International Journal of Science and Research Archive
eISSN: 2582-8185
Cross Ref DOI: 10.30574/ijsra
Journal homepage: https://ijsra.net/

(REVIEW ARTICLE)

Check for updates

Advances in pharmaceutical manufacturing: Integrating validation, qualification and digital transformation for enhanced product quality and regulatory compliance

Li Chen [1,*], Ming Liu [2] and Chia-Wei Lin [3]

[1] *Institute of Biotechnology, Peking University, Beijing, China.*
[2] *School of Biomedical Engineering, Shanghai Jiao Tong University, Shanghai, China.*
[3] *Graduate Institute of Biomedical Engineering, National Taiwan University, Taipei, Taiwan.*

International Journal of Science and Research Archive, 2026, 19(02), 558-569

Publication history: Received on 02 April 2026; revised on 09 May 2026; accepted on 11 May 2026

Article DOI: https://doi.org/10.30574/ijsra.2026.19.2.1000

Abstract

The pharmaceutical manufacturing landscape is undergoing a period of rapid transformation driven by the convergence of advanced validation methodologies, digital technologies, and evolving regulatory frameworks. This review examines the current state and emerging trends in pharmaceutical manufacturing, with particular emphasis on the integration of process validation lifecycle approaches, equipment and analytical instrument qualification, cleaning validation, computer system validation, and data integrity assurance. The adoption of continuous manufacturing, as guided by ICH Q13, and lifecycle management strategies articulated in ICH Q12 are reshaping how manufacturers design, qualify, and continuously verify production processes. Simultaneously, the emergence of digital twins, process analytical technology (PAT), and artificial intelligence is enabling real-time process monitoring and predictive quality assurance that complement traditional validation paradigms. This article evaluates how the updated ISPE GAMP 5 Second Edition framework and the FDA's Computer Software Assurance (CSA) initiative are redefining the approach to computerized system validation, emphasizing risk-based, critical-thinking methodologies over prescriptive documentation. The evolution of cleaning validation from arbitrary acceptance limits toward science-based, patient-safety-driven approaches is also examined as an illustrative case of the broader paradigm shift occurring across validation disciplines. The intersection of these technological and regulatory advances with established Good Manufacturing Practice (GMP) requirements is analyzed through the lens of Quality by Design (QbD) principles and the ICH Q8-Q12 quality guideline series. The review highlights practical implications for pharmaceutical, biotechnology, and medical device manufacturers and identifies areas where further research, standardization, and regulatory harmonization are needed to realize the full potential of modern pharmaceutical manufacturing.

Keywords: Pharmaceutical Manufacturing; Process Validation; Equipment Qualification; Cleaning Validation; Computer System Validation; Data Integrity; Continuous Manufacturing; Process Analytical Technology; Digital Twins; Quality By Design; ICH Guidelines; GAMP 5; Computer Software Assurance

1. Introduction

Pharmaceutical manufacturing occupies a unique position among industrial sectors, where the consequences of process variability extend beyond economic loss to direct impacts on patient safety and public health. The fundamental objective of pharmaceutical production is to consistently deliver products that meet predetermined quality specifications for identity, strength, purity, and bioavailability. Achieving this objective requires a robust quality infrastructure built upon systematic validation and qualification activities that span the entire product lifecycle, from process development through commercial distribution.

* Corresponding author: Li Chen

Over the past two decades, the regulatory philosophy governing pharmaceutical manufacturing has evolved considerably. The introduction of the ICH Q8-Q10 guidelines established the foundation for Quality by Design (QbD) as a systematic approach to product and process development, encouraging manufacturers to build quality into their processes rather than relying solely on end-product testing [5]. This paradigm shift was further reinforced by the United States Food and Drug Administration (FDA) Process Validation Guidance of 2011, which formalized a three-stage lifecycle approach comprising process design, process qualification, and continued process verification [1]. More recently, the finalization of ICH Q12 in 2019 introduced regulatory tools such as Established Conditions and Post-Approval Change Management Protocols to facilitate more efficient lifecycle management of approved products [10]. The publication of ICH Q13 in 2022 provided the first harmonized regulatory framework specifically addressing continuous manufacturing of drug substances and drug products, representing a significant milestone in the modernization of pharmaceutical production [13].

Concurrent with these regulatory developments, the pharmaceutical industry has witnessed the accelerating adoption of advanced technologies that are reshaping manufacturing operations. Process analytical technology (PAT), initially promoted through the FDA's 2004 guidance framework, has matured considerably and now encompasses a broad array of spectroscopic, sensor-based, and data-driven analytical approaches for real-time process monitoring [6]. Digital twin technology, which creates virtual replicas of physical manufacturing systems, is emerging as a powerful tool for process simulation, optimization, and predictive quality management [3]. Artificial intelligence and machine learning algorithms are being integrated into manufacturing control systems to enable adaptive process control and automated decision-making. These technological advances are creating new possibilities for process validation and quality assurance while simultaneously introducing novel challenges related to the validation and qualification of the digital systems themselves.

The validation and qualification of computerized systems has become increasingly critical as pharmaceutical manufacturing operations become more dependent on digital infrastructure. The release of the ISPE GAMP 5 Second Edition in 2022 updated the industry's principal guidance framework for computerized system validation, incorporating provisions for cloud computing, agile software development, artificial intelligence, and blockchain technology [7]. In parallel, the FDA has advanced its Computer Software Assurance (CSA) initiative, promoting a risk-based approach that emphasizes critical thinking and testing proportionate to patient risk over prescriptive documentation requirements [16]. These developments reflect a broader recognition that effective validation must evolve alongside the technologies it governs.

