EEJOURNALS OPEN ACCESS

EURASIAN EXPERIMENT JOURNAL OF ENGINEERING

(EEJE) ISSN: 2992-409X

@EEJE PUBLICATIONS Volume 5 Issue 1 2025

Impact of Policy on Biomedical Innovation

Kansiime Agnes

Department of Clinical Medicine and Dentistry Kampala International University Uganda
agnes.kansiime.2974@studwc.kiu.ac.ug

ABSTRACT

Biomedical innovation, a key pillar of modern healthcare and economic development, thrives within a complex ecosystem shaped by national and international policy frameworks. This paper examines the dynamic interplay between public policy and biomedical innovation, analyzing how regulations, funding mechanisms, and intellectual property rights influence research, development, and equitable access to biomedical advances. It traces the historical evolution of biomedical policy, particularly in the United States, and presents key policy instruments that have fueled groundbreaking discoveries while navigating ethical, economic, and social dilemmas. Case studies highlight the impact of patents, data exclusivity, and biosimilar regulations on pharmaceutical innovation. The paper also considers global perspectives, addressing disparities in innovation capacity and policy harmonization. Finally, it discusses implementation challenges, emerging trends, and the need for adaptive policy frameworks that ensure innovation translates into accessible, safe, and sustainable health solutions. The findings emphasize that coherent, forward-looking policy is essential to balance innovation with public health, economic equity, and ethical considerations.

Keywords: Biomedical Innovation, Health Policy, Intellectual Property Rights, Research Funding, Regulatory Frameworks, Biotechnology, Global Health, Data Exclusivity.

INTRODUCTION

Biomedical innovation serves as a crucial driver of global economic development and overall growth. Nevertheless, the pursuit of encouraging innovation may also inevitably increase the potential for a variety of health and safety risks. The SARS-CoV-2 pandemic has not only highlighted but also crystallized and amplified risks that were already present within the complexities of COVID-19 movements and health-related discourse. The sector of biomedical innovation is a vital aspect of economic development, playing a key role in determining a country's future prosperity and capabilities. However, a nation's regulatory choices regarding highly uncertain and potentially harmful innovations can significantly enable (or conversely disable) future economic development and progress. When we examine national policies in detail, the United States provides a wealth of data collected over several years, along with both theoretical frameworks and practical insights, to aid in developing a coherent and effective approach to biomedical innovation. The origins of biomedical innovation policy can be traced back to the twentieth century, and public policy continues to play an influential role in shaping its future trajectory [1, 2].

Historical Overview of Biomedical Innovation

Biomedical innovation has greatly impacted society's management of human health, with policymakers viewing the sector as a crucial model of innovation. This field has driven significant funding and historical breakthroughs in healthcare, particularly influenced by U.S. policy support. The first wave of biomedical innovation during the 19th century saw advances in sanitation, microbiology, surgery, and pharmacology, primarily from European institutions, which later reached the U.S. with delays due to slow funding development. Although American health reform committees existed before 1900, they were ineffective

until the Spanish Influenza pandemic spurred action. The U.S. then undertook significant efforts to control infectious diseases, marking a pivotal shift by becoming the first nation to link health policy with research. The first Congressional funding for vaccine research occurred in 1916 due to a tuberculosis outbreak, signaling a turning point. Key innovations by the 1950s included organ transplantation, sterilization techniques, antibiotics, and cardiopulmonary bypass. These advancements contributed to what Heinrich von Stackelberg called the birth of science-based innovation systems, influencing not just medicine but also fields like energy and aerospace. Attention shifted towards treatment for various diseases, particularly cancer and arthritis [3, 4].

Key Policies Influencing Biomedical Innovation

Innovation in biomedical research is not just beneficial but absolutely essential for the overarching purpose of improving human health and enhancing overall well-being. Biomedical research, an indispensable and vital field, is primarily conducted within the confines of universities and various academic institutions dedicated to scientific inquiry. These centers of learning and discovery play an incredibly crucial role in advancing our comprehensive understanding of health and the complexities of disease. The numerous incentives, funding opportunities, and resources available to universities to encourage and facilitate ambitious research endeavors are governed by a multifaceted series of policy initiatives. These initiatives hold the potential to significantly impact the level of research activity and the degree of innovation that occurs within these influential academic environments, shaping the future of medical advancements and public health outcomes [5, 6].

