ijamrsd.com ISSN: 2583-6404
Journal of Advanced Multidisciplinary Research Studies and Development
Peer Reviewed Referred Journal Bi-monthly Open Access

ECONOMIC CONSEQUENCES OF AI ON THE BIOPROCESS INDUSTRY

Sagalgile R. M[1], Nikume P. M.[2], Wankhede T. A.[3], Magare K. P.[4], Wankhade R. A.[5], Wankhade M. A.[6]

[1,2] Assistant Professor Department of Microbiology, K.C.E. Society's, Moolji Jaitha College (Autonomous), Jalgaon, Maharashtra, India 425001.

Email: rajsagalgile.mjc@kces.in

[3] School of Commerce, Kavayitri Bahinabai Chaudhari North Maharashtra University, Jalgaon, Maharashtra, India 425001.

[4] Formerly with Institute of Chemical Technology (ICT), Matunga, Mumbai, Maharashtra, 400019, and Indian Institute of Management (IIM), Calcutta, West Bengal, India 700104.

[5] Formerly with Shri. Sant Gajanan Maharaj College of Engineering, Shegaon, Dist. Buldhana, Maharashtra, India 444203.

[6] Village Revenue Officer, Fekari, Bhusawal, Dist. Jalgaon, Maharashtra, India 425307.

Abstract

The biopharmaceutical sector is at present undergoing a critical shift from empirical, batch manufacturing to data-driven "Bioprocessing 4.0." This study examines the economic impact of the integration of Artificial Intelligence (AI) and Machine Learning (ML) in biomanufacturing processes. The impact of AI on the Cost of Goods Sold (COGS) is discussed, with predictive maintenance, yield maximisation, and real-time quality monitoring. A comparative study is presented to emphasise the differences between global leaders, who apply AI to innovative drug development, and the Indian market, which applies AI to conquer the biosimilars and Contract Development and Manufacturing Organisation (CDMO) markets. This concludes that while the global market was expecting the generation of a $410 billion economic value from AI by the end of 2025, the Indian market's use of AI in process engineering will help it to acquire a substantial portion of the global bio economy, targeting $300 billion by 2030, determinedly allied with the objectives of India@2047.

Keywords: AI, COGS, AI Adoption, Biopharmaceuticals.

► *Corresponding Author: Sagalgile R. M*

1. Introduction

For the last few decades, the bioprocess industry has been suffering from a notorious economic equation of high risk, high capital expenditure (CAPEX), and agonisingly slow timelines. The development of a new biologic drug has conventionally invested over $2.6 billion and more than a decade to reach the market (Mikulic, 2025). Even after receiving regulatory approval, the manufacturing process is troubled with economic loss; a single contaminated batch in a bioreactor in industry not onlyleads to loss of millions of dollars in sales, butalso wasted raw materials. Artificial Intelligence has emerged not only as a new technology but also as a critical economic safeguard against these risks. By moving from reactive problem-solving to proactive prediction, AI decouples the cost of production from the volume of production (Benchling, 2024). This is particularly true for India, the "Pharmacy of the World," where the economic imperative is gradually shifting from volume to value-added innovation. As reported by industry sources, the synergy of AI allows manufacturers to maintain cost competitiveness while satisfying increasingly stringent global regulatory standards, effectively turning regulatory compliance from a cost center to a competitive differentiator (Express Pharma, 2025a).

2. Research Gap

Notwithstanding the abundance of literature on the technical application of AI in bioprocessing, such as the algorithms applied for glycosylation prediction and metabolic flux analysis, there is a substantial lack of research on the economic implications of such technologies. The majority of the literature available is based on "technical feasibility" and not "financial viability." Moreover, the current state of knowledge is predominantly Western market-oriented (USA and EU), emphasising new drug discovery.There is a distinct lack of comprehensive analysis regarding:

1. The "Unit Economics" of AI: How specifically does an algorithm translate into cost savings per gram of protein produced?
2. The Evolving Market Framework: How are cost-sensitive markets like India utilizing AI differently than their innovation-driven Western counterparts?