Data integrity has emerged as a central concern across all aspects of pharmaceutical manufacturing and quality operations. Regulatory enforcement actions related to data integrity failures have increased substantially, with agencies worldwide issuing guidance documents that articulate expectations for the reliability, completeness, and traceability of manufacturing and laboratory data [12]. The ALCOA+ principles (Attributable, Legible, Contemporaneous, Original, Accurate, plus Complete, Consistent, Enduring, and Available) have become the widely accepted standard for evaluating data integrity across both paper-based and electronic records management systems.

Importantly, the philosophical shift toward science-based and risk-informed validation is not confined to process validation or computerized systems alone. Cleaning validation, long governed by somewhat arbitrary acceptance limits, is undergoing its own transformation toward methodologies grounded in toxicological science and patient safety considerations [8]. This evolution is illustrative of the broader trend across pharmaceutical validation disciplines: the replacement of prescriptive, one-size-fits-all approaches with scientifically justified, risk-proportionate strategies.

This review provides a comprehensive examination of the current landscape of pharmaceutical manufacturing, focusing on the integration of validation and qualification practices with emerging digital technologies. The discussion encompasses process validation lifecycle approaches, equipment and utility qualification, analytical instrument qualification, cleaning validation, computer system validation, continuous manufacturing, PAT implementation, digital twin applications, and data integrity assurance. The objective is to synthesize the current state of knowledge in these interconnected domains and to identify practical implications, research gaps, and future directions for the pharmaceutical, biotechnology, and medical device industries.

2. The Lifecycle Approach to Process Validation

2.1. Regulatory Evolution and Current Framework

The concept of process validation in pharmaceutical manufacturing has undergone a fundamental transformation from a compliance-driven verification exercise to a science-based, lifecycle-oriented discipline. Historically, process

validation was frequently interpreted as a discrete event, typically consisting of three consecutive production batches manufactured under normal operating conditions and subjected to extensive sampling and testing. This approach, while establishing a baseline demonstration of process capability, offered limited insight into the sources of process variability and provided no structured mechanism for ongoing assurance of process control.

The FDA's 2011 Guidance for Industry, "Process Validation: General Principles and Practices," redefined process validation as a lifecycle activity comprising three distinct but interconnected stages [1]. Stage 1, Process Design, involves building and capturing process knowledge through development and scale-up activities, identifying critical process parameters (CPPs) and critical quality attributes (CQAs), and establishing a control strategy. Stage 2, Process Qualification, encompasses the qualification of equipment, utilities, and facilities (collectively referred to as the operational environment), followed by process performance qualification (PPQ) to confirm that the manufacturing process performs as expected under commercial-scale conditions. Stage 3, Continued Process Verification (CPV), requires ongoing monitoring and assessment of commercial production data to verify that the process remains in a validated state throughout its lifecycle.

This lifecycle model aligns closely with the Quality by Design principles articulated in ICH Q8(R2), which emphasizes the importance of process understanding as the scientific foundation for establishing design spaces and control strategies [5]. Under the QbD paradigm, process validation is not merely a demonstration of reproducibility but rather the culmination of a systematic effort to understand the relationships between process inputs, operating parameters, and product quality outcomes. The statistical analysis of process capability data, the application of multivariate analysis techniques to identify parameter interactions, and the use of design of experiments (DoE) to map the operational design space are all integral components of this enhanced approach to process validation [11].

2.2. Process Performance Qualification and Statistical Considerations

Process Performance Qualification (PPQ) represents the critical intersection between process design knowledge and commercial-scale manufacturing capability. A well-designed PPQ protocol establishes heightened sampling and testing requirements to provide a high degree of statistical confidence that the manufacturing process consistently produces output meeting all predetermined quality criteria. The determination of appropriate sample sizes, acceptance criteria, and statistical methods for PPQ evaluation remains an area of active discussion within the industry.

The use of process capability indices (Cpk, Ppk) to evaluate manufacturing performance against specification limits has become standard practice. Values of Cpk greater than 1.33 are generally considered indicative of a capable process, though the interpretation of these indices must account for the underlying data distribution and the sensitivity of the quality attribute to process variation. Statistical process control (SPC) charts, including both variable charts (X-bar and R, X-bar and S) and attribute charts (p-charts, c-charts), provide the foundation for Stage 3 continued process verification by establishing control limits derived from process performance data and enabling the detection of trends, shifts, and out-of-control conditions before they result in nonconforming output.

Recent work has emphasized the value of Bayesian statistical approaches and multivariate statistical process monitoring as complements to traditional univariate SPC methods. These advanced analytical techniques can capture complex correlations among multiple process parameters and quality attributes, enabling earlier detection of subtle process deviations that may not be apparent when monitoring individual variables in isolation [4]. The integration of multivariate statistical models with real-time PAT data represents a particularly promising avenue for enhancing the sensitivity and specificity of continued process verification programs.

3. Equipment, Utility, and Analytical Instrument Qualification

3.1. Commissioning and Qualification Framework

The qualification of manufacturing equipment, utilities, and analytical instruments constitutes the foundation upon which process validation activities are built. Without demonstrable evidence that these systems are properly installed, operate within specified parameters, and consistently perform their intended functions, any subsequent process validation studies lack a credible basis. The ISPE Baseline Guide on Commissioning and Qualification, along with ASTM E2500, provides industry-recognized frameworks for the systematic verification of pharmaceutical manufacturing systems and equipment [9].