Regulatory Frameworks

Regulatory frameworks play a crucial role in the advancement of products and techniques in high-risk domains like biomedical innovation, reflecting societal choices regarding technological boundaries. For example, an approval pathway for biosimilars reshapes the competitive dynamics in the biological medicines sector, as biosimilar development relies on innovators' data and may involve their patent rights. This regulatory pathway impacts innovation incentives and market competition. Monitoring the repercussions on innovation rates and consumer welfare is of significant interest. By October 206, the FDA had licensed four biosimilars, with 66 more products in various developmental stages linked to around 20 innovative biologics. Unlike drug regulations, the biological framework is dynamic, with rules evolving by product class alongside scientific advancements. China's legal framework showcases the balance between fostering innovation and managing risks, with limited explicit provisions promoting innovation despite constitutional encouragement. When safety incidents arise, penalties can be severe, highlighting the conflict between supporting technological growth and addressing biosafety concerns. The EU's regulatory approach seeks to balance technological exploration with the protection of fundamental rights and long-term societal conditions, which could inform policy adjustments in China. A "right to science" framework integrates interests of scientists and the public, providing criteria for assessing national systems' coherence and implementation [7, 8].

Funding Mechanisms

Biomedical innovation needs supportive institutions and mechanisms to translate promising ideas into new products. The transition from research to practical application is complex, intertwining science, markets, and open processes. When any step in this flow is blocked especially when institutions fail to cultivate viable opportunities the potential of new ideas is severely limited. Scientific breakthroughs often open new avenues for research, but turning these into marketable products demands investment and focused effort. At this juncture, predicting which path will succeed is challenging, and evidence may not exist until implementation occurs. The research community is tasked with generating results that validate potential developments. While scientific work offers criteria for feasibility, novelty, and market relevance, successful technology development requires additional backing to build a compelling case for investment. Applications provide the critical evidence needed to justify the worthiness of a technology. Once an idea shows promise, success hinges on adequate resources and human capital. Commercial partnerships help finance and scale technologies, facilitating reinvestment into further exploration. In uncertain development phases, venture capital and private equity often back willing entrepreneurs. However, ongoing government support is crucial for early-stage work that private institutions find hard to fund due to the unpredictable nature of such projects [9, 10].

Intellectual Property Rights

Intellectual Property Rights are central to the patent regulation system in the United States and significantly affect the creation and diffusion of knowledge in many major scientific and technological fields, including biotechnology. Under the intellectual property system, inventors are granted a temporary monopoly on the use of their discovery, initially for 17 years and, since 1995, for 20 years. This

period of exclusive use is intended to encourage creative endeavors and promote rapid dissemination of knowledge and technological expertise. Forces exist that encourage both the privatization of ideas and the public release of knowledge through patenting. The incentives presented in patent regulation for neither innovation nor diffusion of knowledge are completely consistent. Other factors determining the decision to patent include the size of an entity and the degree of publicness of the invention. The results of these competing forces in biotechnology are that the majority of scientific discoveries are patented by small, U.S.-based firms. The U.S. patenting of scientific discoveries deemed basic to biotechnology such as genetically engineered DNA, regulators, embryonic stem cells, cloning, Dolly-like sheep, and new strains of yeast and viruses raises questions about economic incentives versus the free exchange of ideas and research. Patenting financial services and products could facilitate control and create account access monopolies, enable purveyors of services like credit cards and insurance to price discriminate, and induce negative behaviors such as denying credit to certain minorities or removing or excluding certain regions from coverage. Such scenarios raise concerns about the impact of these practices on regions heavily affected by the HIV/AIDS pandemic [11, 12].

Case Studies of Policy Impact

The Pharmaceuticals Industry and the Avenue of Research through the US Regulatory System Patents and policies that act as incentives to innovation particularly data exclusivity provisions are subject to criticism and debate, especially with respect to the research-based pharmaceutical industry. Data exclusivity is a form of intellectual property protection whereby drug makers who have undergone the FDA's extensive clinical testing and market approval processes can prevent other firms from relying on that proprietary test data for a defined period, even after the firm's patents have expired. Patents on pharmaceuticals generally provide protection for only 17 years from the date of issuance, although the protection is often less because it may have taken years to obtain FDA approval. The protection may be extended for up to 5 years beyond the typical 20 year term of a patent, through a separate regulatory mechanism. Patents encourage pharmaceutical research by preventing the firm that discovered the drug compound from facing competition from any other firm for a period of time. Data exclusivity is not dependent on patent law and can be provided for pharmaceuticals even in countries where patents are not granted. Also, patent protection does not shield FDA-approved medicinal products that contain completely new chemical substances. In principle, a patented product is protected from direct generic competition; however, a generic product can be introduced if it is found to be chemically different but therapeutically equivalent to the patented product. There is evidence that the practicing community is very sensitive to cost considerations and, within limits of price, switches readily [13, 14].

