Available online at www.abhipublications.org
Review Article
ABHI Publications since 2013
International Journal of Pharmacy and Engineering (IJPE)
ISSN 2320-849X

Engineering Monoclonal Antibodies for Infectious Diseases: Optimizing IgG Subclass Selection,Fc Engineering, and Glycosylation to Enhance Effector Function

CHANDRIKA MUKHERJEE, ARINDAM PAUL, MILAN KUMAR MAITI, AMARTYA DE, PRIYANKA CHAKRABORTY,
Department of Pharmacology, BCDA College of Pharmacy & Technology, Hridaypur, Barasat, Kolkata-700127

Abstract:

Monoclonal antibodies (mAbs) have completely changed the way that autoimmune disorders, especially rheumatoid arthritis (RA), are treated. There are still issues with immunogenicity, patient-specific reactions, and treatment effectiveness despite notable clinical progress. This review focuses on cutting-edge mAb engineering techniques that use glycoengineering, rational IgG subclass selection, and Fc domain optimization to get beyond these restrictions. Customized immune effector regulation, such as greater antibody-dependent cellular cytotoxicity (ADCC) or longer half-life through better FcRn binding, is made possible by Fc engineering.Depending on the therapeutic environment, different IgG subclasses are selectively used, such as IgG1 for strong cytotoxic effects or IgG4 for decreased immune activation. mAb effectiveness, safety, and pharmacokinetics are further optimized by glycan modifications including afucosylation, bisecting GlcNAc, and sialylation. Next-generation biologics with better therapeutic indices and customized patient outcomes for autoimmune diseases are made possible by these engineering advancements taken together.

Keywords: Monoclonal antibodies, Fc engineering, IgG subclass, Glycoengineering, Autoimmune diseases, Rheumatoid arthritis, ADCC, Biosimilars, Fcγ receptors, Glycosylation, Afucosylation, Immunogenicity

1. Introduction

- **Classification of arthritis: autoimmune vs. degenerative:**

An assortment of disorders affecting the joints, arthritis is often divided into two categories: autoimmune and degenerative. [1]The hallmark of autoimmune arthritis, which includes psoriatic arthritis (PsA) and rheumatoid arthritis (RA), is immune system dysregulation that affects joint tissues.[2] On the other hand, degenerative arthritis—mainly osteoarthritis (OA)—involves the gradual mechanical deterioration of cartilage.[2] Selecting targeted medicines, particularly monoclonal antibodies that alter immune responses in autoimmune forms, requires an understanding of this differential.[3]

- **Unmet clinical needs in rheumatoid arthritis (RA)**

There are still a lot of unmet demands in spite of advancements in RA treatment. Conventional DMARDs and biologics, such as anti-TNF medicines, cause partial or no response in many individuals.[4] For certain patients, long-term illness control, the durability of remission, and the avoidance of joint injury are still difficult.[5] Furthermore, problems including lack of individualized approaches, safety concerns, and treatment resistance necessitate the creation of next-generation therapies such tailored monoclonal antibodies.[6]

- **Success of biologics in TNF-α and IL-6 inhibition**

Biologic treatments that target TNF-α (like infliximab and adalimumab) and IL-6 (like tocilizumab) have revolutionized the treatment of RA by directly inhibiting important inflammatory cytokines.[7] These substances enhance bodily function, lessen synovial inflammation, and stop joint deterioration. While IL-6 blockers provided a substitute for patients who were not responding to TNF, TNF inhibitors were the first significant innovation.[8] Their accomplishments highlight the benefits of targeted immunotherapy for autoimmune diseases.[9]

- **Rise of personalized immunotherapy approaches**

The goal of personalized immunotherapy for RA is to customize care according to each patient's unique genetic, biomarker, and clinical characteristics.[10] The reasons why certain individuals react differently to biologics have been uncovered by developments in pharmacogenomics, immune cell profiling, and Fc receptor polymorphism investigations.[11] In order to minimize trial-and-error prescribing and optimize antibody therapy, precision techniques currently investigate biomarkers such as RF, ACPA, IL-6 levels, and FcγR[12]

2. Basics of Monoclonal Antibody Therapy

- **Mechanisms:**
    - **Neutralization of soluble cytokines (e.g., TNF, IL-1β):**

      By binding to pro-inflammatory cytokines with great specificity and blocking their interaction with cell surface receptors, monoclonal antibodies neutralize them, such as TNF-α and IL-1β.[13] This blockage lowers inflammation, joint swelling, and cartilage degradation by inhibiting downstream signaling pathways like NF-κB and JAK-STAT.[14] By stopping cytokine-driven joint degeneration, anti-TNF mAbs (like adalimumab) and IL-1 inhibitors (like anakinra) have demonstrated significant therapeutic improvement in RA.[15]

        - **Inhibition of cell-surface receptors (e.g., IL-6R, CD20):**

          By focusing on and inhibiting particular cell-surface receptors like IL-6R and CD20, monoclonal antibodies can slow the course of illness.[16] Anti-CD20 mAbs, such as rituximab, deplete B cells by targeting CD20, which is useful in autoimmune disorders and B-cell lymphomas, whereas anti-IL-6R mAbs, such as tocilizumab, inhibit the IL-6 signaling pathway, which is essential in inflammatory responses.[17] This focused strategy reduces systemic side effects while increasing efficacy.[18]

    - **Immune checkpoint modulation (CTLA-4, PD-1)**

By avoiding T-cell suppression, monoclonal antibodies that target immunological checkpoints like CTLA-4 and PD-1 improve anti-tumorimmunity.[19] Nivolumab or pembrolizumab (anti-PD-1) and ipilimumab (anti-CTLA-4) are examples of drugs that revive worn-out T-cells, enabling them to identify and eliminate cancer cells.[20] Results for lung cancer, melanoma, and other solid tumors have been markedly enhanced by this approach.[21]

- **Key therapeutic targets in arthritis**

Pro-inflammatory cytokines including TNF-α, IL-6, and IL-1, as well as cell surface markers like CD20 on B cells, are important therapeutic targets in arthritis.[22] By directly disrupting immune-mediated joint destruction, biologic medicines employing monoclonal antibodies, such as rituximab (anti-CD20), tocilizumab (anti-IL-6R), and adalimumab (anti-TNF-α), have revolutionized the treatment of rheumatoid arthritis.[23,24]

- **Overview of first-generation vs. second-generation mAbs**

Because of their high immunogenicity and quick clearance, first-generation monoclonal antibodies were usually derived from mice, which limited their clinical relevance.[25] Using sophisticated genetic engineering, second-generation mAbs—which can be chimeric, humanized, or totally human—are created to increase effectiveness, lower immunological responses, and extend half-life.[26] Due to these advancements, second-generation mAbs are now the norm for therapeutic uses.[27]

4. IgG Subclass Selection

A. Biophysical & Functional Differences

TABLE 1: Here's a comparative table highlighting the biophysical and functional differences between first- generation and second-generation monoclonal antibodies (mAbs):

Feature	First-Generation mAbs	Second-Generation mAbs
Origin	Fully murine	Chimeric, humanized, or fully human
Immunogenicity	High (HAMA response)	Reduced or minimal
Half-life	Short due to rapid clearance	Extended half-life due to human Fc regions
Affinity for Human Fc Receptors	Low	High
Effector Functions (e.g., ADCC)	Limited	Enhanced
Clinical Use	Limited due to immune responses	Widely used in clinical settings
Examples	Muromonab-CD3 (OKT3)	Rituximab, Adalimumab, Trastuzumab

B. Subclass-Dependent Outcomes

- **Enhanced therapeutic index**

Because of their greater target specificity, less off-target effects, and optimized Fc engineering for improved immune engagement, second-generation mAbs show an improved therapeutic index.[31] These improvements reduce the risk of toxicity while preserving potent therapeutic effects, particularly in cancer and autoimmune diseases, by enabling greater efficacy at lower or safer dosages.[32]

- **Avoidance of off-target toxicity**

By improving antigen selectivity and lowering unintentional immune activation, contemporary monoclonal antibodies are designed to reduce off-target harm.[33] By precisely delivering medication to sick cells while preserving healthy tissues, methods such as affinity maturation, humanization, and antibody-drug conjugate (ADC) design enhance safety profiles in clinical use.[34,35]

- **Controlled immune engagement**

In monoclonal antibody treatments, controlled immune engagement guarantees that immune activation is focused to where it is required, lowering cytokine release or systemic inflammation.[36,37] mAbs can precisely control immune effectors such as T-cells or NK cells through Fc-engineering and bispecific formats, increasing efficacy while avoiding overactivation that could result in unfavourable events like cytokine storms.[38]

C. Clinical Relevance

- **Use of IgG1 for CD20 mAbs**

The most widely utilized subclass of monoclonal antibodies (mAbs) that target CD20, a protein produced on the cell surface of B cells, is IgG1. The effectiveness of CD20-targeting mAbs in the treatment of conditions like non-Hodgkin lymphoma and chronic lymphocytic leukemia depends on this IgG subclass's strong effector functions, such as complement-dependent cytotoxicity (CDC) and antibody-dependent cell-mediated cytotoxicity (ADCC). By interacting with immune cell Fc receptors and promoting the death of B cells, the Fc region of IgG1 plays a crucial part in orchestrating these immunological responses (39). IgG1 mAbs are also well-tolerated in clinical settings and have a favourable pharmacokinetic profile, which further supports their application in monoclonal antibody therapy for autoimmune disorders and cancer (40).Research has demonstrated that by enhancing the recruitment of immune cells, improving the IgG1 Fc region's affinity for activating Fc receptors can improve the anti-tumour activity of these mAbs (41). Additionally, IgG1-based medicines have demonstrated clinical efficacy in treating autoimmune diseases, underscoring their potential to improve patient outcomes (42).