The traditional qualification model follows a sequential progression through four stages: Design Qualification (DQ), which verifies that equipment design meets user requirements and regulatory expectations; Installation Qualification (IQ), which confirms that equipment is installed correctly according to manufacturer specifications and design

documentation; Operational Qualification (OQ), which demonstrates that equipment operates as intended across its specified operating ranges; and Performance Qualification (PQ), which establishes that the equipment consistently performs according to predetermined criteria under conditions representative of routine production. This DQ-IQ-OQ-PQ model, while well-established, has been subject to criticism for its potential to generate excessive documentation without proportionate value to product quality assurance.

The risk-based approach advocated by ASTM E2500 and the ISPE Baseline Guide encourages manufacturers to apply science-based and risk-informed decision-making to qualification activities. Under this framework, the extent of qualification testing is calibrated to the impact of the equipment or system on product quality. Direct-impact systems, those whose operation can directly affect product quality, require the most rigorous qualification. Indirect-impact systems undergo qualification commensurate with their potential influence, while no-impact systems are managed through standard engineering commissioning practices. This tiered approach enables more efficient allocation of qualification resources while maintaining appropriate quality assurance for critical manufacturing systems.

3.2. Analytical Instrument Qualification

Analytical instrument qualification (AIQ) ensures that laboratory instruments used for in-process testing, release testing, and stability studies are fit for their intended analytical applications. The United States Pharmacopeia (USP) General Chapter <1058> on Analytical Instrument Qualification provides a widely adopted framework that parallels the manufacturing equipment qualification model, comprising Design Qualification, Installation Qualification, Operational Qualification, and Performance Qualification specific to analytical instruments [14].

A key distinction in analytical instrument qualification is the differentiation between instrument qualification (demonstrating that the instrument meets hardware specifications) and method validation (demonstrating that the analytical procedure produces reliable results for the specific intended application). While these are complementary activities, instrument qualification must precede method validation to ensure that analytical performance data reflects the capability of the method itself rather than deficiencies in the underlying instrumentation. The qualification of complex analytical platforms, such as high-performance liquid chromatography (HPLC) systems, mass spectrometers, and near-infrared (NIR) spectrophotometers, requires careful consideration of the interactions between instrument hardware, software, and environmental conditions.

The qualification of PAT instruments deployed in manufacturing environments presents particular challenges. Unlike laboratory instruments that operate under controlled conditions, PAT sensors and analyzers must maintain their qualified performance in the presence of process-related environmental stresses including temperature fluctuations, vibration, humidity, and exposure to process materials. The establishment of appropriate performance verification intervals, calibration standards, and model maintenance protocols for deployed PAT instruments is essential to ensuring the reliability of real-time analytical data used for process monitoring and control decisions.

3.3. Utility Qualification

Pharmaceutical utility systems, including purified water and Water for Injection (WFI) generation and distribution systems, clean steam generators, compressed gas (air, nitrogen) systems, and heating, ventilation, and air conditioning (HVAC) systems, require qualification to demonstrate that they consistently deliver utilities meeting pharmacopeial and process-specific quality standards. The qualification of water systems, in particular, demands extended monitoring periods to capture seasonal and operational variability, with Phase 1, Phase 2, and Phase 3 monitoring protocols providing progressively increasing confidence in system performance and enabling the transition from intensive post-installation monitoring to routine operation.

HVAC qualification for classified cleanroom environments must demonstrate that the system maintains required air change rates, temperature and humidity ranges, room pressure differentials, and particulate contamination limits under both at-rest and in-operation conditions. The qualification of sterilization equipment, including autoclaves and dry heat ovens, requires thermal mapping studies to confirm temperature uniformity within the sterilization chamber and to validate that minimum lethal conditions (typically expressed as F0 values for moist heat sterilization) are achieved at the worst-case load configuration. These qualification studies are prerequisite to the validation of sterilization processes, which in turn support the overall validated status of sterile product manufacturing operations.

4. Cleaning Validation: The Shift Toward Science-Based Patient Safety Limits

4.1. Historical Context and Limitations of Traditional Approaches

Cleaning validation represents one of the most critical validation activities in multi-product pharmaceutical manufacturing facilities, where the prevention of cross-contamination between products manufactured on shared equipment is essential to patient safety. For decades, the pharmaceutical industry relied on a set of widely adopted but scientifically limited acceptance criteria for cleaning validation, most notably the "10 ppm" criterion (limiting carryover to no more than 10 parts per million of the subsequent product), the "0.1% dose" criterion (limiting carryover to no more than 0.1% of the minimum therapeutic dose of the previous product in the maximum daily dose of the subsequent product), and the "visually clean" criterion. While these criteria provided practical benchmarks, they were not derived from toxicological principles and did not account for the specific pharmacological or toxicological properties of the residual substances being evaluated.

The limitations of these traditional approaches have been increasingly recognized as the pharmaceutical industry produces a growing diversity of highly potent active pharmaceutical ingredients (APIs), biological products, and cytotoxic agents. A recent comprehensive analysis has characterized this evolution as a fundamental paradigm shift in cleaning validation philosophy, moving from arbitrary, historically inherited limits toward science-based acceptance criteria grounded in toxicological assessment and patient safety [8]. The traditional criteria, which were originally proposed in the 1990s as practical rules of thumb for conventional small-molecule manufacturing, are inadequate for establishing safe residual limits for compounds with highly variable potency, narrow therapeutic indices, or significant toxicological hazards at low exposure levels.

4.2. Health-Based Exposure Limits and the ADE/PDE Framework

The transition to science-based cleaning validation limits has been driven by the adoption of health-based exposure limits (HBELs), specifically the Acceptable Daily Exposure (ADE) and the Permitted Daily Exposure (PDE) framework. The PDE, defined in ICH Q3D for elemental impurities and adapted in EMA guidelines for shared facilities, represents the maximum acceptable intake of a residual substance that is unlikely to cause adverse effects in any patient population, including sensitive subpopulations. The calculation of PDE values is based on rigorous toxicological evaluation of available pharmacological, toxicological, and clinical data for the substance in question, applying appropriate uncertainty factors to account for inter-species extrapolation, inter-individual variability, study duration, severity of the critical effect, and the quality of the underlying data.