International Perspectives on Policy and Innovation

Regional and international standards have constrained domestic intellectual property and trade legislation. Without international harmonization, trade authorities may act unilaterally, often counterproductively. Recent agreements emphasize transnational cooperation in intellectual property and trade, aiming to create a level playing field among countries. However, achieving complete uniformity in intellectual property laws faces obstacles due to diverse legal frameworks, which can confuse rights holders. The global consensus favors high protection standards, leading to varied options that meet minimum requirements while allowing domestic choices. When the international community adopts principles, it expects countries to legislate accordingly. Applying these principles is complex due to the specific nature of cases and intersecting legal frameworks on patents, trade secrets, and biological materials throughout the innovation life cycle, while also addressing international concerns regarding health, environment, and biodiversity. The Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPS) establishes important provisions on patentability, but creating an international standard for patents remains challenging. Patents cannot solely be granted for discovering natural substances, although the isolation of these substances is patentable. This leads to a significant drive to precisely characterize such substances; around one billion deposits exist in culture collections, yet many remain uncharacterized. The patentability of human genes raises ethical concerns, invoking debates about the ownership and implications of patents that resemble "sanctioned slavery." However, no patent can be issued on a living person. Rapid technological advancements continuously challenge the relevance of existing legislation; legislators often respond with specific changes to maintain the effectiveness and balance of the patent system amid swift developments in life sciences [15, 16].

Challenges in Policy Implementation

The translation of biomedical research into clinical application typically takes 15 to 25 years. Models supporting research include alliances between academia and industry, multidisciplinary approaches, and specialized centers, yet these have not significantly accelerated clinical implementation. To address

challenges arising from international law, scientific developments, and social issues, policymakers face the complex task of adapting patent principles to specific biomedical cases. A central question concerns whether isolating a substance from nature is patentable, as mere discovery is not; patents on human genes also raise ethical concerns related to morality and human dignity. Ensuring that intellectual property rights accord with fundamental human values becomes especially difficult as technical criteria for patent eligibility evolve faster than legislative reform. As of 2011, the benefits of pharmacogenetics have yet to be fully translated into clinical practice despite the identification of potential molecular biomarkers and a limited number of validated diagnostics eligible for combination with drugs. When supporting pharmaceutical innovation, the initial intended applications of new inventions often require adaptation to fit existing socio-economic environments constrained by technical, cultural, economic, ethical, and regulatory factors. In these environments, health organizations, national boundaries, institutions, regulations, communities of practitioners, and patient organizations influence the adoption of innovations [17, 18].

Emerging Trends in Biomedical Policy

Biomedical policy significantly affects individuals' access to the benefits of scientific discoveries. Understanding the challenges faced by researchers and developers is crucial for evaluating how policy facilitates or hinders progress. Innovations in polymer chemistry and material sciences have led to new heart valves, achieving five-year clinical success and CE Mark approval. As biomedical research advances, there's hope for breakthroughs in treating diseases like Alzheimer's, rheumatoid arthritis, and cancers. Technologies for gene interrogation including DNA, RNA analysis, and gene editing tools like CRISPR have substantially improved our understanding of genes, their functions, and mutation impacts. With biomedicine poised for rapid advancements, the development of sophisticated medical technologies has opened new opportunities. These effective tools allow investments in scientific advancements to enhance biological and health studies and diversify medical diagnosis and treatment options. However, advancing medical innovations isn't solely the domain of academic researchers. Commercial drug development demands integration of skills and significant financial investments over time. Timely patient access to discoveries challenges free market claims, particularly when it hinders progress. The rise of biotechnology firms in the 1980s bolstered drug development and allowed academia to partake in fundamental research, though progress was inconsistent. The setbacks experienced by major pharmaceutical companies limited options for translating discoveries into therapies. Therefore, industry and academic leaders are actively seeking ways to expedite progress through innovative support structures. A shift is evident in the focus on combating diseases, as the burden shared by single nations lessens due to advancements in various sectors, while new diseases emerge, highlighting the global community's collective interests in addressing health challenges. In the 21st century's second decade, the future of biomedical innovation relies on uniting diverse participants to enhance global health and wellbeing [19, 20].

