commercial gap if key assets fail in clinical trials, are delayed by regulatory or manufacturing issues, serve smaller patient populations, or launch too late to offset near-term loss-of-exclusivity pressure. Even successful product launches may take years to build the evidence base, payer coverage, prescriber confidence, and patient uptake needed to replace other pharmaceutical sales.

This is why the patent cliff should be understood through a portfolio-management lens. The issue is not whether one company can replace one product with one new product. It is whether companies can assemble enough credible opportunities, across enough therapeutic areas and stages of development, to sustain R&D investment, business development, manufacturing capacity, and commercialization infrastructure while older products move into competitive markets.

The larger the cliff, the more difficult that task becomes. A modest LOE event can often be managed through ordinary lifecycle planning or a successful launch. A compressed wave of major LOE events requires a broader replacement strategy. Companies need multiple shots on goal: internal candidates, new indications, follow-on products, domestic business development, international licensing, and partnerships that can move promising assets into larger development and commercialization platforms.

The patent cliff makes this bridge more important. A manufacturer facing concentrated revenue erosion needs credible pathways to replenish its pipeline before losses materialize. External transactions can accelerate that process, diversify scientific risk, and allow companies to access assets that have already cleared some early development hurdles.

The Search for Replacement Assets

Once the patent cliff is understood as a pipeline-replenishment problem, the strategic response becomes easier to evaluate. Companies facing LOE pressure are not choosing between domestic self-reliance and foreign dependence. They are assembling portfolios from multiple sources, each with different advantages and limitations: internal research, lifecycle strategies, U.S.-based biotechnology, and ex-U.S. innovation.

Internal R&D remains the foundation for most companies. It allows companies to set scientific priorities, build proprietary platforms, and pursue long-term therapeutic

strategies. But internal research is slow, expensive, and uncertain, making it difficult to rely on it alone during a compressed LOE cycle.

Lifecycle management of existing products is another method of pipeline maintenance. New indications, improved formulations, dose-delivery innovations, fixed-dose combinations, and follow-on products can build on the clinical and commercial value of existing franchises. These strategies are especially important to producing meaningful patient benefits, but these are naturally limited to those with scientific support – not all products can be extended through follow-on indications and products.

External innovation is therefore central to managing the cliff. U.S.-based M&A, asset acquisitions, licensing agreements, co-development partnerships, option-to-acquire structures, regional rights deals, and platform collaborations allow companies to access assets that may already have cleared early scientific or clinical hurdles. These transactions are not merely financial maneuvers. They are a part of how the biopharmaceutical ecosystem functions, transferring promising science from smaller developers into organizations with late-stage development, regulatory, manufacturing, payer, and commercial scale.

That external search is increasingly global. Attractive assets can emerge from U.S. biotechnology firms, European developers, Japanese and South Korean companies, academic spinouts, and other mature life sciences markets. These opportunities can serve the same function as U.S.-based external innovation: They expand the universe of possible pipeline additions, diversify scientific risk, and allow manufacturers to access programs that have already cleared some early development hurdles.

China fits within this broader category. Its biopharmaceutical ecosystem has become a more prominent source of licensable assets, particularly in oncology, antibody-drug conjugates, bispecific antibodies, immunology, and metabolic disease. Industry and financial reporting show a marked increase in China-origin licensing activity, including significant growth in deal values as multinational companies search for experimental medicines amid patent-expiration pressure. Greater China licensing deal values rose nearly tenfold from 2021 to $137.7 billion in 2025, with further growth expected in 2026 as multinational firms look for experimental medicines amid patent-expiration pressure. That does not make the patent cliff a China story. It makes China one example of a broader strategic reality: When companies face major revenue erosion, they look for replacement assets wherever credible science is being produced.

Some opportunities will be domestic. Some will come from traditional allied markets. Some will come from China. The relevant policy question is whether U.S. firms retain the

flexibility to pursue legitimate acquisition, licensing, and development strategies that strengthen their portfolios. A molecule discovered abroad can still generate substantial U.S. value. It can be developed through U.S.-led clinical trials, reviewed by FDA, manufactured in the United States or allied markets, commercialized by a U.S.-based company, and made available to U.S. patients. Properly structured, external sourcing can help U.S. companies capture and scale global science rather than surrender it to competitors.