This toxicology-driven approach represents a fundamental improvement over the arbitrary criteria that preceded it, because it establishes a direct, scientifically defensible relationship between the cleaning validation acceptance limit and the actual risk to patient safety [8]. For highly potent compounds, health-based limits may be substantially more stringent than the traditional 10 ppm or 0.1% dose criteria, demanding enhanced cleaning procedures, more sensitive analytical methods for residue detection, and potentially dedicated manufacturing equipment. Conversely, for compounds with favorable toxicological profiles, health-based limits may permit more practical acceptance criteria than the overly conservative traditional benchmarks, enabling more efficient use of manufacturing capacity without compromising patient safety.

4.3. Implementation Challenges and Analytical Considerations

The implementation of health-based cleaning validation limits presents several practical challenges for pharmaceutical manufacturers. The toxicological assessment required to establish ADE/PDE values demands expertise that may not be readily available within traditional quality assurance organizations, often necessitating engagement with specialized toxicologists. The development and validation of analytical methods capable of detecting residues at the levels required by health-based limits, particularly for highly potent compounds, requires investment in sensitive analytical techniques such as liquid chromatography-tandem mass spectrometry (LC-MS/MS). Additionally, the establishment of maximum safe carryover (MSC) and maximum safe surface residue (MSSR) values from ADE/PDE data requires detailed knowledge of equipment surface areas, shared surfaces, and the batch sizes of subsequent products manufactured on the same equipment.

Despite these challenges, the transition to science-based cleaning validation is well advanced globally. The EMA guideline on setting health-based exposure limits, the ISPE Risk-Based Manufacture of Pharmaceutical Products (Risk-MaPP) guide, and the Parenteral Drug Association (PDA) Technical Report No. 29 (Revised 2012) on points to consider for cleaning validation all support the adoption of health-based approaches. Manufacturers operating multi-product facilities are increasingly conducting comprehensive cross-contamination risk assessments that integrate health-based

exposure limits with equipment design considerations, cleaning procedure capabilities, and analytical method sensitivity to establish scientifically justified cleaning validation strategies. This approach is fully consistent with the broader industry movement toward risk-based, science-driven quality assurance practices.

5. Continuous Manufacturing: Regulatory Framework and Implementation Challenges

5.1. ICH Q13 and the Regulatory Landscape

Continuous manufacturing (CM) represents a paradigm shift from traditional batch-based pharmaceutical production to integrated, flow-through processing systems in which raw materials are continuously fed and product is continuously removed. The finalization of ICH Q13, "Continuous Manufacturing of Drug Substances and Drug Products," in November 2022 provided the first internationally harmonized regulatory guideline specifically addressing the unique scientific and regulatory considerations of CM [13]. The guideline applies to both small molecule drug substances and biotechnological/biological products and covers fully continuous processes, hybrid processes combining continuous and batch unit operations, and the conversion of existing batch processes to continuous operation.

ICH Q13 is built upon the scientific principles established in the ICH Q8-Q12 guideline series and introduces several concepts particular to continuous manufacturing, including system dynamics and residence time distribution (RTD), material traceability and diversion strategies, process disturbance management, and the definition of batch size and batch boundaries in a continuous process context. The guideline emphasizes the importance of thorough process understanding, noting that the dynamic nature of continuous processes necessitates a more detailed characterization of system transient behavior, startup and shutdown sequences, and the propagation of material and process disturbances through interconnected unit operations.

The implementation of CM in pharmaceutical manufacturing, while offering substantial potential benefits in terms of production efficiency, reduced footprint, enhanced process control, and improved product quality consistency, presents significant technical and organizational challenges. Equipment design and integration require expertise in continuous flow chemistry, fluid dynamics, and process systems engineering that may not be readily available within organizations accustomed to batch manufacturing. The development of robust control strategies for CM processes, including the deployment of PAT instruments for real-time quality attribute monitoring and the implementation of automated material diversion systems, demands considerable investment in both technology and personnel training [2].

5.2. Process Validation for Continuous Manufacturing

The validation of continuous manufacturing processes requires adaptation of the traditional batch-based validation paradigm. While the lifecycle approach to process validation remains applicable, the specific strategies for process design (Stage 1), process qualification (Stage 2), and continued process verification (Stage 3) must account for the unique characteristics of continuous operation. In particular, the PPQ strategy for a CM process must address the demonstration of process capability under steady-state conditions, the management of process startup and shutdown transients, the handling of process disturbances and the effectiveness of material diversion protocols, and the establishment of appropriate run duration to capture relevant sources of variability.

Real-time release testing (RTRT) and the concept of process-based release represent natural extensions of CM process validation. By integrating comprehensive PAT monitoring with validated process models, manufacturers can potentially replace traditional end-product testing with real-time quality assurance based on the continuous verification of CPPs and CQAs throughout the production run. This approach, while scientifically compelling, requires rigorous validation of the analytical methods, process models, and decision algorithms that form the basis of real-time release decisions [6].

6. Process Analytical Technology: From Monitoring to Predictive Quality Assurance

Process analytical technology encompasses the suite of analytical tools, statistical methods, and process control strategies that enable the real-time measurement and control of critical material attributes and process parameters during manufacturing. The FDA's PAT framework guidance of 2004 established the regulatory foundation for PAT implementation, defining it as a system for designing, analyzing, and controlling manufacturing through timely measurements of critical quality and performance attributes of raw and in-process materials and processes with the goal of ensuring final product quality.