Future Directions for Policy and Innovation

The acknowledgment of intellectual property rights is regarded as absolutely essential to the contemporary incentives that drive commercial innovation. This is particularly true within the rapidly evolving and immensely complex biological realm, which offers a myriad of intricate challenges and opportunities. Such recognition opens up a multitude of intriguing avenues to explore and develop novel frameworks that can effectively foster innovation in this dynamic sector. The coverage of these avenues, alongside a thorough examination of the policies necessary for sustainable innovation, remains surprisingly limited at this time. However, the emerging trends and developments we witness currently anticipate several promising directions in which meaningful and significant change must indeed unfold. Such changes are critical to better support innovative pursuits and to enhance the overall landscape of innovation within the market. As we look forward, the exploration of these intellectual property rights in relation to emerging technologies is more important than ever, ensuring that creativity and inventiveness continue to thrive amidst ongoing transformation [21, 22].

Ethical Considerations in Biomedical Policy

Extensive experimentation with genetic materials has engendered a broad scholarly concern for literacy about clinical and public health facets of emerging "gene-based technologies." The ethical proclivities of clinicians and scientists in the Shanghai area were analysed to explore the development of a culturally relevant scale for biomedical innovation. A survey of 117 experts in clinical and basic biomedical research revealed that Chinese experts produced a nine-factor structure of ethical concern relating to biomedical advances: safety; respect for persons, animals, and the environment; equitable distribution of benefits; confidentiality; social justice; primacy of human subjects; social pressure to adopt technologies; and

openness. This array of factors is consistent with the considerations guiding Western bioethics, but the absence of "informed consent" and the presence of "social pressure to adopt technologies" mark a departure from Western canonical frameworks. Cultural emphasis on family consent versus individual consent was underscored, consistent with the EU Regulation 536/2014 recognizing involvement of family members or legal representatives when the subject cannot provide informed consent. China's ethical position reflects widespread adoption of Western bioethical considerations but under a distinctive socio-political context [23, 24].

CONCLUSION

The impact of policy on biomedical innovation is profound, multifaceted, and pivotal to the trajectory of global health progress. From the earliest government interventions during health crises to today's intricate web of intellectual property laws, funding structures, and regulatory systems, policy decisions have continuously shaped the pace and direction of scientific advancement. While these policies have catalyzed remarkable breakthroughs, they also pose challenges regarding equitable access, ethical governance, and sustainable application. International cooperation, harmonized standards, and adaptive legislative frameworks are critical for addressing the complex realities of 21st-century biomedical research. Moving forward, policies must strike a deliberate balance between protecting innovation incentives and ensuring that the fruits of scientific discovery benefit all segments of society, especially in under-resourced regions. Ultimately, biomedical innovation can only fulfill its promise when guided by thoughtful, inclusive, and forward-thinking policy design.

