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

Regulatory challenges in complex generics: A focus on liposomal and nanoparticulate drug products

Kateregga Ismael [1] and B Naga Shubha [2,*]

[1] *Department of Industrial Pharmacy, Raghavendra Institute of Pharmaceutical Education and Research (RIPER)-Autonomous, Anantapuramu-515721, Andhra Pradesh, India.*
[2] *Department of Pharmaceutics, Raghavendra Institute of Pharmaceutical Education and Research (RIPER)-Autonomous, Anantapuramu-515721, Andhra Pradesh, India.*

International Journal of Science and Research Archive, 2025, 14(03), 834-849

Publication history: Received on 06 February 2025; revised on 15 March 2025; accepted on 17 March 2025

Article DOI: https://doi.org/10.30574/ijsra.2025.14.3.0730

Abstract

Complex generics, particularly liposomal and nanoparticulate drug products, pose unique regulatory challenges due to their intricate formulations, specialized delivery mechanisms, and physicochemical properties. Unlike traditional generics, these formulations require rigorous characterization, bioequivalence assessments, and in-depth in vitro and in vivo studies to ensure therapeutic equivalence. Regulatory agencies such as the FDA, EMA, and ICH have developed specific guidelines, yet differences in global regulatory frameworks persist, adding complexity to the approval process. Key hurdles include demonstrating sameness in composition, stability, and clinical efficacy, necessitating advanced analytical techniques and alternative bioequivalence methodologies like physiologically based pharmacokinetic (PBPK) modeling and in vitro–in vivo correlation (IVIVC). Manufacturing consistency, batch-to-batch reproducibility, and quality control further complicate the regulatory landscape, requiring stringent validation protocols. This review explores the evolving regulatory pathways, recent advancements in characterization tools, and the role of AI in streamlining approvals. Harmonizing international guidelines and fostering industry-academia collaboration will be crucial in overcoming regulatory barriers and accelerating the market entry of complex generics. The insights presented herein will aid pharmaceutical scientists, regulatory professionals, and policymakers in navigating the challenges associated with developing and approving liposomal and nanoparticulate generic drugs.

Keywords: Bioequivalence assessment; Complex generics; Liposomal drug products; Nanoparticulate formulations; Regulatory challenges

1. Introduction

1.1. Overview of Complex Generics

1.1.1. Definition and Significance of Complex Generics

Complex generics are a category of generic drugs that exhibit complexities in their formulation, route of delivery, or active ingredient properties, making their approval and regulatory pathways more challenging than traditional generics(1, 2). According to the U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA), complex generics include products with complex active ingredients (e.g., peptides, liposomes), complex formulations (e.g., nanoparticles, microspheres), complex routes of administration (e.g., transdermal, inhalation), and complex drug-device combinations(3). These products are designed to offer the same therapeutic benefits as their reference-listed drugs (RLDs) while ensuring comparable safety, efficacy, and quality(4). Due to their intricate nature, demonstrating bioequivalence (BE) and

* Corresponding author: B Naga Shubha

pharmaceutical equivalence requires advanced analytical, in vitro, and in vivo studies, often making their development more resource-intensive(5).

1.1.2. Distinction from Traditional Generics

Unlike traditional small-molecule generics, which primarily require bioequivalence studies to gain regulatory approval, complex generics involve additional layers of evaluation, including structural characterization, formulation sameness, and alternative BE assessment methods(3, 6). Traditional generics rely on straightforward pharmaceutical equivalence and pharmacokinetic (PK) studies, whereas complex generics often require comparative clinical trials, extensive in vitro testing, and, in some cases, physiologically based pharmacokinetic (PBPK) modeling(7). Additionally, batch-to-batch consistency and manufacturing control are more stringent for complex generics due to their sensitivity to process variations.