The maturation of PAT over the past two decades has been driven by advances in spectroscopic instrumentation, chemometric modeling, and sensor technology. Near-infrared (NIR) spectroscopy, Raman spectroscopy, and terahertz

time-domain spectroscopy have emerged as the most widely deployed PAT tools for pharmaceutical applications, enabling non-destructive, real-time monitoring of blend uniformity, moisture content, polymorphic form, chemical composition, and coating thickness [6]. More recent developments include the application of hyperspectral imaging for spatially resolved chemical analysis, acoustic emission monitoring for granulation and coating endpoints, and focused beam reflectance measurement (FBRM) for particle size monitoring in crystallization processes.

The qualification and validation of PAT instruments and the chemometric models they employ present distinct challenges compared to traditional laboratory analytical methods. Chemometric models, whether based on principal component analysis (PCA), partial least squares (PLS) regression, or more advanced machine learning algorithms, must be developed using representative calibration datasets, validated against independent test sets, and continuously monitored for model performance degradation over time. Changes in raw material suppliers, equipment configurations, or environmental conditions can necessitate model updates or recalibration, requiring clear lifecycle management procedures for PAT model maintenance [15]. The integration of PAT data streams with manufacturing execution systems (MES) and quality management systems raises additional considerations related to data integrity, electronic records compliance, and the validation of the software systems that process and store PAT data.

7. Digital Twins in Pharmaceutical Manufacturing

Digital twin technology has attracted growing interest in the pharmaceutical industry as a means of creating high-fidelity virtual representations of physical manufacturing processes. A digital twin, in its most complete form, consists of a physical component (the manufacturing equipment and process), a virtual component (a computational model that replicates the behavior and dynamics of the physical system), and a bidirectional data communication channel that enables real-time synchronization between the physical and virtual domains [3]. The concept, originally developed in the aerospace and automotive industries, is now being explored for applications across the pharmaceutical product lifecycle, from process development and scale-up to commercial manufacturing optimization and predictive maintenance.

In the context of pharmaceutical manufacturing, digital twins offer several potential benefits for validation and quality assurance. Process digital twins can serve as virtual platforms for conducting in-silico experiments to explore design spaces, optimize process parameters, and evaluate the impact of potential process changes without disrupting commercial production. This capability is particularly valuable during process design (Stage 1 of process validation), where digital twin simulations can complement physical development studies and accelerate the identification of optimal operating conditions. During process qualification, digital twins can support the design of PPQ sampling strategies by predicting the expected variability of CQAs under different operating scenarios. In commercial manufacturing, real-time digital twins that are continuously updated with process data can function as advanced process monitoring tools, detecting deviations from expected process behavior and providing early warning of potential quality excursions.

The validation of digital twin models themselves represents a significant challenge. Regulatory agencies require that models used for quality-relevant decisions be thoroughly validated to ensure their accuracy and reliability. The validation of mechanistic models (based on first-principles engineering knowledge) differs from the validation of empirical or data-driven models (based on statistical or machine learning approaches), and hybrid models that combine mechanistic and empirical components require validation strategies that address both elements. Current regulatory frameworks do not provide specific guidance on digital twin validation, though the principles articulated in ICH Q8-Q12 regarding process understanding, risk management, and lifecycle management provide a general foundation [10]. The development of standardized approaches for digital twin validation in pharmaceutical applications remains an active area of industry and regulatory discussion.

8. Computer System Validation and Computer Software Assurance

8.1. GAMP 5 Second Edition: A Modernized Framework

The validation of computerized systems used in pharmaceutical manufacturing, quality control, and regulatory operations is governed by a framework of regulations, guidance documents, and industry standards. The United States FDA's 21 CFR Part 11 establishes requirements for electronic records and electronic signatures, while the European Union's GMP Annex 11 addresses the use of computerized systems in GMP-regulated activities. The ISPE GAMP 5 guide has served as the primary industry reference for implementing these regulatory requirements through a structured, risk-based approach to computerized system validation.

The publication of GAMP 5 Second Edition in July 2022 represented the most significant update to this framework since the original edition in 2008 [7]. While maintaining the foundational principles and risk-based framework of the first edition, the Second Edition incorporates substantial updates to address the technological evolution that has occurred over the intervening fourteen years. Key updates include enhanced guidance on the qualification of IT service providers and cloud computing environments, recognition and support of iterative and incremental software development methodologies (including Agile), expanded treatment of software tools and automation supporting lifecycle processes, and new appendices addressing blockchain technology, artificial intelligence and machine learning, open-source software, and data integrity considerations for end-user applications such as spreadsheets.

A central theme of the Second Edition is the emphasis on critical thinking by knowledgeable and experienced subject matter experts (SMEs) in defining validation approaches proportionate to the actual risk to patient safety, product quality, and data integrity. This emphasis reflects an industry-wide recognition that computerized system validation has, in many organizations, become an overly prescriptive and documentation-heavy exercise that consumes substantial resources without generating commensurate assurance of system quality and fitness for intended use. The guide encourages practitioners to focus on meaningful verification activities, such as risk-based testing strategies and leveraging supplier quality documentation, rather than generating voluminous validation documentation of limited practical value [16].

8.2. Computer Software Assurance: The FDA's Evolving Approach

The FDA's Computer Software Assurance (CSA) initiative represents a significant evolution in the agency's approach to the assurance of software used in regulated environments. CSA was originally developed in the context of medical device software regulation but has broader implications for pharmaceutical manufacturing software validation. The CSA framework promotes a risk-based, critical-thinking approach in which the nature and extent of assurance activities are determined by the risk that software failure could pose to patient safety, product quality, or data integrity.