The Policy Stakes

Understanding the U.S. pharmaceutical market through the lens of the patent cliff and pipeline replacement economics should clarify the ongoing drug-pricing debate; it demonstrates that branded-drug revenue is temporary by design. The U.S. market has a built-in mechanism for moving products from protected revenue to price competition: time-limited exclusivity followed by generic or biosimilar entry. Once that protection ends, competitors can shift market share, reduce prices, and generate savings for patients and payers.

Federal policy has trended toward undermining that mechanism, however, and creates inefficient incentives that materially impact the necessary pipeline replacement. Price-setting policies compress expected returns during the protected period. Trade policy can raise manufacturing and supply-chain costs. National security legislation can restrict the contracting, investment, licensing, and partnership pathways companies use to develop or acquire new assets. In total, these policies risk making the patent cliff harder to manage at precisely the moment companies need more flexibility to refill pipelines.

The Medicare Drug Price Negotiation Program is the most direct example of pre-exclusivity revenue compression. Despite its name, the program is not a conventional negotiation between equal market participants. It is an administrative price-setting regime backed by severe penalties for noncompliance. For selected products, federally imposed prices can take effect nine years after approval for small-molecule drugs and 13 years after approval for biologics, before generic or biosimilar competition would otherwise discipline the market. That shortens the economic value of the protected period before the traditional market-based exclusivity cycle has fully run its course.

That timing is particularly damaging in the context of the current patent cliff. The sector is already facing a major LOE wave that will reduce revenue from some of the world's most important medicines. Price setting squeezes from the front end while generic and biosimilar competition squeezes from the back end. The result is a smaller and less predictable revenue window for the products that are supposed to finance late-stage development, manufacturing scale-up, business development, and future launches.

At the same time, national security policy is increasingly reaching into the biopharmaceutical sector. The BIOSECURE Act and related proposals focus on restricting federal contracting or federally funded work involving certain biotechnology companies of concern, including Chinese-linked firms. The stated concern is not imaginary: Biotechnology can implicate sensitive health data, genetic information, supply-chain resilience, and national-security risk. But the policy design matters. If restrictions are broad or poorly targeted, they can disrupt contract research, development services, manufacturing relationships, and the operating infrastructure that many drug developers use to move assets through the pipeline.

The proposed Biotech Investment National Security Act would extend this logic further by bringing biotechnology into the outbound-investment and transaction-screening framework. The bill adds biotechnology to covered technologies under the Comprehensive Outbound Investment National Security (COINS) Act and potentially subjecting licensing, joint ventures, and certain investments involving covered foreign persons to national security review. This disrupts one of the central ways companies acquire replacement assets, share development risk, and access promising science developed outside their own labs. A policy that treats ordinary therapeutic licensing as presumptively suspect could narrow the set of tools firms use to respond to LOE pressure.

Tariffs create a related problem on the cost side. Pharmaceutical supply chains are global, and reshoring manufacturing capacity is expensive, technically complex, and time-consuming. Tariffs may be promoted to force domestic production, but they can raise input costs, complicate sourcing decisions, and increase uncertainty for companies already managing patent-cliff exposure. Whatever the stated industrial policy objective, tariffs increase costs in both the overall branded and generic markets.

The common flaw across these policies is not that policymakers are identifying irrelevant concerns. Drug affordability matters. Supply chain resilience matters. Sensitive data and national security risks matter. The flaw is that policy is moving in ways that compress the innovation window, increase operating uncertainty, and restrict pipeline-replenishment strategies without sufficient regard for how the biopharmaceutical ecosystem actually responds to LOE pressure.