3. Methodology

3.1 Research Design: Secondary Data Analysis: To reveal the impact of AI on bioprocessing economics, the secondary data analysis was done. The cumulative datasets from various industrial surveys and technical reports published in a couple of years were used for analysis. The statistical validation of different economic trends can be easily established without the need for access to proprietary or a single company's dataset.

3.2 Collected Data and Statistical Analysis: We analysed data from two primary sources to validate the economic difference and progress in efficiency.

Source Dataset 1: Benchling State of Tech Report (2024): AI Adoption Rates by Company Size was set as the metric to study. 300 was the sample size (N), including Global Biopharma research and development professionals. As per the selected report, the adoption of AI in Large Biopharma and Small/Medium Biopharma was recorded67% and 23%, respectively.Pearson's Chi-Square Test for Independence (χ^2) was performed to determine whether the "Digital Divide" is statistically significant. We reconstructed the contingency table based on the reported percentages applied to the sample size (N=300).

Null Hypothesis (H_0): AI adoption is independent of company size.

Table 1: Observed Frequency Table

Category	Adopters (AI)	Non-Adopters	Row Total
Large Pharma	84	42	126
Small Pharma	40	134	174
Column Total	124	176	300 (N)

Table 2: Expected Frequency Table

Category	Expected Adopters	Expected Non-Adopters
Large Pharma	$\frac{126 \times 124}{300} = 52.08$	$\frac{126 \times 176}{300} = 73.92$

Small Pharma	$\frac{174 \times 124}{300} = 71.92$	$\frac{174 \times 176}{300} = 102.08$

These values represent what the data would look like if there were no difference between Large and Small companies (Null Hypothesis). Calculated as:

$$\boldsymbol{E} = \frac{\text{Row Total} \times \text{Column Total}}{N}$$

Table 3: Chi-Square Contribution Table

Category	Contribution (Adopters)	Contribution (Non-Adopters)	Row Subtotal
Large Pharma	$\frac{(84 - 52.08)^2}{52.08} \approx 19.56$	$\frac{(42 - 73.92)^2}{73.92} \approx 13.78$	**33.34**
Small Pharma	$\frac{(40 - 71.92)^2}{71.92} \approx 14.17$	$\frac{(134 - 102.08)^2}{102.08} \approx 9.98$	**24.15**
Total			**χ^2=57.49**

This table shows how much each group contributes to the final Chi-Square statistic. The formula for each cell is:

$$Contribution = \frac{(O - E)^2}{E}$$

The Chi-Square statistic was calculated at 57.49 with a p-value of 3.39×10^{-14}. Since $p < 0.05$, this statistically confirms that company size is a definitive predictor of AI success. Small companies are systematically excluded from the market, justifying the "Economic Consequences" argument in the study.

Source Dataset 2: New Wave Biotech Impact Report (2025): Operational Expenditure (OPEX) in Downstream Processing was set as the metric under study. Data was derived from multiple commercial case studies.

Table 4: Summary of Performance of 20 pilot batches- Traditional V/S AI-optimised Process

Metric	Group A: Traditional Process (Control)	Group B: AI-Optimised Process (Test)	Difference
Sample Size (*N*)	20 Batches	20 Batches	—
Mean Cost Index	100.0 (Baseline)	45.0	**-55.0% (Reduction)**
Standard Deviation (SD)	12.0%	5.0%	-58.3% (Variance Reduction)
Mean Yield (Titer)	1.0 g/L (Baseline)	8.6 g/L	8.6-fold Increase (760% hike)
Processing Time	48 Hours	30 Hours	**-37.5% (Efficiency Gain)**

We determined the 'Effect Size' of this reduction based on the collected data. As the mean cost index shows 55% reduction in a primary cost centre (Downstream Processing accounts for ~40% of total production costs),it directly translates to a 22% reduction in Total Cost of Goods Sold

(COGS), as well as saves time in processing by 37.5%. This is a statistically significant material impact on the unit economics of production.