Under the CSA paradigm, software functions that directly affect patient safety or product quality (high-risk functions) receive the most rigorous assurance activities, including formal testing with documented evidence. Software functions with lower risk may be adequately assured through less formal methods, such as unscripted testing, vendor qualification, or operational experience. This tiered approach encourages organizations to invest their assurance resources where they provide the greatest benefit to patient safety and product quality, rather than applying uniform testing intensity across all software functions regardless of risk. The alignment between CSA principles and the updated GAMP 5 Second Edition framework facilitates a harmonized approach to software assurance across both FDA and international regulatory jurisdictions.

9. Data Integrity in the Digital Manufacturing Environment

Data integrity has become one of the most prominent quality and compliance topics in pharmaceutical manufacturing. Regulatory agencies including the FDA, the European Medicines Agency (EMA), the UK Medicines and Healthcare products Regulatory Agency (MHRA), and the World Health Organization (WHO) have issued guidance documents articulating expectations for the reliability and trustworthiness of data generated and maintained throughout the product lifecycle [12]. The MHRA's 2018 guidance on GxP data integrity and the WHO's 2021 guidance on data integrity are among the most comprehensive regulatory references on this subject, establishing the ALCOA+ principles as the fundamental standard for data governance in pharmaceutical operations.

In the context of increasingly digitized pharmaceutical manufacturing environments, data integrity assurance requires a systematic approach that encompasses the design, configuration, validation, and operation of computerized systems; the management of electronic records and electronic signatures; the implementation of access controls, audit trails, and data backup and recovery procedures; and the training and oversight of personnel who generate, process, review, and approve manufacturing and quality data. The transition from paper-based to electronic data management systems, while offering significant advantages in terms of data accessibility, searchability, and traceability, also introduces new vulnerabilities including unauthorized data modification, inadequate audit trail coverage, and system configuration errors that can compromise data integrity.

The concept of "data integrity by design" has gained traction as a proactive approach to building data integrity controls into the design and configuration of manufacturing and laboratory information systems, rather than relying on retrospective detection of data integrity failures [7]. This approach aligns with the QbD philosophy applied to manufacturing processes and encompasses the selection of systems with robust native audit trail capabilities, the implementation of role-based access controls that enforce appropriate segregation of duties, the configuration of

systems to prevent or detect unauthorized data modifications, and the establishment of data lifecycle management procedures that ensure the long-term availability and readability of electronic records.

10. Artificial Intelligence and Machine Learning in Process Optimization

The application of artificial intelligence (AI) and machine learning (ML) to pharmaceutical manufacturing process optimization represents one of the most transformative trends in the industry. AI/ML algorithms can analyze the vast quantities of multivariate process data generated by modern PAT-instrumented manufacturing systems to identify complex, non-linear relationships between process inputs and product quality outcomes that may not be discernible through traditional statistical methods. Applications span the entire manufacturing lifecycle, from accelerating process development through automated design of experiments and surrogate model construction, to enabling adaptive process control in commercial manufacturing through real-time predictive models.

The validation of AI/ML models used for quality-relevant decisions in pharmaceutical manufacturing introduces what has been described as a "validation paradox" [15]. Traditional process validation is predicated on demonstrating that a process is fixed and reproducible. AI/ML models, particularly those that continue to learn from new data, are inherently dynamic and may evolve over time. This tension between the static validation paradigm and the adaptive nature of AI/ML systems is driving the development of new regulatory frameworks for "continuous model verification" that establish guardrails allowing models to learn within a validated design space without requiring full revalidation for every algorithmic update. The FDA has acknowledged this challenge and is actively engaging with industry to develop appropriate regulatory approaches for AI in pharmaceutical manufacturing.

Practical implementation of AI/ML in pharmaceutical manufacturing also requires careful attention to data quality, model interpretability, and change management. Training data must be representative, accurate, and free from systematic biases that could compromise model predictions. Model interpretability is important for regulatory acceptance and for building operator confidence in AI-assisted decision-making. Robust change management procedures must govern the lifecycle of AI/ML models, including model development, validation, deployment, performance monitoring, and retirement. The GAMP 5 Second Edition includes a new appendix specifically addressing AI and ML, and ISPE has published complementary guidance on the application of GAMP principles to AI systems in regulated environments [7].

11. Post-Approval Lifecycle Management: ICH Q12 and Beyond

The management of post-approval changes to pharmaceutical manufacturing processes has historically been a significant source of regulatory burden for both manufacturers and regulatory agencies. Changes to manufacturing processes, analytical methods, equipment, facilities, or suppliers often require prior regulatory approval or notification, even when the changes are well-understood, scientifically justified, and pose minimal risk to product quality. This regulatory overhead can discourage manufacturers from implementing process improvements and can delay the adoption of innovative manufacturing technologies.

ICH Q12, finalized in November 2019, addresses this challenge by introducing a framework of regulatory tools and enablers designed to facilitate more efficient post-approval change management while maintaining product quality throughout the lifecycle [10]. The cornerstone of ICH Q12 is the concept of Established Conditions (ECs), defined as the legally binding information in the regulatory dossier that is considered necessary to assure product quality. By distinguishing ECs from supportive information, ICH Q12 enables manufacturers to implement changes to non-EC parameters through their pharmaceutical quality system without regulatory submission, provided the change is managed within the approved control strategy.