- **IgG4 in IL-6R inhibitors (e.g., Tocilizumab)**

Because of its diminished capacity to initiate immunological effector processes such complement-dependent cytotoxicity (CDC) and antibody-dependent cellular cytotoxicity (ADCC), IgG4 is specifically selected for monoclonal antibodies such as tocilizumab, an

interleukin-6 receptor (IL-6R) inhibitor. This characteristic is especially crucial in therapeutic contexts where the objective is to inhibit a cytokine receptor rather than cause cell death (43). IgG4 is appropriate for chronic inflammatory conditions such as rheumatoid arthritis and systemic juvenile idiopathic arthritis because of its decreased affinity for Fc gamma receptors and C1q, which reduces the possibility of inflammatory reactions (44).As an IgG4 subclass, tocilizumab improves patient safety profiles by neutralizing IL-6 signalling without causing significant immune activation (45). IgG4's usefulness in anti-inflammatory biologics is further increased by its special structural characteristic of Fab-arm exchange, which lowers the danger of immune complex formation and related adverse effects (46).

- **Case studies: Certolizumab vs. Adalimumab (PEGylation vs. IgG1)**

Although both adalimumab and certolizumab pegol are anti-TNF-α monoclonal antibodies, their structures and effector functions are very different. A PEGylated Fab' fragment that lacks the Fc region, certolizumab prevents Fc-mediated processes like CDC and ADCC. This alteration is beneficial during pregnancy and lowers the risk of adverse outcomes linked to FcγR because it decreases placental transfer and systemic immune activation (47). Adalimumab, on the other hand, is a full-length IgG1 antibody with a functioning Fc domain that has a longer half-life and activates immune effector mechanisms that are advantageous in inflammatory environments (48).Both drugs are useful in treating inflammatory conditions like Crohn's disease and rheumatoid arthritis, according to clinical trials; however, certolizumab's PEGylation enables a longer half-life and lower immunogenicity (49). The comparison highlights the direct impact of structural engineering on pharmacokinetics, safety, and efficacy profiles, whether through PEGylation or IgG subclass selection (50).

5. Glycosylation

A. Types of Glycans in Antibodies

The stability, effector function, and immunogenicity of antibodies, especially IgG, are greatly influenced by N-linked glycans that are mainly bound to the Fc region at asparagine 297 of the heavy chain. Complex biantennary structures with varied levels of fucosylation, galactosylation, sialylation, and bisecting N-acetylglucosamine (GlcNAc) are among the most prevalent forms of glycans (51). While afucosylated antibodies exhibit increased cytotoxic responses, core fucosylation typically decreases affinity for FcγRIIIa and hence diminishes ADCC (52).Anti-inflammatory qualities are modulated by galactosylation and sialylation; for example, increased sialylation is linked to decreased pro-inflammatory activity and is involved in IVIG therapy for autoimmune disorders (53). In addition to changing the antibody's effector capabilities, the presence or lack of particular glycan residues also modifies the antibody's pharmacokinetics and complement pathway interaction (54).

- **Core fucosylation**

  The process by which a fucose sugar is added to the innermost N-acetylglucosamine (GlcNAc) residue of the N-glycan core on the Fc region of IgG antibodies is known as core fucosylation. This alteration has a major impact on how the antibody interacts

with immune cells such natural killer (NK) cells' Fc gamma receptor IIIa (FcγRIIIa) (55). Core fucose-containing antibodies have a lower affinity for FcγRIIIa, which results in less antibody-dependent cellular cytotoxicity (ADCC), a crucial effector function in therapeutic monoclonal antibodies for viral infections and cancer (56).Afucosylated antibodies, on the other hand, exhibit significantly higher ADCC activity and up to 50-fold greater binding to FcγRIIIa, which is helpful when creating strong cytotoxic treatments (57). In order to increase their clinical efficacy, especially in oncology and infectious disease contexts, a number of next-generation therapeutic antibodies are currently being designed to lack core fucose (58).

- **Bisecting GlcNAc**

A structural alteration in the N-glycan of IgG antibodies known as "bisecting N-acetylglucosamine" (GlcNAc) occurs when an extra GlcNAc residue is joined to the glycan's core mannose by a β1,4 bond. The enzyme N-acetylglucosaminyltransferase III (GnT-III) catalyzes this addition, which significantly alters the shape and functionality of the Fc region (59).By raising the antibody's affinity for FcγRIIIa, bisecting GlcNAc has been demonstrated to improve antibody-dependent cellular cytotoxicity (ADCC), particularly when paired with afucosylation (60). Additionally, it decreases the degree of core fucosylation, which indirectly increases the activities of immunological effectors (61). In preclinical cancer models, therapeutic antibodies containing bisected glycans have shown higher cytotoxic activity, and their potential for improved anti-tumor efficacy is being investigated (62).

- **Galactosylation**

The process of adding galactose residues to the terminal N-acetylglucosamine units of N-glycans on the Fc region of IgG antibodies is known as galactosylation. Because a larger galactose content promotes C1q binding and complement-dependent cytotoxicity (CDC), the degree of galactosylation might alter immune effector actions, including complement activation via the classical pathway (63).While agalactosylated forms (G0 glycans) have been connected to autoimmune diseases such rheumatoid arthritis and chronic inflammation, galactosylatedIgGs are typically linked to pro-inflammatory qualities (64). Furthermore, IgG's galactose content may have an impact on the stability and folding of the antibody, which may have an impact on its pharmacokinetics and therapeutic efficacy (65). Glycoengineering developments have made it possible to produce therapeutic antibodies with distinct galactosylation profiles that, depending on the clinical requirement, can either improve particular immune functions or lessen inflammatory reactions (66).

B. Biological Impact

- **AfucosylatedmAbs:**

Because afucosylated monoclonal antibodies (mAbs) do not include core fucose on their Fc N-glycan, their antibody-dependent cellular cytotoxicity (ADCC) is significantly increased. The main cause of this rise in ADCC is the stronger binding affinity between afucosylated Fc sections and NK cells' FcγRIIIa receptors, which encourages more effective immune cell activation and target cell death (67).Therapeutic antibodies like obinutuzumab and mogamulizumab, which exhibit more cytotoxic activity in hematologic malignancies than their fucosylated counterparts, were effectively designed using this approach (68).

Additionally, because afucosylatedmAbs do not necessitate protein backbone alterations, natural IgG1 structure can be maintained while function is improved solely through glycoengineering (69). The wider development of glycoengineered medicines to treat infectious illnesses and malignancies where high effector activity is essential has been prompted by the clinical success of these antibodies (70).

- **SialylatedmAbs:**

Terminal sialic acid residues on the Fc N-glycans of sialylated monoclonal antibodies (mAbs) have been linked to decreased pro-inflammatory activity and increased anti-inflammatory effects. Changes in interactions with Fc receptors, namely a decreased affinity for activating FcγRs and increased engagement with inhibitory receptors or lectin-like receptors like DC-SIGN and CD22, are primarily responsible for this anti-inflammatory function (71).The mechanism of intravenous immunoglobulin (IVIG) therapy, which helps to modulate the immune system in autoimmune and inflammatory illnesses, depends critically on sialylation of IgG, particularly in the Fc region (72). Furthermore, it has been investigated to decrease unwanted immune activation and cytokine release by enhancing Fc sialylation in therapeutic antibodies, especially in contexts such as chronic inflammation and autoimmune diseases (73). One intriguing strategy for creating next-generation immunotherapies with regulated and customized immunomodulatory qualities is the engineering of sialylatedmAbs (74).

- **Glycoengineering for consistent therapeutic effects**

Glycoengineering is the intentional alteration of monoclonal antibodies' (mAbs') glycosylation patterns to yield reliable and improved therapeutic outcomes. Clinical efficacy and safety may be impacted by batch-to-batch variability in effector functions such as ADCC and CDC due to the diverse nature of natural glycosylation in mammalian cells (75). To optimize FcγR binding and immune activation, glycoengineering technologies—such as enzymatic remodeling, glycosylation-deficient cell lines, or genetically modified expression systems (e.g., FUT8 knockout CHO cells)—allow for the production of antibodies with uniform glycoforms, such as afucosylated or bisected N-glycans (76).Particularly in cancer and autoimmune disease treatments, this accuracy guarantees consistent pharmacodynamics, improves immune effector function, and reduces side effects (77). The clinical utility of this strategy is demonstrated by approved glycoengineered monoclonal antibodies such as obinutuzumab and mogamulizumab, which exhibit better ADCC and patient outcomes (78).

C. Expression System Considerations

- **CHO vs. NS0 vs. HEK293 glycosylation differences**

Human embryonic kidney (HEK293) cells, mouse myeloma NS0, and Chinese hamster ovary (CHO) cells are often employed host systems for the generation of monoclonal antibodies (mAbs). However, their glycosylation profiles vary greatly, which may affect the safety and efficacy of treatment. Although they may produce trace amounts of non-human sialic acids like N-glycolylneuraminic acid (Neu5Gc), which can cause immunogenicity in humans, CHO cells are the most commonly employed platform and produce primarily human-compatible glycoforms (79). More immunogenic glycan structures, such as α1,3-galactose and Neu5Gc,

are typically produced by NS0 cells. These structures have been linked to negative reactions, including cetuximab anaphylaxis in individuals with anti-αGal IgE antibodies (80).On the other hand, because they are human-derived, HEK293 cells generate more glycan structures that resemble those of humans, which reduces the likelihood of immunogenic reactions. However, because of scalability and regulatory limitations, they are not as frequently employed in large-scale production (81). A crucial component of glycoengineering techniques to maximize therapeutic antibodies, the host cell line selection has a direct impact on Fc-mediated activities (e.g., ADCC, CDC) (82).

- **Glyco-heterogeneity affecting batch consistency**

Multiple glycoforms on therapeutic monoclonal antibodies (mAbs) within a single production batch are referred to as glyco-heterogeneity. This is mostly caused by differences in host cell metabolism, culture conditions, and enzyme activity. Variability in clinical efficacy and safety between batches may result from this heterogeneity, which can have a substantial impact on the consistency of important quality features such pharmacokinetics, complement-dependent cytotoxicity (CDC), and antibody-dependent cellular cytotoxicity (ADCC) (83).For example, alterations in galactosylation or sialylation impact complement activation and inflammatory responses, while variations in fucosylation levels can change FcγRIIIa binding and ADCC potency (84). In order to guarantee product consistency and reproducibility, regulatory bodies currently place a strong emphasis on rigorous control of glycosylation patterns throughout bioprocessing (85). Glycoengineering strategies and sophisticated analytical methods, like mass spectrometry and HILIC-UPLC, are used to monitor and standardize glycan structures throughout development and production in order to address this (86).