REFERENCES

1. Han Y, Fan LL, Xue Y. A sustainable balance between innovation and risk: How the "right to science" affects China's medical biotechnology regulatory policy. Computational and Structural Biotechnology Journal. 2024 Dec 1;24:306-13.
2. Mireles MS. An examination of patents, licensing, research tools, and the tragedy of the anticommons in biotechnology innovation. U. Mich. JL Reform. 2004;38:141.
3. Rao GH. Biomedical research and healthcare: Opportunities, expectations, and limitations. International Journal of Biomedicine. 2018 Dec 1;8(4):273-9.
4. Kesselheim AS, Xu S, Avorn J. Clinicians' contributions to the development of coronary artery stents: a qualitative study of transformative device innovation. PLoS One. 2014 Feb 12;9(2):e88664.
5. Rezaie R, McGahan AM, Frew SE, Daar AS, Singer PA. Emergence of biopharmaceutical innovators in China, India, Brazil, and South Africa as global competitors and collaborators. Health Research Policy and Systems. 2012 Jun 6;10(1):18.
6. Li JF, Garnsey E. Policy-driven ecosystems for new vaccine development. Technovation. 2014 Dec 1;34(12):762-72.
7. Tettey F, Parupelli SK, Desai S. A review of biomedical devices: classification, regulatory guidelines, human factors, software as a medical device, and cybersecurity. Biomedical Materials & Devices. 2024 Mar;2(1):316-41.
8. Grimm H, Biller-Andorno N, Buch T, Dahlhoff M, Davies G, Cederroth CR, Maissen O, Lukas W, Passini E, Törnqvist E, Olsson IA. Advancing the 3Rs: innovation, implementation, ethics and society. Frontiers in Veterinary Science. 2023 Jun 15;10:1185706. frontiersin.org
9. Wild C, Sehic O, Schmidt L, Fabian D. Public contributions to R&D of medical innovations: A framework for analysis. Health Policy. 2025 Feb 1;152:105235.
10. Lo AW, Thakor RT. Financing biomedical innovation. Annual Review of Financial Economics. 2022 Nov 1;14(1):231-70.
11. Hodgson A, Maxon ME, Alper J. The US bioeconomy: charting a course for a resilient and competitive future. Industrial Biotechnology. 2022 Jun 1;18(3):115-36.
12. Daraojimba C, Abioye KM, Bakare AD, Mhlongo NZ, Onunka O, Daraojimba DO. Technology and innovation to growth of entrepreneurship and financial boost: a decade in review (2013-2023). International Journal of Management & Entrepreneurship Research. 2023;5(10):769-92. academia.edu
13. Chakrabarti G. Need of data exclusivity: Impact on access to medicine. Journal of Intellectual Property Rights (JIPR). 2023 May 4;19(5):325-36.
14. Mphil IA, Dehury RK, Behera MR. Access to Essential Medicines in India: The role of innovations, patents, and intellectual property rights. Asia Pacific Journal of Health Management. 2024 Dec 22;19(3).

15. Jiang H, Yu M. Understanding RCEP and CPTPP: from the perspective China's dual circulation economic strategy. China Economic Journal. 2021 May 4;14(2):144-61.
16. Taghizade S, Chattu VK, Jaafaripooyan E, Kevany S. COVID-19 pandemic as an excellent opportunity for Global Health Diplomacy. Frontiers in Public Health. 2021 Jul 12;9:655021. frontiersin.org
17. Zheng C, Li M, Ding J. Challenges and opportunities of nanomedicines in clinical translation. Bio Integration. 2021 Jul 1;2(2):57.
18. Austin CP. Opportunities and challenges in translational science. Clinical and Translational Science. 2021 Sep;14(5):1629-47.
19. Bibbins-Domingo K, Shields B, Ayanian JZ, Bonow RO, Bressler NM, Christakis D, Disis ML, Josephson SA, Kibbe MR, Öngür D, Piccirillo JF. Public access to scientific research findings and principles of biomedical research—a new policy for the JAMA Network. JAMA neurology. 2023 Feb 1;80(2):132-3. jamanetwork.com
20. Balas EA, De Leo G, Shaw KB. Strategic policy options to improve quality and productivity of biomedical research. Politics and the Life Sciences. 2025 Apr;44(1):108-19.
21. Mezzanotti F, Simcoe T. Innovation and appropriability: Revisiting the role of intellectual property. National Bureau of Economic Research; 2023 Jul 10.
22. Janis MD. A Tale of the Apocryphal Axe: Repair, Reconstruction, and the Implied License in Intellectual Property Law. Md. L. Rev.. 1999;58:423.
23. Casu G, de Padua Serafim A, Zaia V, Gremigni P. Measurement in Health Psychology. Frontiers in psychology. 2022 May 24;13:937700. frontiersin.org
24. Gomez R, Karimi L, Hein K, Papapetrou S, Stavropoulos V. Symptom Checklist-90-Revised: Factor structure and relevance as a measure for the Hierarchical Taxonomy of Psychopathology model. International Journal of Mental Health. 2024 May 4:1-24. tandfonline.com

CITE AS: Kansiime Agnes. (2025). Impact of Policy on Biomedical Innovation. EURASIAN EXPERIMENT JOURNAL OF ENGINEERING, 5(1):48-53.