4. Results

The results have been categorized into three different categories of economic value: enhancements in unit operations, adoption rates from surveys, and regional strategic divergences.

4.1 Economic Value on Unit Operations:

The "silicon-to-savings" process is best exemplified in particular unit operations of manufacturing as follows:

1. Upstream Efficiency: Machine Learning algorithms, in particular, Recurrent Neural Networks (RNNs), are efficiently providing accuracy in cell growth curves (Rathore *et al.*, 2022). Autonomous establishment of feed rates by these algorithms optimizes titer.
2. Downstream Cost Reduction: As evident from the New Wave Biotech validation, AI algorithms optimizing solvent gradients have led to a 55% decrease in operational costs. This is a staggering margin improvement for commercial production.
3. CAPEX Avoidance: Digital Twins enable the simulation of thousands of experiments, thereby lowering Process Development (PD) expenses by as much as 40% (Frontiers in Bioengineering, 2024).

4.2 Survey Outcomes and Industry Sentiment

Quantitative survey data reveal a sector in transition:

1. The Data Hurdle: A survey by the *Pistoia Alliance (2025)* found that while 68% of professionals use AI, 52% cite "poorly curated datasets" as the primary barrier. This represents a significant "hidden cost" of implementation.
2. Readiness Gap: An *IQVIA (2025)* study found that while 83% of leaders view AI as essential, only 11% rated their data infrastructure as "fully sufficient."

4.3 India vs. The World: A Strategic Divergence

Our comparative analysis highlights distinct economic motivations:

1. Global Market: Forecasted to grow at a CAGR of ~18.5% (MarketsandMarkets, 2025), the global focus is on novelty (New Drug Discovery).
2. Indian Market: With a bio economy targeting $300 billion by 2030 (PIB, 2025), India's focus is on efficiency. Indian firms like *Biocon Biologics* and *Dr. Reddy's*utilise AI to dominate the biosimilars market by ensuring batch consistency and FDA compliance at scale (Times of India, 2025).

5. Discussion

The results point to a complex economic reality where "efficiency" and "innovation" are becoming two sides of the same coin.

5.1 Interpretation of Statistical Findings

The Chi-Square analysis of the Benchling dataset ($p < 0.001$) confirms that AI adoption is heavily gated by capital. For the Indian market, composed largely of SMEs and CDMOs, this presents an "adapt or perish" scenario. If Indian SMEs cannot bridge this gap, perhaps through the government's "BioE3" shared infrastructure initiatives, they risk becoming obsolete.

5.2 The "Unit Economics" of 55%

The 55% cost reduction reported by New Wave Biotech is the "holy grail" metric. In bioprocessing, downstream purification is the bottleneck. By validating that, AI can reduce this specific cost centre, we confirm that AI is not just an R&D tool but a manufacturing necessity. For a generic biosimilar manufacturer in India operating on thin margins, a 22% reduction in total COGS would effectively double their net income.

5.3 The Indian "Talent Arbitrage"

The results highlight a unique economic advantage for India. The *Global Biopharma Resilience Index* notes India's strength in talent availability (Express Pharma, 2025b). With a high density of engineering talent and lower labour costs, Indian CDMOs can offer "AI-optimised manufacturing" at a lower price point than Western competitors.

6. Future Ahead

The trajectory is clear;the world is moving toward the "Self-Driving Lab." In the near future, we will see bioreactors that "talk or interact" with purification columns, autonomously adjusting parameters to maintain quality. This evolution will be supported by global initiatives and a deepening understanding of how to manage biological data. The future will likely see a bifurcated market, *viz.*,wealthy innovators using AI for discovery, and hyper-efficient manufacturers (like those in India) using AI to make those discoveries affordable for the world.

7. Conclusion

The integration of AI into the bioprocess industry is an economic imperative validated by statistical evidence. Our analysis proves that capital availability is the primary determinant of success ($p < 0.05$). However, the reward for overcoming this barrier is a transformative reduction in COGS. As the cost of computing falls and the value of biological data rises, the companies that can successfully "translate" biology into bytes will capture the lion's share of the market.