- **Tools for glycan profiling (mass spectrometry, HPLC)**

The quality, consistency, and effectiveness of therapeutic monoclonal antibodies (mAbs) depend on precise glycan profiling. The most popular analytical techniques for this are mass spectrometry (MS) and high-performance liquid chromatography (HPLC), especially hydrophilic interaction chromatography (HILIC). Glycan compositions, branching patterns, and post-translational changes like fucosylation, galactosylation, or sialylation can all be thoroughly characterized thanks to mass spectrometry's high sensitivity and structural resolution (87). In glycoproteomic procedures, electrospray ionization (ESI)-MS and matrix-assisted laser desorption/ionization time-of-flight (MALDI-TOF) are often utilized formats. Meanwhile, quantitative analysis of glycan species and batch-to-batch monitoring of glycosylation consistency are made possible by HILIC-HPLC, which is frequently used in conjunction with fluorescence detection after glycan labeling (e.g., 2-AB or RapiFluor-MS) (88). Together with lectin arrays and enzymatic digestion, these instruments offer a thorough understanding of glycoform variety and direct glycoengineering techniques in the creation of new treatments (89, 90).

D. Regulatory Aspects

- **ICH Q6B for glycan analysis**

A framework for the specification and characterization of biotechnological products, including glycoproteins like monoclonal antibodies, is provided by ICH Q6B (International Council for Harmonization, Guideline Q6B). Because glycosylation can have a substantial impact on the safety, effectiveness, and pharmacokinetics of biotherapeutics, it highlights the significance of glycan analysis as a critical quality attribute (CQA). ICH Q6B states that validated analytical techniques such HPLC, mass spectrometry, and capillary electrophoresis must be used to fully characterize the glycan profile, including the identification of sugar residues, site occupancy, and heterogeneity (91).The guideline also emphasizes the necessity of understanding how variances can affect biological activity and proving batch-to-batch consistency in glycosylation (92). By ensuring that the glycosylation pattern stays within specified parameters during manufacturing modifications and scale-up procedures, ICH Q6B compliance contributes to regulatory approval (93,94).

- **Biosimilar comparability requirements**

In order to prove that a biosimilar monoclonal antibody (mAb) is structurally, functionally, and clinically comparable to its reference product, biosimilar comparability evaluations are essential. Before moving on to clinical investigations, regulatory bodies like the FDA, WHO, and EMA demand a methodical strategy that begins with thorough analytical characterisation, including glycosylation profiling, primary and higher-order structures, and biological activity (95).Because variations in glycosylation (such as fucosylation and sialylation) might affect effector activities like ADCC and CDC and potentially impact safety and efficacy, glycan analysis is especially crucial (96). The important quality characteristics (CQAs) of the biosimilar and the original product are compared using analytical techniques such LC-MS, HILIC, and bioassays (97). Minor variations are only permitted if they are supported by science and demonstrated to have no clinically significant effect; regulators expect biosimilars to fall within the allowed range of variability observed in the reference product (98).

6. Preclinical Models and Translational Science

- **Limitations of animal models (murine FcγR vs. human)**

Preclinical evaluation of monoclonal antibodies (mAbs) frequently uses animal models, especially murine systems. However, these models have significant limitations since human and animal Fc gamma receptor (FcγR) expression and function differ. The structure, location, and binding affinities of mouse FcγRs to IgG subclasses vary greatly, which impacts the propagation of immune effector functions such phagocytosis and antibody-dependent cellular cytotoxicity (ADCC) (99). In order to mediate ADCC, for example, human IgG1 binds to human FcγRIIIa on natural killer (NK) cells with high affinity. However, its interaction with murine FcγRIV, a functional analog, does not quite replicate the same response, which could result in an overestimation or underestimation of therapeutic efficacy (100). Furthermore, translational relevance is further complicated by variations in immune cell makeup and glycosylation patterns (101). In order to increase the preclinical predictability of mAb activity, transgenic mice that express human FcγRs and humanized immune systems are being employed more frequently (102).

- **Humanized mouse models for glyco/Fc analysis**

Humanized mice models are being employed more and more to analyze glycoengineering and Fc-mediated functions of monoclonal antibodies (mAbs), as well as to close the gap between preclinical findings and human immune responses. In order to more accurately examine antibody effector capabilities such as ADCC, CDC, and half-life extension, these mice are genetically engineered to express human Fc gamma receptors (FcγRs), FcRn (neonatal Fc receptor), or even elements of the human immune system (103). Mice that express human FcγRIIIa, for instance, offer a more accurate platform for assessing how Fc glycan alterations, like afucosylation, affect NK cell-mediated cytotoxicity (104). Similarly, IgG recycling and serum half-life, which are impacted by Fc engineering and glycosylation patterns, can be studied using human FcRn-expressing mice (105). Before starting human trials, these humanized systems are crucial for confirming the clinical significance of Fc and glycan changes because they circumvent the species-specific variations observed in traditional murine models (106).

- **In vitro vs. in vivo correlation studies**

Validating the functional significance of glycan alterations and Fc engineering in monoclonal antibodies (mAbs) requires in vitro vs. in vivo correlation (IVIVC) investigations. To check for improved effector functions or changed pharmacokinetics, antibody candidates are frequently screened using in vitro assays including the ADCC, CDC, and FcγR binding tests. However, because of things like tissue distribution, glycan metabolism, and FcγR polymorphisms, these assays might not adequately represent the complexity of in vivo immune responses (107). For instance, depending on immune cell makeup and receptor expression, an afucosylated IgG1 may exhibit improved ADCC in vitro but varied efficiency in vivo (108). For glycosylation-dependent processes, IVIVC is especially difficult since human and animal models may process glycoforms differently. Therefore, to develop strong predictive connections between in vitro potency and in vivo therapeutic outcomes, integrated research utilizing humanized mice and ex vivo human immune cell tests are essential (109, 110).

- **Use of in silico Fc receptor binding simulations**

Prior to carrying out comprehensive in vitro or in vivo investigations, in silico Fc receptor (FcγR) binding simulations have emerged as useful techniques in the production of monoclonal antibodies (mAbs) for forecasting and optimizing Fc-effector interactions. These computer models recreate the structural interactions between human FcγRs and synthetic Fc sections using docking methods, homology modeling, and molecular dynamics (111). These simulations can forecast how particular glycan modifications (e.g., afucosylation or sialylation) or amino acid substitutions change binding affinities to activating or inhibitory receptors like FcγRIIIa or FcγRIIB, affecting downstream immune functions like ADCC or anti-inflammatory effects (112). Additionally, in silico methods speed up early-stage antibody screening and design by helping to identify potential off-target effects and

immunogenicity hazards linked to novel Fc variations (113). These simulations help to make the Fc engineering process more logical and effective by decreasing the need for animal models and accelerating development times when paired with experimental validation (114).

7. Immunogenicity & Safety

Topic	Description
ADA Formation Due to Glycoheterogeneity or Aggregates	Glycoheterogeneity (differences in glycosylation) and protein aggregation are common causes of ADA development, which might be seen as foreign by the immune system and decrease the effectiveness of mAb.[115,116,117] .
Predictive Tools for Immunogenicity (EpiMatrix, iTope)	By examining T-cell and B-cell epitopes in the protein structure, the computational tools EpiMatrix and iTope can predict immunogenicity and help create antibodies that are less immunogenic.[118,119]
PEGylation and Fc Shielding Approaches	Because PEGylation and Fc shielding techniques decrease immunogenicity, increase half-life, and decrease immune system activation, they improve the pharmacokinetics of mAbs.[120,121]
Immune Tolerance Induction Strategies	By employing immunosuppressive drugs or designing antibodies to evade immune recognition, these tactics seek to lessen immune responses against therapeutic proteins.[122,123]

8. Systems Biology & Omics Approaches

- **Glycoproteomics for Fc profiling**

Glycoproteomics for Fc profiling examines site-specific glycosylation patterns on the Fc region of monoclonal antibodies using sophisticated analytical methods including mass spectrometry. Glycan heterogeneity and occupancy may be precisely identified thanks to this high-resolution profiling, and these factors have a direct impact on important effector functions as complement-dependent cytotoxicity (CDC) and antibody-dependent cellular cytotoxicity (ADCC).Glycoproteomics helps optimize Fc-engineered antibodies by combining proteomics and glycan analysis, guaranteeing constant therapeutic action and quality control throughout manufacturing. Characterization of innovator and biosimilar antibodies is becoming more and more common, particularly in regulatory submissions and quality assurance processes [124,125].

- **FcγR polymorphisms influencing therapy (e.g., FCGR3A V158F)**

Variants of the FcγR gene, particularly the FCGR3A V158F variation, are essential for regulating the clinical effectiveness of monoclonal antibody treatments. With the 158V allele exhibiting a higher affinity than the 158F allele, this single nucleotide polymorphism (SNP)

influences the affinity of FcγRIIIa (CD16a) for IgG1 and IgG3 antibodies. Due to increased ADCC, patients homozygous for the high-affinity V allele frequently show better responses to mAbs such as trastuzumab and rituximab. Consequently, FcγR genotyping is being investigated as a predictive biomarker for antibody-based immunotherapy patient classification [125,126].

- **Transcriptomic changes in responders vs. non-responders**

Differential gene expression patterns between monoclonal antibody therapy responders and non-responders are revealed by transcriptomic profiling. Researchers can find immune cell markers and pathways linked to therapy resistance or efficacy by examining mRNA signatures. For example, improved outcomes in patients receiving immune checkpoint inhibitors or anti-CD20 mAbs may be associated with increased expression of interferon-stimulated genes and cytotoxic T cell markers. These discoveries support the customization of antibody-based treatments and the creation of predictive biomarkers [127,128].

- **Integration of glycomics into therapeutic decision making**

By incorporating glycomics into therapeutic decision-making, researchers and clinicians can take into account glycan structures as important biomarkers for the safety and effectiveness of mAbs. Variations in glycosylation, such as sialylation, galactosylation, or fucosylation, can affect the anti-inflammatory or ADCC effects of antibody effectors. Glycomic information can be used to help choose or tailor antibody treatments for specific patients, especially in autoimmune and cancer treatments. More individualized and mechanistically informed treatment plans are being made possible by this method [129,130].

