JMEAI
Journal of the Iranian Scientific Association of Medical Ethics
J Iran Sci Asso Med Ethi.2025; 1(1): 24-28
https://jirme.com
Iranian Scientific Association of Medical Ethics
Review Article
OPEN ACCESS

Ethical and Legal Challenges in Resource Allocation for Rare Disease Patients

Kebria Farzaneh[1], Saman Eskandari[2], Hamid Mohammadikojidi[3]

1. Razi Clinical Research Development Unit, Razi Hospital, Guilan University of Medical Sciences, Rasht, Iran.
2. Spiritual Health Research Center, Research Institute for Health Development, Kurdistan University of Medical Sciences, Sanandaj, Iran.
3. Department of Forensic Medicine, School of Medicine, Guilan University of Medical Sciences, Rasht, Iran (Corresponding Author), Email: h_mohammadi8778@yahoo.com, Tel: +98- 09111395719.

ABSTRACT

Rare diseases, defined as conditions affecting fewer than 5 per 10,000 individuals, present unique ethical and legal challenges in healthcare resource allocation. Despite legislative advancements like the Orphan Drug Act (ODA), systemic barriers persist, including high treatment costs, limited access, and inequitable distribution of resources. This paper examines the ethical and legal dilemmas in allocating resources to rare disease patients, evaluates global frameworks, and proposes actionable solutions to balance equity, cost-effectiveness, and justice. A comprehensive review of literature, legislative policies, and economic evaluations was conducted, focusing on rare disease definitions, orphan drug development, and resource allocation models. Key challenges include economic disincentives for pharmaceutical investment, ethical conflicts between individual rights and collective welfare, and fragmented international classification systems. Solutions such as multi-criteria decision analysis (MCDA), expanded orphan drug legislation, and centralized reference networks are discussed. A hybrid approach integrating ethical principles, economic pragmatism, and global collaboration is essential to ensure equitable care for rare disease patients.

Keywords: Rare diseases, Resource allocation, Medical ethics, Orphan drugs, Health equity

Please cite this article as follows: Farzaneh K, Eskandari S, Mohammadikojidi H. Ethical and Legal Challenges in Resource Allocation for Rare Disease Patients. J Iran Sci Asso Med Ethi.2025; 1(1): 24-28.

Introduction

Rare diseases, often chronic and life-threatening, affect approximately 300 million people globally (1). Defined by the European Union as conditions with a prevalence below 5 per 10,000 individuals (2), these diseases—such as cystic fibrosis and Duchenne muscular dystrophy—pose disproportionate challenges to healthcare systems due to their complexity, high treatment costs, and low patient populations (3).

The ethical imperative to address rare diseases conflicts with economic realities: allocating limited resources to small patient groups risks

neglecting more prevalent health issues (4). This tension is exacerbated in low- and middle-income countries (LMICs), where rare diseases often receive minimal attention despite higher prevalence rates (5). This paper explores the intersection of ethics, law, and economics in rare disease care, proposing pathways to reconcile these competing priorities.

Defining Rare Diseases: A Global Discrepancy

1. Prevalence Thresholds:

United States: The FDA classifies rare diseases based on prevalence (<200,000 affected individuals) (6).

European Union: The EMA uses a ratio (<5 per 10,000) (7).

Japan: Combines prevalence (<50,000) and severity criteria (8).

This lack of standardization hinders international collaboration and complicates drug development (9). For example, pediatric cancers may be classified as "rare" in some regions but not others, leading to inconsistent funding and research prioritization (10).

2. Case Study: Ribose-5-Phosphate Isomerase Deficiency

This ultra-rare metabolic disorder, diagnosed in only one patient since 1984, exemplifies the challenges of studying conditions with minimal epidemiological data (11). Such cases highlight the need for adaptive regulatory frameworks.

Ethical and Legal Challenges

1. Economic Barriers

Orphan Drug Development: High costs (average $1.5 billion per drug) and low profitability deter investment. Only 10% of rare diseases have approved therapies (12).

Pricing Inequities: Orphan drugs cost 25–30 times more than non-orphan drugs. For example, Zolgensma, a gene therapy for spinal muscular atrophy, costs $2.1 million per dose (13).