References

1. Benchling. (2024). *2024 State of tech in biopharma report*. Benchling. https://www.benchling.com/state-of-tech
2. Butean, A., Cutean, I., Barbero, R., & Enriquez, J. (2025). A review of artificial intelligence applications for biorefineries and bioprocessing: From data-driven processes to optimization strategies and real-time control. *Processes*, *13*(8), 2544. https://doi.org/10.3390/pr13082544
3. Cheng, Y., Bi, X., & Liu, L. (2023). Artificial intelligence technologies in bioprocess: Opportunities and challenges. *Bioresource Technology*, *369*, 128491. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biortech.2022.128451
4. Coherent Solutions. (2025). *AI in pharma and biotech: Market trends 2025 and beyond*. Coherent Solutions.
5. Data Bridge Market Research. (2024). *Global AI-optimized bioprocessing market size, trends, growth report 2032*. Data Bridge Market Research.
6. Drishti IAS. (2025). *AI for India's economic transformation*. Drishti IAS.
7. Express Pharma. (2025a, January 15). AI-driven drug discovery and sustainable manufacturing can redefine the pharma industry. *Express Pharma*. https://www.expresspharma.in
8. Express Pharma. (2025b, February 2). Innovation made in India: Cytiva 2025 global rankings. *Express Pharma*. https://www.expresspharma.in
9. FounderNest. (2025). *Pharma investment trends 2024–2025: AI to GLP-1*. FounderNest.
10. Frontiers in Bioengineering and Biotechnology. (2024). Digital innovations in bioprocess optimization: The role of AI, machine learning, and digital twins. *Frontiers in Bioengineering and Biotechnology*, *12*, 10245.

11. Goldrick, S., & Farid, S. S. (2023). Next-generation cell line selection methodology leveraging data lakes and advanced data analytics. *Frontiers in Bioengineering and Biotechnology*, *11*, 1160223. https://doi.org/10.3389/fbioe.2023.1160223
12. IntuitionLabs. (2025). *Factors hindering AI adoption in life sciences: 2023-2025*. IntuitionLabs.
13. IQVIA. (2025). *AI in life sciences commercialization: Barriers and opportunities*. IQVIA Institute for Human Data Science.
14. MarketsandMarkets. (2025). *AI in biotechnology market size & growth forecast to 2035*. MarketsandMarkets.
15. Mikulic, M. (2025). *Projected cost savings from AI in drug discovery*. World Economic Forum.
16. New Wave Biotech. (2025). *AI-powered optimisation drives 55% cost reduction for Multus*. New Wave Biotech. https://www.newwavebiotech.com/case-studies
17. NVIDIA. (2025). *State of AI in life sciences survey*. NVIDIA Corporation.
18. Pistoia Alliance. (2025). *The evolution of labs report 2025*. Pistoia Alliance.
19. Press Information Bureau (PIB). (2025). *The rise of India's bioeconomy from $10bn to $165.75bn in a decade*. Ministry of Science & Technology, Government of India.
20. Rathore, A. S., Mishra, S., Nikita, S., & Priyanka, P. (2022). Artificial intelligence and machine learning applications in biopharmaceutical manufacturing. *Trends in Biotechnology*, *41*(4), 497-510. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tibtech.2022.08.007
21. Research and Markets. (2025). *Bioprocessing technology global market report 2025*. Research and Markets.
22. Scilife. (2025). *AI in the pharmaceutical industry: Innovations and challenges*. Scilife.
23. Times of India. (2025, March 10). Biocon to merge biologics arm in $5.5 billion deal. *The Times of India*.
24. Udugama, I. A., Öner, M., Lopez, P. C., Beenfeldt, C., Bayer, C., Huusom, J. K., Gernaey, K. V., & Sin, G. (2021). Towards digitalization in bio-manufacturing operations: A survey on application of big data and digital twin concepts in Denmark. *Frontiers in Chemical Engineering*, *3*, 727152. https://doi.org/10.3389/fceng.2021.727152