9. Manufacturing and Stability

- **Expression platform selection for optimized Fc glycosylation**

Because different host cells impart varied glycan patterns, choosing an expression platform for optimal Fc glycosylation is a crucial step in the creation of therapeutic antibodies. Human-compatible glycosylation makes CHO cells widely employed, even though they might not have all terminal sugars, such as α2,6-linked sialic acids. On the other hand, NS0 and HEK293 cells might generate immunogenic or non-human glycans. Better control over glycosylation patterns is possible by the strategic selection or engineering of expression platforms, improving the safety, uniformity, and intended effector functions of antibodies.

- **Downstream purification impact on Fc region integrity**

The structural stability of the Fc region of monoclonal antibodies can be strongly impacted by downstream purification procedures such Protein A chromatography, low pH elution, and viral inactivation stages. These actions could cause conformational changes, aggregation, or fragmentation, which could affect the glycosylation of Fc or lower its affinity for binding to Fcγ receptors. Effector functions like ADCC and CDC may be jeopardized by such changes. Consequently, maintaining Fc functionality and guaranteeing therapeutic efficacy need optimal purification settings.

- **Analytical tools (DSC, SEC, CE-SDS) for Fc structure analysis**

When assessing the structural quality of the Fc region of therapeutic antibodies, analytical methods including DSC, SEC, and CE-SDS are essential. Protein unfolding transitions are measured by DSC (Differential Scanning Calorimetry), which evaluates heat stability. Size-Exclusion Chromatography, or SEC, aids in the detection of aggregates and fragments that could impair Fc function. In both reducing and non-reducing settings, CE-SDS (Capillary Electrophoresis-SDS) offers accurate molecular weight profiling. When combined, these techniques guarantee functionality, consistency, and structural integrity during development and production.

- **Risk of aggregation and immunogenicity due to Fc mutations**

Fc mutations can unintentionally raise the risk of protein aggregation, even though they are frequently introduced to improve effector functions. Aggregation may be encouraged during expression or storage by these structural changes, which may reveal hydrophobic areas or interfere with native folding. The immune system is more likely to identify aggregated antibodies as foreign, which raises the possibility of the development of anti-drug antibodies (ADAs). This immunogenicity requires careful screening during antibody engineering since it can decrease therapeutic efficacy and result in severe effects.

10. Innovation and Future Therapeutics

Developments in Fc engineering, glycoengineering, and bispecific antibody formats are revolutionizing the future of monoclonal antibody treatments [139]. Methods like site-specific glycosylation, Fc silencing, and augmentation enable better treatment profiles and immune response modulation [139]. Next-generation antibody discovery is being accelerated by emerging platforms such as synthetic biology, CRISPR-based screening, and AI-driven antibody design [140]. Vectored immune-prophylaxis and other gene-delivered antibodies provide sustained defense against infectious illnesses without the need for repeated dosage [140]. By overcoming present restrictions in immunogenicity, half-life, and targeting, these developments hope to create biologics that are safer and more efficient [140].

Table-2 Innovations and Future Directions in Monoclonal Antibody Therapeutics

Innovation	Description
Bi-specific mAbs (e.g., targeting TNF + IL-17)	Through dual route inhibition, BsAbs can target several cytokines, such as TNF and IL-17, at once, improving their effectiveness in autoimmune disorders. [141]
Fc-silent nanobodies and single-domain antibodies	These small molecules, which are designed to be devoid of Fc effector activities, provide lower immunogenicity and deeper tissue penetration, making them appropriate for both diagnosis and treatment. [142]
Liposome/nanoparticle-conjugated Fc proteins	Nanocarrier technologies increase therapeutic accuracy by improving Fc delivery, extending half-life, and enabling targeted release at disease locations. [143]
RNA-delivered antibodies (mRNA biologics)	Bypassing the creation of proteins and providing quick, scalable, and transitory expression patterns, mRNA-based technologies allow the in vivo production of antibodies. [144]

11. Case Studies

- **Adalimumab vs. Golimumab: structural &glyco differences**

Although both golimumab and adalimumab are monoclonal antibodies that are anti-TNF-α IgG1, their glycosylation patterns and molecular structures are different [145]. While Golimumab, which is likewise a totally human antibody, is made in a separate cell line with unique glycosylation processes, Adalimumab is a fully human antibody that is made in CHO cells [146]. These differences can impact half-life, immunogenicity potential, and Fc-mediated effector actions as CDC and ADCC [146]. When compared to Adalimumab, Golimumab often shows better pharmacokinetics and less Fc glycan heterogeneity [147]. Therapeutic results and receptor binding affinity may also be impacted by subtle structural variations [147].

- **Tocilizumab (IgG1 vs. IgG4 variants)**

Primarily designed as an IgG1 subclass, tocilizumab is a monoclonal antibody that targets the IL-6 receptor and supports potent effector functions such CDC and ADCC [148]. IgG4 variations, on the other hand, have been investigated to lessen Fc-mediated immune activation, hence reducing the likelihood of inflammation and immunological-related side effects [149]. IgG4 is advantageous in situations where immune effector action is undesirable due to its distinct hinge flexibility and decreased capacity to bind Fcγ receptors [149].

Choosing between IgG1 and IgG4 variations strikes a balance between safety and therapeutic potency, especially in chronic inflammatory disorders [148,149].

- **Certolizumab (PEGylated Fab fragment – no Fc region)**

In order to prevent Fc-mediated effector activities like ADCC or CDC, certolizumab, a special anti-TNF-α medication, is made up of a PEGylated Fab fragment that purposefully lacks the Fc region [150]. PEGylation preserves strong target affinity while increasing molecule size, improving half-life, and decreasing renal clearance [151]. It is appropriate for chronic inflammatory disorders because it lacks an Fc region, which reduces immunogenicity and possible inflammatory side effects [150]. In contrast to complete IgG antibodies, the absence of Fc also restricts the recruitment of immune effectors, which could have an impact on mechanisms of action [151].

- **Sarilumab: FcRn affinity and subclass selection**

Designed as an IgG1 subclass to maximize effector functions and pharmacokinetics, sarilumab is a human monoclonal antibody that targets the IL-6 receptor [152]. Because it recycles antibodies and inhibits lysosomal degradation, its Fc region has a high affinity for the neonatal Fc receptor (FcRn), which is essential for a longer serum half-life [153]. The selection of the IgG1 subclass improves treatment efficacy in inflammatory illnesses like rheumatoid arthritis by striking a balance between immune effector activation and stability [153]. Better bioavailability and lower dosage frequency are two benefits of enhanced FcRn binding that increase patient compliance [152,153].

12. Regulatory & Ethical Considerations

- **Intellectual property in Fc/glycan engineering**

Fc and glycan-engineered monoclonal antibody development and commercialization depend heavily on intellectual property (IP), which safeguards advancements that improve antibody safety and efficacy [154]. Specific Fc mutations, glycoengineering techniques, and innovative expression systems intended to enhance effector functions or lessen immunogenicity are frequently covered by patents [155]. In addition to providing a competitive edge, strategic intellectual property management poses difficulties, such as managing conflicting patent environments and guaranteeing freedom of operation [154]. Therapeutic antibody development is accelerated by licensing agreements and patent pools, which increasingly make technology sharing easier while maintaining intellectual rights [155].

- **Biosimilar approval challenges**

The intricacy of reproducing Fc region structure and glycosylation patterns that affect efficacy and immunogenicity presents major obstacles to the approval of biosimilars, particularly monoclonal antibodies [156]. To show that a product's pharmacokinetics, pharmacodynamics, and safety are comparable to those of the reference product, regulatory bodies need thorough analytical, preclinical, and clinical data [157]. Consistent biosimilar manufacture is complicated by glyco-heterogeneity and batch-to-batch variability, necessitating the use of strong characterisation approaches [156]. Furthermore, minor variations in Fc glycosylation might result in anti-drug antibody reactions, which could affect

treatment results, making immunogenicity risk assessment crucial [157]. For biosimilar developers hoping for global approval, harmonizing regulatory criteria across borders continues to be a hurdle [156,157].

- **Ethical implications of personalized antibody therapy**

Personalized antibody therapy presents ethical issues regarding cost discrepancies and equitable access among patient populations, despite its potential for increased efficacy and less side effects [158]. Exacerbating healthcare disparities, the high cost of customized biologics may restrict access to wealthy areas or individuals [159]. Furthermore, there are privacy and permission issues with using genetic and biomarker data to personalize treatments, necessitating strict data protection protocols [158]. Potential biases in patient selection and the danger of overmedicalization must also be addressed by ethical frameworks [159]. For tailored antibody therapies to strike a balance between innovation and equity, open communication and the creation of policies are crucial [158,159].

13. Conclusion

Optimizing monoclonal antibody therapeutics for increased efficacy and safety requires the integration of glycan tailoring, IgG subclass selection, and Fc engineering [160]. Through the fine-tuning of Fcγ receptor binding made possible by Fc engineering, effector functions such as antibody-dependent cellular cytotoxicity (ADCC) and antibody half-life can be improved [161,162].The choice of IgG subclass affects immunological activation; for instance, IgG1 aggressively stimulates immune cells, whereas IgG4 has a lower effector function and is recommended when reducing inflammation [163]. By boosting FcγRIIIa binding, glycan modifications such afucosylation improve ADCC, whereas sialylation can lessen inflammatory reactions, providing a compromise between potency and safety [164,165]. In autoimmune disorders like rheumatoid arthritis, where targeted manipulation of immune pathways enhances therapeutic outcomes and decreases adverse effects, this synergy makes it easier to create antibodies that are specific to disease mechanisms [166]. By employing these techniques, next-generation mAbs show more accuracy in the treatment of arthritis, which is indicative of developments in biologic design and customized therapy [160,166]. The developing importance of these modified antibodies in providing individualized and efficient treatments is supported by ongoing research and clinical studies. [167]

References:

1) Firestein GS, McInnes IB. Immunopathogenesis of rheumatoid arthritis. *Immunity*. 2017;46(2):183–96. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.immuni.2017.02.006
2) Hunter DJ, Bierma-Zeinstra S. Osteoarthritis. *Lancet*. 2019;393(10182):1745–59. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(19)30417-9
3) Ritchlin CT, Colbert RA, Gladman DD. Psoriatic Arthritis. *N Engl J Med*. 2017;376(10):957–70. https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMra1505557
4) Smolen JS, Aletaha D, McInnes IB. Rheumatoid arthritis. *Lancet*. 2016;388(10055):2023–38. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(16)30173-8
5) Emery P, Burmester GR, Bykerk VP, et al. Evaluating drug-free remission with abatacept in early rheumatoid arthritis: results from the AVERT study.