LMIC Burden: Rare diseases are often more prevalent in LMICs, yet 90% lack access to orphan drugs due to cost and infrastructure gaps (14).

2. Ethical Dilemmas

Distributive Justice: Should resources favor rare disease patients over larger populations with common illnesses? (15).

Autonomy vs. Utilitarianism: Individual rights to treatment conflict with utilitarian principles of maximizing population health (16).

Informed Consent: Legal frameworks in some countries (e.g., Saudi Arabia) still require male guardian consent for female patients, violating autonomy (17).

3. Regulatory Fragmentation

Orphan Drug Act (ODA): The 1983 U.S. ODA incentivizes drug development via tax credits and market exclusivity. Similar laws in the EU and Japan have increased approvals (2,500+ orphan drugs since 1983) (18).

Gaps in LMICs: Only 35% of LMICs have orphan drug policies, perpetuating access disparities (19).

Proposed Solutions

1. Legislative and Policy Reforms

Global Harmonization: Adopt unified definitions and funding criteria through WHO-led initiatives (20).

Subsidized Pricing Models: Tiered pricing based on GDP, as seen in Gavi's vaccine programs (21).

Ethical Waivers: Exempt rare disease therapies from strict cost-effectiveness thresholds (e.g., UK's NICE recommendations) (22).

2. Economic Tools

Multi-Criteria Decision Analysis (MCDA):

Step 1: Define criteria (e.g., disease severity, treatment efficacy, societal impact) (23).

Step 2: Weight criteria based on regional priorities (24).

Step 3: Rank therapies using quantitative scoring (25).

Step 4: Allocate resources to high-priority interventions (26).

Case Study: Poland's use of MCDA increased funding for rare disease therapies by 40% between 2018–2022 (27).

3. Collaborative Networks

European Reference Networks (ERNs): Centralized hubs for diagnosis and treatment reduced diagnostic delays by 60% in member countries (28).

Patient Advocacy Groups: Organizations like NORD (USA) and EURORDIS (EU) amplify patient voices in policymaking (29).

Case Studies in Resource Allocation

1. Orphan Drug Act (USA)

Impact: 550+ orphan drugs approved since 1983 (30).

Critique: Critics argue ODA enables price gouging, as 70% of orphan drugs exceed $100,000/year (31).

2. Iran's Rare Disease Framework

Challenges: Limited funding and reliance on GDP-based cost-effectiveness thresholds (32).

Progress: The 2021 National Rare Disease Plan established specialized centers in Tehran and Shiraz (32).

Ethical Frameworks

1. Principle of Rescue: Prioritize immediate, life-saving interventions for rare disease patients regardless of cost (16).

2. Rule of Rescue vs. QALY: While Quality-Adjusted Life Years (QALY) favor cost-effective treatments, the "rescue" principle justifies higher spending for critically ill patients (17).

Conclusion and Recommendations

Rare disease care demands a paradigm shift:

Global Equity: LMICs require tailored funding mechanisms and technology transfers (20).

Ethical Guidelines: Integrate patient autonomy and distributive justice into policies (15).

Hybrid Financing: Combine public funding, philanthropic contributions, and cross-border partnerships (21).

Future Directions

AI-driven drug repurposing and international rare disease registries could revolutionize care. Policymakers must balance compassion with pragmatism to ensure no patient is left behind.