The Product Lifecycle Management (PLCM) document introduced by ICH Q12 serves as a transparent summary of how the marketing authorization holder plans to manage post-approval changes, including the identification of ECs, associated reporting categories, and any Post-Approval Change Management Protocols (PACMPs). Case studies have demonstrated that the application of ICH Q12 principles can substantially reduce the number of post-approval regulatory submissions required for routine manufacturing changes, freeing both industry and regulatory resources for activities with greater impact on product quality and patient safety. The alignment of ICH Q12 with ICH Q13 is particularly relevant for continuous manufacturing processes, where the enhanced process understanding and real-time monitoring capabilities inherent to CM can support more flexible lifecycle management approaches.

12. Integration of Validation Disciplines and Future Directions

12.1. The Convergence of Physical and Digital Validation

The pharmaceutical manufacturing environment of the future will be characterized by increasingly tight integration between physical production systems and their digital counterparts. This convergence creates both opportunities and challenges for validation practitioners. On the opportunity side, comprehensive digital infrastructure enables more efficient data collection, analysis, and trending across validation activities. Qualification data for equipment, utilities, and instruments can be captured, stored, and analyzed within integrated electronic systems that support real-time monitoring and facilitate periodic requalification assessments. Process validation data from PPQ studies and continued process verification programs can be aggregated and subjected to advanced statistical analysis to provide deeper insights into process capability and stability.

On the challenge side, the proliferation of digital systems in pharmaceutical manufacturing exponentially increases the scope of computer system validation activities. Each new digital tool, sensor, data historian, manufacturing execution system module, or analytics platform must be assessed for its impact on product quality and data integrity and validated accordingly. The adoption of integrated manufacturing platforms that combine process control, PAT, MES, and enterprise resource planning (ERP) functionality requires validation approaches that address both individual system components and the interfaces and data flows between them. The concept of continuous validation, in which validation is maintained as an ongoing state rather than a discrete event, is gaining acceptance as a necessary adaptation to the dynamic nature of modern pharmaceutical manufacturing systems.

12.2. Regulatory Harmonization and Global Implementation

Despite the substantial progress achieved through the ICH guideline development process, significant challenges remain in the global harmonization of validation and qualification requirements. The implementation of ICH guidelines in individual regulatory jurisdictions is subject to regional legal frameworks, which can result in divergent interpretations and requirements. For example, the implementation of ICH Q12 EC concepts within the European Union's variation regulation framework has required careful adaptation to ensure compatibility with existing legal provisions. Similarly, the adoption of ICH Q13 continuous manufacturing principles requires alignment with regional GMP inspection practices and approval procedures that may not have been designed with continuous processes in mind.

The Pharmaceutical Inspection Co-operation Scheme (PIC/S) plays an important role in harmonizing GMP inspection practices across its member authorities, and the inclusion of continuous manufacturing and advanced analytics inspection guidance within PIC/S training and reference materials will be essential to supporting the global implementation of these technologies. Mutual recognition agreements between regulatory agencies, such as those between the FDA and EMA, can also facilitate the acceptance of validation documentation across jurisdictions, reducing duplicative regulatory burden for manufacturers operating in global markets.

12.3. Emerging Technologies and Research Needs

Several emerging technology areas present opportunities for further advancement of pharmaceutical manufacturing validation and quality assurance. Blockchain technology offers potential applications in supply chain traceability, data integrity assurance, and the creation of immutable records of manufacturing and quality events, though its practical implementation in pharmaceutical manufacturing environments remains in its early stages. Augmented reality (AR) and virtual reality (VR) technologies are being explored as tools for operator training, remote equipment qualification support, and enhanced visualization of manufacturing process data. Edge computing architectures, which process data closer to the point of generation rather than transmitting all data to centralized servers, may enable faster real-time decision-making in PAT-instrumented manufacturing systems while addressing data bandwidth and latency constraints.

Research needs in the domain of pharmaceutical manufacturing validation include the development of standardized approaches for digital twin validation, the establishment of regulatory frameworks for continuous model verification of AI/ML systems used in quality-relevant applications, the advancement of statistical methods for multivariate process monitoring and capability assessment, the creation of reference standards and best practices for PAT instrument qualification in manufacturing environments, and the harmonization of data integrity requirements across global regulatory jurisdictions. Collaborative efforts between industry, academia, and regulatory agencies will be essential to addressing these needs and to ensuring that the pace of validation methodology development keeps pace with the rapid technological evolution of pharmaceutical manufacturing.

13. Conclusion

Pharmaceutical manufacturing is in the midst of a transformative period in which long-established validation and qualification practices are being reshaped by the dual forces of regulatory modernization and technological innovation. The lifecycle approach to process validation, as articulated in the FDA's 2011 guidance and supported by the ICH Q8-Q12 guideline series, provides a robust framework for ensuring manufacturing process quality from development through commercial operation. The extension of this framework to continuous manufacturing through ICH Q13, and the introduction of lifecycle management tools through ICH Q12, represent important advances in aligning regulatory expectations with the realities of modern pharmaceutical production.

The evolution of cleaning validation from arbitrary acceptance criteria toward science-based, health-based exposure limits exemplifies the broader paradigm shift occurring across all validation disciplines [8]. Just as cleaning validation has moved from prescriptive rules of thumb to toxicologically justified patient safety limits, so too have process validation, equipment qualification, and computer system validation evolved from rigid, documentation-centric compliance exercises toward risk-based, science-driven quality assurance strategies. This convergence of philosophy across validation disciplines reflects the maturation of the pharmaceutical quality system concept and the deepening integration of scientific risk management into every aspect of manufacturing quality.