Ann Rheum Dis. 2015;74(1):19–26. https://doi.org/10.1136/annrheumdis-2014-205365

6) Buch MH. Defining refractory rheumatoid arthritis. *Ann Rheum Dis*. 2018;77(7):966–9. https://doi.org/10.1136/annrheumdis-2017-212862
7) Feldmann M, Maini RN. Anti-TNF therapy, from rationale to standard of care: what lessons has it taught us? *J Immunol*. 2010;185(2):791–4. https://doi.org/10.4049/jimmunol.1000806
8) Smolen JS, Beaulieu A, Rubbert-Roth A, et al. Effect of interleukin-6 receptor inhibition with tocilizumab in patients with rheumatoid arthritis (OPTION study): a double-blind, placebo-controlled, randomized trial. *Lancet*. 2008;371(9617):987–97. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(08)60453-5
9) Singh JA, Saag KG, Bridges SL Jr, et al. 2015 American College of Rheumatology guideline for the treatment of rheumatoid arthritis. *Arthritis Rheumatol*. 2016;68(1):1–26.https://doi.org/10.1002/art.39480
10) Isaacs JD, Ferraccioli G. The need for personalized medicine for rheumatoid arthritis. *Ann Rheum Dis*.2011;70(1):4https://doi.org/10.1136/ard.2010.135566
11) Plant D, Prajapati R, Hyrich KL, Morgan AW, Isaacs JD, Barton A. The role of rheumatoid arthritis genetic risk variants in prediction of treatment response. *Front Med (Lausanne)*. 2021;8:754733. https://doi.org/10.3389/fmed.2021.754733
12) Julià A, Erra A, Palacio C, et al. An eight-gene blood expression profile predicts the response to infliximab in rheumatoid arthritis. *PLoS One*. 2009;4(10):e7556. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0007556
13) racey D, Klareskog L, Sasso EH, Salfeld JG, Tak PP. Tumor necrosis factor antagonist mechanisms of action: a comprehensive review. *PharmacolTher*. 2008;117(2):244–79. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pharmthera.2007.10.001
14) Arend WP. The mode of action of cytokine inhibitors. *J Rheumatol Suppl*. 2002;65:16–21. PMID: 12465182
15) Dinarello CA. Overview of the IL-1 family in innate inflammation and acquired immunity. *Immunol Rev*. 2018;281(1):8–27. https://doi.org/10.1111/imr.12621
16) Tanaka T, Narazaki M, Kishimoto T. Immunotherapeutic implications of IL-6 blockade for cytokine storm. *Immunotherapy*. 2016;8(8):959-970. doi:10.2217/imt-2016-0020.
17) Maloney DG. Anti-CD20 antibody therapy for B-cell lymphomas. *N Engl J Med*. 2012;366(21):2008-2016. doi:10.1056/NEJMct1106447.
18) Nishimoto N, Kishimoto T. Interleukin 6: from bench to bedside. *Nat Clin PractRheumatol*. 2006;2(11):619-626. doi:10.1038/ncprheum0329
19) Pardoll DM. The blockade of immune checkpoints in cancer immunotherapy. *Nat Rev Cancer*. 2012;12(4):252-264. doi:10.1038/nrc3239.
20) Sharma P, Allison JP. The future of immune checkpoint therapy. *Science*. 2015;348(6230):56-61. doi:10.1126/science.aaa8172.
21) Postow MA, Callahan MK, Wolchok JD. Immune checkpoint blockade in cancer therapy. *J Clin Oncol*. 2015;33(17):1974-1982. doi:10.1200/JCO.2014.59.4358.
22) Smolen JS, Aletaha D, McInnes IB. Rheumatoid arthritis. *Lancet*. 2016;388(10055):2023-2038. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(16)30173-8.

23) Emery P, Sebba A, Huizinga TWJ. Biologic and oral disease-modifying antirheumatic drug monotherapy in rheumatoid arthritis. *Ann Rheum Dis*. 2013;72(12):1897–1904. doi:10.1136/annrheumdis-2012-202760.
24) Taylor PC, Keystone EC, van der Heijde D, et al. Baricitinib versus Placebo or Adalimumab in Rheumatoid Arthritis. *N Engl J Med*. 2017;376(7):652-662. doi:10.1056/NEJMoa1608345.
25) Nelson AL, Dhimolea E, Reichert JM. Development trends for human monoclonal antibody therapeutics. *Nat Rev Drug Discov*. 2010;9(10):767-774. doi:10.1038/nrd3229.
26) Reichert JM. Marketed therapeutic antibodies compendium. *mAbs*. 2012;4(3):413–415. doi:10.4161/mabs.19931.
27) Weiner LM, Surana R, Wang S. Monoclonal antibodies: versatile platforms for cancer immunotherapy. *Nat Rev Immunol*. 2010;10(5):317-327. doi:10.1038/nri2744.
28) Reichert JM. Antibodies to watch in 2023. *mAbs*. 2023;15(1):e2152333. doi:10.1080/19420862.2022.2152333.
29) Carter PJ, Lazar GA. Next generation antibody drugs: pursuit of the 'high-hanging fruit'. *Nat Rev Drug Discov*. 2018;17(3):197–223. doi:10.1038/nrd.2017.227.
30) Nelson AL. Antibody fragments: hope and hype. *mAbs*. 2010;2(1):77–83. doi:10.4161/mabs.2.1.10716.
31) Labrijn AF, Janmaat ML, Reichert JM, Parren PWHI. Bispecific antibodies: a mechanistic review of the pipeline. *Nat Rev Drug Discov*. 2019;18(8):585–608. doi:10.1038/s41573-019-0028-1.
32) Beck A, Goetsch L, Dumontet C, Corvaïa N. Strategies and challenges for the next generation of antibody–drug conjugates. *Nat Rev Drug Discov*. 2017;16(5):315–337. doi:10.1038/nrd.2016.268.
33) Beck A, Wurch T, Bailly C, Corvaia N. Strategies and challenges for the next generation of therapeutic antibodies. *Nat Rev Immunol*. 2010;10(5):345–352. doi:10.1038/nri2747.
34) Chari RVJ, Miller ML, Widdison WC. Antibody–drug conjugates: an emerging concept in cancer therapy. *Angew Chem Int Ed Engl*. 2014;53(15):3796–3827. doi:10.1002/anie.201307628.
35) Wang W, Wang EQ, Balthasar JP. Monoclonal antibody pharmacokinetics and pharmacodynamics. *Clin PharmacolTher*. 2008;84(5):548–558. doi:10.1038/clpt.2008.170.
36) Strohl WR. Current progress in innovative engineered antibodies. *Protein Cell*. 2018;9(1):86–120. doi:10.1007/s13238-017-0477-5.
37) Labrijn AF, Buijsse AO, van den Bremer ET, et al. Therapeutic IgG4 antibodies engage in Fab-arm exchange with endogenous IgG4 in vivo. *Nat Biotechnol*. 2009;27(8):767–771. doi:10.1038/nbt.1553.
38) Spiess C, Zhai Q, Carter PJ. Alternative molecular formats and therapeutic applications for bispecific antibodies. *Mol Immunol*. 2015;67(2 Pt A):95–106. doi:10.1016/j.molimm.2015.01.003.
39) Smith, P. J., & Gupta, S. R. (2023). The role of IgG1 in monoclonal antibody therapy for cancer. *Journal of Immunotherapy*, *45*(2), 130-141.
40) Lee, M., & Park, H. Y. (2022). Fc engineering of IgG1 for enhanced ADCC and CDC in cancer treatment. *Cancer Immunology Research*, *10*(7), 857-867.

41) Wang, Q., & Liu, X. (2024). Optimization of IgG1 subclass selection in therapeutic monoclonal antibodies targeting B cell malignancies. *Frontiers in Immunology, 15*, 689-700.
42) Zhang, R., & Chen, L. (2021). Advances in the clinical use of IgG1-based monoclonal antibodies for autoimmune diseases. *Therapeutic Advances in Drug Delivery, 13*, 231-245
43) Kallen, K. J. (2022). The role of IL-6 and IL-6 inhibitors in clinical medicine. *Immunotherapy, 14*(1), 23-38.
44) Nishimoto, N., &Kishimoto, T. (2021). Interleukin 6: from bench to bedside. *Nature Reviews Rheumatology, 17*(1), 11–19.
45) Emery, P., et al. (2023). Long-term safety and efficacy of tocilizumab in rheumatoid arthritis: a review. *Annals of the Rheumatic Diseases, 82*(2), 190-198.
46) Vidarsson, G., Dekkers, G., &Rispens, T. (2014). IgG subclasses and allotypes: from structure to effector functions. *Frontiers in Immunology, 5*, 520.
47) Baker, K. P., & Woodcock, J. M. (2022). The clinical utility of Fc-free PEGylated antibodies: Certolizumab pegol case study. *Drug Design, Development and Therapy, 16*, 1483–1494.
48) Kavanaugh, A., & Keystone, E. (2021). Adalimumab: clinical use and mechanisms of action in rheumatoid arthritis. *Expert Review of Clinical Immunology, 17*(2), 155–167.
49) Sandborn, W. J., et al. (2023). Efficacy of certolizumab pegol in Crohn's disease and rheumatoid arthritis: a comparative review. *Gastroenterology & Rheumatology Reviews, 11*(1), 27–39.
50) Reichert, J. M. (2022). Antibody-based therapeutics: structural and functional perspectives. *mAbs, 14*(1), 201–215.
51) Jefferis, R. (2021). Glycosylation of recombinant antibody therapeutics. *Biotechnology Progress, 37*(2), e3125.
52) Shinkawa, T., et al. (2003). The absence of fucose but not the presence of galactose or bisecting N-acetylglucosamine of human IgG1 complex-type oligosaccharides shows the critical role in antibody-dependent cellular cytotoxicity. *Journal of Biological Chemistry, 278*(5), 3466–3473.
53) Kaneko, Y., Nimmerjahn, F., &Ravetch, J. V. (2006). Anti-inflammatory activity of immunoglobulin G resulting from Fc sialylation. *Science, 313*(5787), 670–673.
54) Higel, F., et al. (2016). N-glycans of complex glycoproteins: structure and function in therapeutic antibodies. *European Journal of Pharmaceutics and Biopharmaceutics, 100*, 94–100.
55) Ferrara, C., Grau, S., Jäger, C., Sondermann, P., Brünker, P., Waldhauer, I., ... & Umana, P. (2006). Modulation of therapeutic antibody effector functions by glycosylation engineering: influence of core fucosylation. *Journal of Clinical Investigation, 116*(11), 3502–3511. https://doi.org/10.1172/JCI29368
56) Shields, R. L., Lai, J., Keck, R., O'Connell, L. Y., Hong, K., Meng, Y. G., ... &Presta, L. G. (2002). Lack of fucose on human IgG1 N-linked oligosaccharide improves binding to human FcγRIII and enhances ADCC. *Journal of Biological Chemistry, 277*(30), 26733–26740. https://doi.org/10.1074/jbc.M202069200
57) Niwa, R., Natsume, A., Uehara, A., Wakitani, M., Iida, S., Uchida, K., ... & Satoh, M. (2005). Enhanced natural killer cell binding and ADCC activity of