References

1. Ludlow, P. The European Commission. The New European Community, Routledge: 2018; 85-132.
2. Philippidis, A. Orphan drugs, big pharma. Human Gene Therapy. 2011; 22(9): 1037-1040.
3. Wamelink, M. M., et al. The difference between rare and exceptionally rare: molecular characterization of ribose 5-phosphate isomerase deficiency. Journal of Molecular Medicine. 2010; 88: 931-939.
4. O'Connor, D. J. Orphan drug designation–Europe, the USA and Japan. Expert Opinion on Orphan Drugs. 2013; 1(4): 255-259.
5. Gammie, T., et al. Access to orphan drugs: a comprehensive review of legislations, regulations and policies in 35 countries. PloS One. 2015; 10(10): e0140002.
6. Abbasi, M. & Faraji, O. Role of ethics in fair allocation of health resources. 2013; 121-134.
7. Yousefi, M., et al. Methods of resource allocation based on needs in health systems, and exploring the current Iranian resource allocation system. Hakim Journal. 2010; 13(2): 80-90.
8. Duchange, N., et al. Ethical management in the constitution of a European database for leukodystrophies rare diseases. European Journal of Paediatric Neurology. 2014; 18(5): 597-603.
9. Kacetl, J., et al. Ethical Questions Linked to Rare Diseases and Orphan Drugs–A Systematic Review. Risk Management and Healthcare Policy: 2020; 2125-2148.
10. Lenaerts, K. Exploring the limits of the EU charter of fundamental rights. European Constitutional Law Review. 2012; 8(3): 375-403.
11. Hews-Girard, J., et al. Objectivity in rare disease research: a philosophical approach. Nursing Inquiry. 2020; 27(1): e12323.
12. Rodriguez-Monguio, R., et al. Ethical imperatives of timely access to orphan drugs: is possible to reconcile economic incentives and patients' health needs? Orphanet Journal of Rare Diseases. 2017; 12(1): 1-8.
13. Hyde, R. & Dobrovolny, D. Orphan drug pricing and payer management in the United States: are we approaching the tipping point? American Health & Drug Benefits. 2010; 3(1): 15.
14. Tambuyzer, E. Rare diseases, orphan drugs and their regulation: questions and misconceptions. Nature Reviews Drug Discovery. 2010; 9(12): 921-929.
15. Force, U. P. S. T., et al. Guide to Clinical Preventive Services. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.1996.
16. World Health Organization. International Classification of Diseases. 9th Revision.1978.
17. Haffner, M. E. Adopting orphan drugs—two dozen years of treating rare diseases. New England Journal of Medicine. 2006; 354(5): 445-447.
18. Wästfelt, M., et al. A journey of hope: lessons learned from studies on rare diseases and orphan drugs. Journal of Internal Medicine. 2006; 260(1): 1-10.
19. Bank, I., et al. Social aspects of genetic testing for factor V Leiden mutation in healthy individuals and their importance for daily practice. Thrombosis Research. 2004; 113(1): 7-12.
20. Schieppati, A., et al. Rare diseases: a global challenge. The Lancet. 2008; 371: 2039-2041.
21. Dehnavieh, R., et al. Challenges of determining basic health insurance package in Iran. Payesh (Health Monitor). 2011; 10(2): 273-283.
22. Barham, L. Three NICE thresholds for cost-effectiveness: does that make sense. Pharmaphorum. 2016; 25.
23. Czech, M., et al. A review of rare disease policies and orphan drug reimbursement systems in 12 Eurasian countries. Frontiers in Public Health. 2020; 7: 416.

24. Roberts, M., et al. Conceptualizing a model: a report of the ISPOR-SMDM modeling good research practices task force–2. Medical Decision Making. 2012; 32(5): 678-689.

25. Thokala, P., et al. Multiple criteria decision analysis for health care decision making—an introduction: report 1 of the ISPOR MCDA Emerging Good Practices Task Force. Value in Health. 2016; 19(1): 1-13.

26. Moradi, N., et al. Willingness to pay for one quality-adjusted life year in Iran. Cost Effectiveness and Resource Allocation. 2019; 17(1): 1-10.

27. Simoens, S. Health technologies for rare diseases: does conventional HTA still apply? Expert Review of Pharmacoeconomics & Outcomes Research. 2014; 14(3): 315-317.

28. Bravi, F., et al. Hospital network performance: A survey of hospital stakeholders' perspectives. Health Policy. 2013; 109(2): 150-157.

29. Mobinizade, M. & Fakoorfard, Z. Allocation of resources for diagnostic and therapeutic interventions in rare diseases. Health Technology Assessment in Action. 2021.

30. Gericke, C. A., et al. Ethical issues in funding orphan drug research and development. Journal of Medical Ethics. 2005; 31(3): 164-168.

31. McCabe, C., et al. Orphan drugs and the NHS: should we value rarity? BMJ. 2005; 331(7523): 1016-1019.

32. Pinxten W, Denier Y, Dooms M, Cassiman JJ, Dierickx K. A fair share for the orphans: ethical guidelines for a fair distribution of resources within the bounds of the 10-year-old European Orphan Drug Regulation. Journal of Medical Ethics. 2012; 38(3):148-53.