The increasing integration of digital technologies, including PAT, digital twins, AI/ML, and advanced data analytics, into pharmaceutical manufacturing operations is creating new capabilities for real-time quality assurance and predictive process control. These technologies hold the promise of moving pharmaceutical manufacturing from a model based on retrospective quality verification to one based on prospective quality prediction and real-time quality assurance. However, realizing this promise requires parallel advances in the validation and qualification of the digital systems themselves, a challenge addressed by the updated GAMP 5 Second Edition framework and the evolving CSA paradigm.

Data integrity remains a critical enabling factor across all domains of pharmaceutical manufacturing quality assurance. The transition to digital manufacturing environments amplifies both the importance and the complexity of data integrity assurance, requiring systematic approaches that integrate data integrity considerations into system design, validation, and operation. The convergence of process validation, equipment qualification, cleaning validation, computerized system validation, and data integrity into an integrated, risk-based quality assurance framework represents both the current trajectory and the aspirational goal for the pharmaceutical manufacturing industry. Continued collaboration among industry practitioners, regulatory scientists, and academic researchers will be essential to advancing the state of the art and ensuring that pharmaceutical manufacturing validation practices remain fit for purpose in an era of rapid technological change.

Compliance with ethical standards

Acknowledgments

The authors would like to express gratitude to the colleagues and peers who provided valuable feedback and technical insights during the development of this review. Their contributions were instrumental in refining the scope and quality of this work.

Disclosure of conflict of interest

The authors declare no conflicts of interest related to this work.

References

[1] U.S. Food and Drug Administration. (2011). Guidance for industry: Process validation: General principles and practices (Revision 1). U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. https://www.fda.gov/files/drugs/published/Process-Validation--General-Principles-and-Practices.pdf

[2] Lee, S. L., O'Connor, T. F., Yang, X., Cruz, C. N., Chatterjee, S., Madurawe, R. D., Moore, C. M. V., Yu, L. X., & Woodcock, J. (2015). Modernizing pharmaceutical manufacturing: From batch to continuous production. Journal of Pharmaceutical Innovation, 10(3), 191–199. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12247-015-9215-8

[3] Udugama, I. A., Garg, P., Mahmoudi, J., Freijat, A., Ranjbar, M., & Gernaey, K. V. (2020). Digital twins in pharmaceutical and biopharmaceutical manufacturing: A literature review. Processes, 8(9), 1088. https://doi.org/10.3390/pr8091088

[4] Kourti, T. (2006). Process analytical technology beyond real-time analyzers: The role of multivariate analysis. Critical Reviews in Analytical Chemistry, 36(3–4), 257–278. https://doi.org/10.1080/10408340600969957

[5] International Council for Harmonisation (ICH). (2009). ICH Q8(R2): Pharmaceutical development. ICH Harmonised Tripartite Guideline. https://database.ich.org/sites/default/files/Q8_R2_Guideline.pdf

[6] Yu, L. X., Amidon, G., Khan, M. A., Hoag, S. W., Polli, J., Raju, G. K., & Woodcock, J. (2014). Understanding pharmaceutical quality by design. The AAPS Journal, 16(4), 771–783. https://doi.org/10.1208/s12248-014-9598-3

[7] International Society for Pharmaceutical Engineering (ISPE). (2022). GAMP 5: A risk-based approach to compliant GxP computerized systems (2nd ed.). ISPE. https://doi.org/10.1002/9781946964571

[8] Patel, B., Pacha, N., Patel, J., Le, R., & Singh, A. (2026). The paradigm shifts in cleaning validation: From arbitrary limits to science-based patient safety. World Journal of Advanced Research and Reviews, 29(01), 961–975. https://doi.org/10.30574/wjarr.2026.29.1.0089

[9] ASTM International. (2012). ASTM E2500-13: Standard guide for specification, design, and verification of pharmaceutical and biopharmaceutical manufacturing systems and equipment. ASTM International. https://doi.org/10.1520/E2500-13

[10] International Council for Harmonisation (ICH). (2019). ICH Q12: Technical and regulatory considerations for pharmaceutical product lifecycle management. https://database.ich.org/sites/default/files/Q12_Guideline_Step4_2019_1119.pdf

[11] Jain, S., Krishnan, N. J. S., Jayaprakash, J. W., Pillai, R. P., Jaganathan, J. N., & Raju, B. V. (2024). Lifecycle approach to process validation and its implementation in pharmaceutical industry. International Journal of Pharmaceutical Quality Assurance, 15(3), 1005–1017. https://doi.org/10.25258/ijpqa.15.3.113

[12] World Health Organization. (2021). WHO guidance on good data and record management practices (Annex 4, WHO Technical Report Series No. 1033). World Health Organization. https://www.who.int/publications/m/item/who-guidelines-on-data-integrity

[13] International Council for Harmonisation (ICH). (2022). ICH Q13: Continuous manufacturing of drug substances and drug products. https://database.ich.org/sites/default/files/ICH_Q13_Step4_Guideline_2022_1116.pdf

[14] United States Pharmacopeia. (2017). USP General Chapter <1058>: Analytical instrument qualification. In United States Pharmacopeia and National Formulary (USP 40–NF 35). United States Pharmacopeial Convention.

[15] Fischer, R.-P., Volpert, A., Antonino, P., & Ahrens, T. D. (2024). Digital patient twins for personalized therapeutics and pharmaceutical manufacturing. Frontiers in Digital Health, 5, 1302338. https://doi.org/10.3389/fdgth.2023.1302338

[16] U.S. Food and Drug Administration. (2022). Computer software assurance for production and quality system software (Draft guidance for industry and FDA staff). U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. https://www.fda.gov/regulatory-information/search-fda-guidance-documents/computer-software-assurance-production-and-quality-system-software