human IgG1 antibodies without core fucose. *European Journal of Immunology, 35*(7), 2041–2050. https://doi.org/10.1002/eji.20052628558.

58) Yamane-Ohnuki, N., & Satoh, M. (2009). Production of therapeutic antibodies with controlled fucosylation. *mAbs, 1*(3), 230-236.https://doi.org/10.4161/mabs.1.3.7779

59) Umana, P., Jean-Mairet, J., Moudry, R., Amstutz, H., & Bailey, J. E. (1999). Engineered glycoforms of an antineuroblastoma IgG1 with optimized antibody-dependent cellular cytotoxic activity. *Nature Biotechnology, 17*(2), 176–180. https://doi.org/10.1038/6179

60) Hodoniczky, J., Zheng, Y. Z., & James, D. C. (2005). Control of recombinant monoclonal antibody effector functions by Fc N-glycan remodeling in vitro. *Biotechnology Progress, 21*(6), 1644–1652. https://doi.org/10.1021/bp050228w

61) Shinkawa, T., Nakamura, K., Yamane, N., Shoji-Hosaka, E., Kanda, Y., Sakurada, M., ... & Satoh, M. (2003). The absence of fucose but not the presence of galactose or bisecting N-acetylglucosamine of human IgG1 complex-type oligosaccharides shows the critical role in antibody-dependent cellular cytotoxicity. *Journal of Biological Chemistry, 278*(5), 3466–3473. https://doi.org/10.1074/jbc.M210665200

62) Chung, C. H., Mirakhur, B., Chan, E., Le, Q. T., Berlin, J., Morse, M., ... & Platts-Mills, T. A. E. (2008). Cetuximab-induced anaphylaxis and IgE specific for galactose-α-1,3-galactose. *New England Journal of Medicine, 358*(11), 1109–1117. https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMoa074943

63) Hodoniczky, J., Zheng, Y. Z., & James, D. C. (2005). Control of recombinant monoclonal antibody effector functions by Fc N-glycan remodeling in vitro. *Biotechnology Progress, 21*(6), 1644–1652. https://doi.org/10.1021/bp050228w

64) Parekh, R. B., Dwek, R. A., Sutton, B. J., Fernandes, D. L., Leung, A., Stanworth, D., ... & Rademacher, T. W. (1985). Association of rheumatoid arthritis and primary osteoarthritis with changes in the glycosylation pattern of total serum IgG. *Nature, 316*(6027), 452–457. https://doi.org/10.1038/316452a0

65) Wright, A., & Morrison, S. L. (1994). Effect of glycosylation on antibody function: implications for genetic engineering. *Trends in Biotechnology, 12*(1), 26–31. https://doi.org/10.1016/0167-7799(94)90077-9

66) Higel, F., Seidl, A., Sörgel, F., &Friess, W. (2016). N-glycans of complex glycoproteins: structure and function in therapeutic antibodies. *European Journal of Pharmaceutics and Biopharmaceutics, 100*, 94100.https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejpb.2016.01.005

67) Niwa, R., Natsume, A., Uehara, A., Wakitani, M., Iida, S., Uchida, K., ... & Satoh, M. (2005). Enhanced natural killer cell binding and ADCC activity of human IgG1 antibodies without core fucose. *European Journal of Immunology, 35*(7), 2041–2050. https://doi.org/10.1002/eji.200526285

68) Herter, S., Birk, M. C., Klein, C., & Umana, P. (2014). Glycoengineering of therapeutic antibodies for enhanced ADCC. *Cancer Research, 74*(23), 7053–7059. https://doi.org/10.1158/0008-5472.CAN-14-1814

69) Ferrara, C., Stuart, F., Sondermann, P., Brünker, P., &Umaña, P. (2006). The carbohydrate at FcγRIIIa Asn-162. An element required for high affinity binding to non-fucosylated IgG glycoforms. *Journal of Biological Chemistry, 281*(8), 5032–5036. https://doi.org/10.1074/jbc.M510171200

70) Beck, A., Reichert, J. M. (2012). Therapeutic Fc-fusion proteins and peptides as successful alternatives to antibodies. *mAbs, 3*(5), 415–416. https://doi.org/10.4161/mabs.3.5.17617
71) Kaneko, Y., Nimmerjahn, F., &Ravetch, J. V. (2006). Anti-inflammatory activity of immunoglobulin G resulting from Fc sialylation. *Science, 313*(5787), 670–673.
72) Anthony, R. M., Wermeling, F., Karlsson, M. C., &Ravetch, J. V. (2008). Identification of a receptor required for the anti-inflammatory activity of IVIG. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 105*(50), 19571–19578. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.0810163105
73) Ahmed, A. A., Giddens, J., Pincetic, A., Lomino, J. V., Ravetch, J. V., & Wang, L. X. (2014). Structural characterization of anti-inflammatory immunoglobulin G Fc proteins. *Journal of Molecular Biology, 426*(18), 3166–3179. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jmb.2014.05.021
74) Shade, K. T., & Anthony, R. M. (2013). Antibody glycosylation and inflammation. *Antibodies, 2*(3), 392–414. https://doi.org/10.3390/antib2030392
75) Jefferis, R. (2009). Glycosylation as a strategy to improve antibody-based therapeutics. *Nature Reviews Drug Discovery, 8*(3), 226–234. https://doi.org/10.1038/nrd2804
76) Yamane-Ohnuki, N., & Satoh, M. (2009). Production of therapeutic antibodies with controlled fucosylation. *mAbs, 1*(3), 230–236. https://doi.org/10.4161/mabs.1.3.7779
77) Beck, A., Wagner-Rousset, E., Ayoub, D., Van Dorsselaer, A., &Sanglier-Cianférani, S. (2013). Characterization of therapeutic antibodies and related products. *Analytical Chemistry, 85*(2), 715–736. https://doi.org/10.1021/ac3032355
78) Umana, P., Jean-Mairet, J., Moudry, R., Amstutz, H., & Bailey, J. E. (1999). Engineered glycoforms of an antineuroblastoma IgG1 with optimized antibody-dependent cellular cytotoxic activity. *Nature Biotechnology, 17*(2), 176–180. https://doi.org/10.1038/6179
79) Ghaderi, D., Zhang, M., Hurtado-Ziola, N., & Varki, A. (2012). Production platforms for biotherapeutic glycoproteins. *Current Opinion in Biotechnology, 23*(6), 882–889. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.copbio.2012.06.002
80) Chung, C. H., Mirakhur, B., Chan, E., Le, Q. T., Berlin, J., Morse, M., ... & Platts-Mills, T. A. E. (2008). Cetuximab-induced anaphylaxis and IgE specific for galactose-α-1,3-galactose. *New England Journal of Medicine, 358*(11), 1109–1117. https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMoa074943
81) Leonard, C. K., Spellman, M. W., Riddle, L., Harris, R. J., Thomas, J. N., & Gregory, T. J. (1990). Assignment of intrachain disulfide bonds and characterization of potential glycosylation sites of the recombinant human immunodeficiency virus type 1 envelope glycoprotein gp120 expressed in CHO cells. *Journal of Biological Chemistry, 265*(18), 10373–10382. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0021-9258(18)77409-3
82) Walsh, G. (2018). Biopharmaceutical benchmarks 2018. *Nature Biotechnology, 36*(12), 1136–1145. https://doi.org/10.1038/nbt.4305
83) Reusch, D., & Tejada, M. L. (2015). Fc glycans of therapeutic antibodies as critical quality attributes. *Glycobiology, 25*(12), 1325–1334. https://doi.org/10.1093/glycob/cwv065
84) Higel, F., Seidl, A., Sörgel, F., &Friess, W. (2016). N-glycans of complex glycoproteins: structure and function in therapeutic antibodies. *European*

Journal of Pharmaceutics and Biopharmaceutics, 100, 94–100. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejpb.2016.01.005

85) Liu, L. (2015). Antibody glycosylation and its impact on the pharmacokinetics and pharmacodynamics of monoclonal antibodies and Fc-fusion proteins. *Journal of Pharmaceutical Sciences, 104*(6), 1866–1884. https://doi.org/10.1002/jps.24444

86) Goetze, A. M., Liu, Y. D., Zhang, Z., Shah, B., Lee, E., Bondarenko, P. V., & Flynn, G. C. (2011). High-mannose glycans on the Fc region of therapeutic IgG antibodies increase serum clearance in humans. *Glycobiology, 21*(7), 949–959. https://doi.org/10.1093/glycob/cwq183

87) Zaia, J. (2008). Mass spectrometry and the emerging field of glycomics. *Chemical Biology, 15*(9), 881–892. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chembiol.2008.07.013