The patent cliff is not an argument for insulating mature, branded products from competition. Generic and biosimilar entry after exclusivity should be encouraged. But it is an argument against layering additional policy shocks onto an already significant transition point. If companies face price setting before LOE, tariff pressure in supply chains, and

broader restrictions on licensing, investment, and development partnerships, they will have fewer ways to replace cliff-exposed revenue.

That revenue loss has consequences across the innovation chain. Large manufacturers use successful products to support late-stage trials, manufacturing scale-up, commercialization, and business development. Emerging biotechnology companies depend on acquisition, licensing, and partnership interest from larger firms. Investors evaluate early-stage risk against the possibility that a successful product will generate sufficient returns. When policy reduces the value of success and narrows the pathways for external innovation, it changes decisions well before any individual product loses exclusivity.

The policy stakes, then, are not limited to drug prices today. They extend to whether the United States can maintain the conditions necessary to finance, develop, acquire, manufacture, and commercialize tomorrow's therapies. The patent cliff already moves older medicines into competitive markets. Policymakers should make that transition work better, not make it harder for companies to refill the pipeline that comes next.

Policy Recommendations

A serious patent cliff strategy should preserve the full set of tools companies use to replenish pipelines while maintaining the post-exclusivity competition that generates savings for patients and payers. Policymakers should not treat the cliff as a reason to weaken the innovation environment, restrict legitimate dealmaking, or layer additional uncertainty onto an already difficult revenue transition. Instead, policy should focus on making the competitive cycle work: Reward innovation for a defined period, allow generic and biosimilar competition after exclusivity, and preserve the pathways companies use to finance and develop the next generation of therapies.

First, policymakers should strengthen post-exclusivity competition. Generic and biosimilar pathways should be predictable, efficient, and capable of producing real market entry once exclusivity has ended. That is where the affordability promise of the patent cliff is realized.

Second, policymakers should avoid pre-exclusivity price setting that weakens the reward structure before the market-based cycle has run its course. The Medicare Drug Price Negotiation Program is a central example of this mistake. It imposes administrative pricing before traditional generic or biosimilar competition would otherwise occur, compressing the revenue window that supports investment and business development.

Third, policymakers should preserve legitimate acquisition and licensing pathways. Patent-cliff management depends on external innovation. Companies need flexibility to evaluate assets globally, structure transactions according to risk, and integrate promising products

into larger development platforms. Restrictions that narrow the available universe of assets would make the cliff harder to manage.

Fourth, national security review should be targeted and evidence based. Transactions involving sensitive health data, genetic information, military-linked entities, critical infrastructure, or concentrated manufacturing dependence may warrant heightened scrutiny. But routine therapeutic licensing should not automatically be treated as equivalent to a supply-chain vulnerability or data-security risk. Policymakers should define the risk precisely before imposing restrictions.

Finally, the United States should strengthen its domestic innovation environment. The best way to respond to a more competitive global biopharmaceutical landscape is to make the United States the most attractive place to start, finance, test, manufacture, regulate, and commercialize biotechnology. That requires predictable FDA review, durable intellectual property protections, competitive capital markets, stable reimbursement expectations, and a policy environment that does not penalize successful innovation before the market-based exclusivity cycle has run its course.

Conclusion

The patent cliff is a predictable feature of the drug market, but the current cycle is unusually consequential. It will create important savings as generic and biosimilar competition enters the market. It will also force manufacturers to replace large amounts of maturing revenue in a compressed period.

That replacement will not come from one source. It will require internal R&D, lifecycle management, new launches, U.S.-based acquisitions, licensing agreements, ex-U.S. partnerships, and disciplined portfolio strategy. China’s growing role in global licensing is relevant, but it is not the organizing principle. It is one example of how external innovation has become more global at the same time the patent cliff has made pipeline replenishment more urgent.

The central policy challenge is to preserve the innovation bargain. The United States should welcome post-exclusivity competition because it generates savings for patients and payers. But it should reject pre-exclusivity price setting and avoid policies that narrow the tools companies need to refill pipelines. The goal should be a system that makes older medicines more affordable while ensuring that tomorrow’s therapies are still developed, financed, manufactured, and made available to patients.