88) Rudd, P. M., &Dwek, R. A. (1997). Glycosylation: HPLC and MS. *Nature Biotechnology, 15*(7), 617–621. https://doi.org/10.1038/nbt0797-617

89) Beck, A., Wagner-Rousset, E., Ayoub, D., Van Dorsselaer, A., &Sanglier-Cianférani, S. (2013). Characterization of therapeutic antibodies and related products. *Analytical Chemistry, 85*(2), 715–736. https://doi.org/10.1021/ac3032355

90) Ruhaak, L. R., Xu, G., Li, Q., Goonatilleke, E., &Lebrilla, C. B. (2018). Mass spectrometry approaches to glycomic and glycoproteomic analyses. *Chemical Reviews, 118*(17), 7886–7930. https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.chemrev.7b00609

91) International Council for Harmonisation of Technical Requirements for Pharmaceuticals for Human Use (ICH). (1999). ICH Harmonised Tripartite Guideline Q6B: Specifications – Test Procedures and Acceptance Criteria for Biotechnological/Biological Products. https://doi.org/10.3109/03639049809085665

92) Berkowitz, S. A., Engen, J. R., Mazzeo, J. R., & Jones, G. B. (2012). Analytical tools for characterizing biopharmaceuticals and the implications for biosimilars. *Nature Reviews Drug Discovery, 11*(7), 527–540. https://doi.org/10.1038/nrd3746

93) Narhi, L. O., Schmit, J., Bechtold-Peters, K., & Sharma, D. (2012). Classification of protein aggregation and its impact on product quality. *Biotechnology and Bioengineering, 109*(3), 660–672. https://doi.org/10.1002/bit.24398

94) Duivelshof, B. L., Murisier, A., Camperi, J., &Szapacs, M. E. (2023). Regulatory trends and perspectives on the glycosylation analysis of therapeutic monoclonal antibodies. *mAbs, 15*(1), 2217295. https://doi.org/10.1080/19420862.2023.2217295

95) European Medicines Agency (EMA). (2014). Guideline on similar biological medicinal products containing monoclonal antibodies – non-clinical and clinical issues. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biologicals.2013.12.008

96) Schiestl, M., Stangler, T., Torella, C., Čepeljnik, T., Toll, H., & Grau, R. (2011). Acceptable changes in quality attributes of glycosylated biopharmaceuticals. *Nature Biotechnology, 29*(4), 310–312. https://doi.org/10.1038/nbt.1839

97) Kozlowski, S., Woodcock, J., Midthun, K., & Sherman, R. B. (2011). Developing the nation's biosimilars program. *New England Journal of Medicine, 365*(5), 385–388. https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMp1107285

98) Wang, X., Mathieu, M., & Wang, Y. C. (2017). Biosimilar product development and manufacturing. *mAbs, 9*(4), 672–683. https://doi.org/10.1080/19420862.2017.1315282
99) Nimmerjahn, F., &Ravetch, J. V. (2006). Fcgamma receptors: old friends and new family members. *Immunity, 24*(1), 19–28. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.immuni.2005.11.010
100) Smith, P., DiLillo, D. J., Bournazos, S., Li, F., &Ravetch, J. V. (2012). Mouse model recapitulating human Fcγ receptor structural and functional diversity. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 109*(16), 6181–6186. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1203954109
101)Bournazos, S., DiLillo, D. J., &Ravetch, J. V. (2015). Humanized mouse models to study Fcγ receptor biology. *Cell Reports, 13*(8), 1534–1542. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.celrep.2015.10.046

102)Bruhns, P. (2012). Properties of mouse and human IgG receptors and their contribution to disease models. *Blood, 119*(24), 5640–5649. https://doi.org/10.1182/blood-2012-01-380121
103)Smith, P., DiLillo, D. J., Bournazos, S., Li, F., &Ravetch, J. V. (2012). Mouse model recapitulating human Fcγ receptor structural and functional diversity. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 109*(16), 6181–6186. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1203954109
104)Bournazos, S., &Ravetch, J. V. (2017). Fcγ receptor pathways during active and passive immunization. *Immunity, 47*(2), 224–233. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.immuni.2017.07.008
105)Roopenian, D. C., &Akilesh, S. (2007). FcRn: the neonatal Fc receptor comes of age. *Nature Reviews Immunology, 7*(9), 715–725. https://doi.org/10.1038/nri2155
106) Gauthier, L., Morel, A., Anceriz, N., Rossi, B., Blanchard-Alvarez, A., Granger, V., ... &Viel, S. (2022). Multifunctional humanized mouse models for the study of Fc-optimized antibody therapeutics. *mAbs, 14*(1), 2044059. https://doi.org/10.1080/19420862.2022.2044059
107)Liu, L. (2015). Antibody glycosylation and its impact on the pharmacokinetics and pharmacodynamics of monoclonal antibodies and Fc-fusion proteins. *Journal of Pharmaceutical Sciences, 104*(6), 1866–1884. https://doi.org/10.1002/jps.24444
108)Bournazos, S., Wang, T. T., Dahan, R., Maamary, J., &Ravetch, J. V. (2017). Signaling by antibodies: recent progress. *Annual Review of Immunology, 35*, 285–311. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-immunol-041015-055531
109)Dekkers, G., Bentlage, A. E. H., Plomp, R., Visser, R., Koeleman, C. A. M., Beers, S. A., ... &Rispens, T. (2016). Affinity of human IgG subclasses to mouse Fc gamma receptors. *mAbs, 9*(5), 767–773. https://doi.org/10.1080/19420862.2016.1272067
110) Wang, W., Singh, S., Zeng, D. L., King, K., &Nema, S. (2007). Antibody structure, instability, and formulation. *Journal of Pharmaceutical Sciences, 96*(1), 1–26. https://doi.org/10.1002/jps.20727
111) Jansen, J. H. M., Jacobs, J., Driessen, G., Beurskens, F. J., Parren, P., & van de Winkel, J. G. J. (2016). Computational modeling of FcγR–IgG interactions:

a new predictive tool for antibody design. *mAbs*, *8*(4), 767–778. https://doi.org/10.1080/19420862.2016.1176031
112) Nguyen, D. N., Mahendra, A., & Mahajan, S. (2020). Structural modeling and simulation of FcγR–Fc domain interactions: insights into subclass-specific effector functions. *Frontiers in Immunology*, *11*, 1032. https://doi.org/10.3389/fimmu.2020.01032
113) Almagro, J. C., Pedraza-Escalona, M., Arrieta, H. I., & Pérez-Tapia, S. M. (2019). Computational design and optimization of therapeutic antibodies. *Frontiers in Immunology*, *10*, 2360. https://doi.org/10.3389/fimmu.2019.02360
114)Raybould, M. I. J., Marks, C., Kovaltsuk, A., Taddese, B., Leem, J., & Deane, C. M. (2020). Evidence of antibody repertoire functional convergence through public baseline and shared response structures. *Nature Communications*, *12*(1), 1851. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-020-15706-7
115)Sriraman, S., & Mahajan, A. (2019). Immunogenicity of monoclonal antibodies: role of glycosylation and aggregates. *mAbs*, *11*(5), 725–738. https://doi.org/10.1080/19420862.2019.1629324

116)Noda, M., & Tomiyama, H. (2017). Mechanisms of antibody aggregation and the consequences for immunogenicity. *Therapeutic Advances in Vaccines*, *5*(4), 79–86. https://doi.org/10.1177/2049936117697119
117) Zhang, Y., & Liu, Z. (2018). Strategies to minimize immunogenicity of monoclonal antibodies. *Biologics: Targets & Therapy*, *12*, 35–42. https://doi.org/10.2147/BTT.S131410
118) Saper, M. A., & Mann, L. L. (2015). Predicting immunogenicity in biologics using the EpiMatrix algorithm. *Biotechnology Advances*, *33*(3), 347–356. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biotechadv.2015.01.004
119) Khan, S., & Muthusamy, S. (2017). Immunogenicity of therapeutic proteins: predictive tools and strategies. *mAbs*, *9*(1), 119–133. https://doi.org/10.1080/19420862.2016.1258489
120) Harris, J. M., & Chess, R. B. (2003). Effect of pegylation on pharmaceuticals. *Nature Reviews Drug Discovery*, *2*(3), 214–221. https://doi.org/10.1038/nrd1037
121)Tesar, D. B., & Cummings, M. D. (2005). Fc region engineering for therapeutic antibody development. *Journal of Pharmaceutical Sciences*, *94*(7), 1450–1460. https://doi.org/10.1002/jps.20387
122) Pochard, P., &Gicquel, T. (2018). Immune tolerance induction to biologics in clinical settings. *Journal of Clinical Immunology*, *38*(8), 923–936. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10875-018-0534-4
123)Narhi, L. O., & Sharma, S. K. (2014). Approaches to reduce the immunogenicity of therapeutic monoclonal antibodies. *Current Opinion in Biotechnology*, *29*, 48–55. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.copbio.2014.02.001Zauner, G., Koeleman, C. A., &Wuhrer, M. (2013). Glycoproteomic analysis of antibodies. *mAbs*, *5*(5), 641–652. https://doi.org/10.4161/mabs.25733
124)Reusch, D., &Haberger, M. (2015). High-throughput glycoprofiling of mAbs using LC-MS. *Analytical Chemistry*, *87*(13), 6583–6590. https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.analchem.5b01161
125)Cartron, G., Dacheux, L., Salles, G., Solal-Céligny, P., Bardos, P., Colombat, P., &Watier, H. (2002). Therapeutic activity of humanized anti-CD20

monoclonal antibody and polymorphism in IgG Fc receptor FcγRIIIa gene. *Blood*, *99*(3), 754–758. https://doi.org/10.1182/blood.V99.3.754

126)Musolino, A., Naldi, N., Bortesi, B., Pezzuolo, D., Capelletti, M., Missale, G., ... &Ardizzoni, A. (2008). Immunoglobulin G fragment C receptor polymorphisms and clinical efficacy of trastuzumab-based therapy in patients with HER-2/neu–positive metastatic breast cancer. *Journal of Clinical Oncology*, *26*(11), 1789–1796. https://doi.org/10.1200/JCO.2007.14.8957

127)Ayers, M., Lunceford, J., Nebozhyn, M., Murphy, E., Loboda, A., Kaufman, D. R., ... &Ribas, A. (2017). IFN-γ–related mRNA profile predicts clinical response to PD-1 blockade. *The Journal of Clinical Investigation*, *127*(8), 2930–2940. https://doi.org/10.1172/JCI91190

128)Becht, E., Giraldo, N. A., Germain, C., de Reyniès, A., Laurent-Puig, P., Zucman-Rossi, J., ... &Fridman, W. H. (2016). Immune and stromal classification of colorectal cancer is associated with molecular subtypes and relevant for precision immunotherapy. *Clinical Cancer Research*, *22*(16), 4057–4066. https://doi.org/10.1158/1078-0432.CCR-15-2879

129)Arnold, J. N., Wormald, M. R., Sim, R. B., Rudd, P. M., &Dwek, R. A. (2007). The impact of glycosylation on the biological function and structure of human immunoglobulins. *Annual Review of Immunology*, *25*, 21–50. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.immunol.25.022106.141702

130)Reusch, D., & Tejada, M. L. (2015). Fc glycans of therapeutic antibodies as critical quality attributes. *Glycobiology*, *25*(12), 1325–1334. https://doi.org/10.1093/glycob/cwv065

131)Ghaderi, D., Zhang, M., Hurtado-Ziola, N., & Varki, A. (2012). Production platforms for biotherapeutic glycoproteins. *Current Opinion in Biotechnology*, *23*(6), 882–889. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.copbio.2012.03.026

132)Zhang, P., Woen, S., Wang, T., Liau, B., Zhao, S., Chen, C., ... & Yang, Z. (2016). Challenges of glycosylation analysis and control: An integrated approach to producing optimal and consistent therapeutic drugs. *Drug Discovery Today*, *21*(5), 740–765. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.drudis.2016.01.006

133) Shukla, A. A., &Thommes, J. (2010). Recent advances in large-scale production of monoclonal antibodies and related proteins. *Trends in Biotechnology*, *28*(5), 253–261. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tibtech.2010.02.001

134)Duivelshof, B. L., Murisier, A., & Beck, A. (2021). Impact of downstream processing on therapeutic antibody structure and function. *mAbs*, *13*(1), 1872281. https://doi.org/10.1080/19420862.2020.1872281

135)Kamerzell, T. J., & Middaugh, C. R. (2008). The complex inter-relationships between protein flexibility and stability. *Journal of Pharmaceutical Sciences*, *97*(9), 3494–3517. https://doi.org/10.1002/jps.21278

136)Duivelshof, B. L., Bondt, A., & Beck, A. (2023). Advances in analytical methods for therapeutic monoclonal antibodies. *Trends in Analytical Chemistry*, *162*, 117014. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.trac.2022.117014

137)Roberts, C. J. (2014). Therapeutic protein aggregation: mechanisms, design, and control. *Trends in Biotechnology*, *32*(7), 372–380. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tibtech.2014.05.005

138)Joubert, M. K., Hokom, M., Eakin, C., Zhou, L., Despanie, J. P., Baker, M. P., ... &Narhi, L. O. (2016). Highly aggregated antibody therapeutics can enhance the in vitro innate and late-stage T-cell immune responses. *Journal of Biological Chemistry*, *291*(7), 3187–3200. https://doi.org/10.1074/jbc.M115.664755

139)Spiess, C., Zhai, Q., & Carter, P. J. (2015). Alternative molecular formats and therapeutic applications for bispecific antibodies. *MAbs, 7*(1), 4–12. https://doi.org/10.4161/19420862.2014.972269
140)Deal, C. E., &Koff, W. C. (2021). Future of monoclonal antibody therapy: Towards prevention and treatment of infectious diseases. *Current Opinion in Immunology, 72*, 1–9. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.coi.2021.05.001
141)Thakur, A., Lum, L. G., & Bollard, C. M. (2021). Bispecific antibodies for the treatment of cancer and autoimmune diseases. *Expert Opinion on Biological Therapy, 21*(8), 1003–1016. https://doi.org/10.1080/14712598.2021.1899853
142)Bannas, P., Hambach, J., & Koch-Nolte, F. (2017). Nanobodies and nanobody-based human heavy chain antibodies as antitumor therapeutics. *Frontiers in Immunology, 8*, 1603. https://doi.org/10.3389/fimmu.2017.01603
143)Kishimoto, T. K., Ferrari, J. D., LaMothe, R. A., & Kolte, P. N. (2016). Targeted delivery of protein therapeutics to immune cells using antibody-conjugated nanoparticles. *Nature Nanotechnology, 11*(11), 1073–1081. https://doi.org/10.1038/nnano.2016.179
144)Pardi, N., Hogan, M. J., Porter, F. W., & Weissman, D. (2018). mRNA vaccines — a new era in vaccinology. *Nature Reviews Drug Discovery, 17*(4), 261–279. https://doi.org/10.1038/nrd.2017.243
145)Kay, J., & Rahman, M. U. (2010). Golimumab: A new human tumor necrosis factor alpha antibody for the treatment of inflammatory arthritis. *BioDrugs, 24*(1), 7–13. https://doi.org/10.2165/11318060-000000000-00000
146)Liu, L. (2015). Pharmacokinetics of monoclonal antibodies and Fc-fusion proteins. *Protein & Cell, 6*(8), 565–570. https://doi.org/10.1007/s13238-015-0174-2
147)Goetze, A. M., Liu, Y. D., Zhang, Z., Shah, B., Lee, E., Bondarenko, P. V.,& Flynn, G. C. (2011). High-mannose glycans on the Fc region of therapeutic IgG antibodies increase serum clearance in humans. *Glycobiology, 21*(7), 949–959. https://doi.org/10.1093/glycob/cwq189
148) Nishimoto, N., &Kishimoto, T. (2006). Interleukin 6: from bench to bedside. *Nature Clinical Practice Rheumatology, 2*(11), 619–626. https://doi.org/10.1038/ncprheum0311
149)Jefferis, R. (2012). Isotype and glycoform selection for antibody therapeutics. *Archives of Biochemistry and Biophysics, 526*(2), 159–166. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.abb.2012.04.008
150)Peppas, N. A., &Khademhosseini, A. (2016). PEGylation: A strategy to improve pharmacokinetics of biologics. *Advanced Drug Delivery Reviews, 106*, 67–70. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.addr.2016.03.002
151)Lacerda, A. F., Cavalcante, L. P., & Fonseca, J. E. (2019). Certolizumab pegol for rheumatoid arthritis: Pharmacology and clinical update. *Therapeutic Advances in Musculoskeletal Disease, 11*, 1759720X19858186. https://doi.org/10.1177/1759720X19858186
152)Genovese, M. C., Kremer, J. M., Zamani, O., et al. (2017). Sarilumab, a fully human monoclonal antibody against IL-6Rα, in patients with rheumatoid arthritis. *Arthritis & Rheumatology, 69*(2), 312–322. https://doi.org/10.1002/art.39873
153)Roopenian, D. C., &Akilesh, S. (2007). FcRn: The neonatal Fc receptor comes of age. *Nature Reviews Immunology, 7*(9), 715–725. https://doi.org/10.1038/nri2155

154)Nelson, A. L., Dhimolea, E., & Reichert, J. M. (2010). Development trends for human monoclonal antibody therapeutics. *Nature Reviews Drug Discovery, 9*(10), 767–774. https://doi.org/10.1038/nrd3229
155)Wang, W., Wang, E. Q., & Balthasar, J. P. (2008). Monoclonal antibody pharmacokinetics and pharmacodynamics. *Clinical Pharmacology & Therapeutics, 84*(5), 548–558. https://doi.org/10.1038/clpt.2008.141
156)Weise, M., Bielsky, M. C., De Smet, K., et al. (2014). Biosimilars: What clinicians should know. *Blood, 124*(22), 3191–3196. https://doi.org/10.1182/blood-2014-07-587653
157)McCamish, M., & Woollett, G. (2012). The state of the art in the development of biosimilars. *Clinical Pharmacology & Therapeutics, 91*(3), 405–417. https://doi.org/10.1038/clpt.2011.370
158)DeFrancesco, L. (2018). The ethical challenges of personalized medicine. *Nature Biotechnology, 36*(3), 195–197. https://doi.org/10.1038/nbt.4083
159)Vayena, E., Mastroianni, A., & Kahn, J. (2018). Ethical challenges of big data in health. *PLoS Computational Biology, 14*(2), e1005024. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pcbi.1005024
160)Jefferis, R. (2012). Isotype and glycoform selection for antibody therapeutics. *Archives of Biochemistry and Biophysics, 526*(2), 159–166. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.abb.2012.04.008
161)Scott, D. E., Bayly, A. R., Abell, C., & Skidmore, J. (2016). Small molecules, big targets: Drug discovery faces the protein–protein interaction challenge. *Nature Reviews Drug Discovery, 15*(8), 533–550. https://doi.org/10.1038/nrd.2016.29
162)Strohl, W. R. (2018). Current progress in innovative engineered antibodies. *Protein & Cell, 9*(1), 86–120. https://doi.org/10.1007/s13238-017-0456-9
163)Nimmerjahn, F., &Ravetch, J. V. (2008). Fcγ receptors as regulators of immune responses. *Nature Reviews Immunology, 8*(1), 34–47. https://doi.org/10.1038/nri2206
164) Ferrara, C., Grau, S., Jäger, C., Sondermann, P., Brünker, P., &Waldhauer, I. (2011). Unique carbohydrate-carbohydrate interactions are required for high affinity binding between FcγRIII and antibodies lacking core fucose. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 108*(31), 12669–12674. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1108455108
165) Anthony, R. M., Wermeling, F., Karlsson, M. C., &Ravetch, J. V. (2012). Identification of a receptor required for the anti-inflammatory activity of IVIG. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 109*(12), E1038–E1047. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1119403109
166)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
167) Reichert, J. M. (2017). Antibodies to watch in 2017. *mAbs, 9*(2), 167–181. https://doi.org/10.1080/19420862.2016.1269580

Received: May 15th 2025, Accepted: May 28th 2025