1.1.3. Importance in Improving Drug Efficacy and Patient Outcomes

The development of complex generics plays a crucial role in enhancing drug efficacy, patient adherence, and treatment affordability(8). Many complex drug products, such as liposomal formulations and nanoparticle-based therapeutics, offer superior drug delivery by improving solubility, bioavailability, and targeted drug release(9). This results in better therapeutic outcomes with reduced side effects. Furthermore, complex generics provide cost-effective alternatives to high-priced branded drugs, increasing accessibility to essential treatments, especially for chronic and life-threatening diseases like cancer, autoimmune disorders, and infectious diseases(10).

2. Introduction to Liposomal and Nanoparticulate Drug Products

2.1. Role of Nanotechnology in Drug Delivery

Nanotechnology has revolutionized drug delivery by enabling precise targeting, controlled release, and enhanced bioavailability of therapeutic agents(11, 12). Liposomal and nanoparticulate drug delivery systems are among the most successful applications of nanotechnology in pharmaceuticals(13). These systems encapsulate drugs within nanocarriers, protecting them from enzymatic degradation, improving solubility, and facilitating transport across biological barriers(14). Nanotechnology enables site-specific drug accumulation, reducing systemic toxicity and improving treatment efficacy, particularly in oncology, infectious diseases, and neurodegenerative disorders(15).

2.2. Advantages of Liposomal and Nanoparticulate Formulations

Liposomal and nanoparticulate drug delivery systems offer several advantages over conventional formulations(16). These include improved pharmacokinetics, prolonged circulation time, and reduced immunogenicity(17). Liposomes enhance drug solubility and stability, while nanoparticles improve targeted drug release, minimizing off-target effects(18). Additionally, both systems help overcome multidrug resistance by enabling intracellular drug delivery, making them highly beneficial for cancer therapy and antimicrobial treatments(19).

2.3. Examples of FDA-Approved Complex Generic Products

Several liposomal and nanoparticulate drug formulations have received FDA approval as complex generics. Notable examples include Liposomal Doxorubicin (generic for Doxil®) for cancer treatment and Amphotericin B Liposome (generic for AmBisome®) for fungal infections(20). Additionally, Budesonide Nanoparticles (generic for Pulmicort Respules®) have been approved for respiratory conditions(21). These approvals demonstrate the regulatory challenges and scientific rigor required for developing complex generics(22).

3. Regulatory Importance and Challenges

3.1. The Role of Regulatory Agencies (FDA, EMA, ICH)

Regulatory agencies such as the U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA), the European Medicines Agency (EMA), and the International Council for Harmonisation of Technical Requirements for Pharmaceuticals for Human Use (ICH) play a crucial role in ensuring the safety, efficacy, and quality of complex generic drug products(23). The FDA provides Product-Specific Guidelines (PSGs) for complex generics, outlining the necessary bioequivalence (BE) and characterization studies(24). The EMA's Committee for Medicinal Products for Human Use (CHMP) establishes scientific guidelines for evaluating nanomedicines and liposomal formulations(25). Meanwhile, the ICH harmonizes global regulatory standards, facilitating consistent approval processes across different regions(26). These agencies require

extensive comparative analytical, in vitro, and in vivo studies to ensure that complex generics maintain therapeutic equivalence with their reference-listed drugs (RLDs)(24).

3.2. Why Complex Generics Require a Different Regulatory Approach

Unlike traditional small-molecule generics, complex generics involve intricate formulations, unique delivery mechanisms, and structural complexities that make conventional BE studies insufficient(2, 3). Traditional generics typically demonstrate BE through pharmacokinetic (PK) studies, but complex generics often require additional characterization, including physicochemical analysis, in vitro release studies, immunogenicity assessments, and sometimes comparative clinical trials(27). Liposomal and nanoparticulate drug products pose challenges in maintaining batch-to-batch consistency, stability, and performance equivalence, necessitating stringent regulatory scrutiny(28). Additionally, manufacturing processes play a critical role in determining the final product's quality, further complicating regulatory approval(29).

3.3. Purpose and Scope of the Review

This review aims to provide a comprehensive analysis of the regulatory challenges faced in the approval of complex generics, with a specific focus on liposomal and nanoparticulate drug products. It will explore current regulatory pathways, bioequivalence assessment methodologies, and critical quality attributes (CQAs) required for regulatory approval. The review will also highlight key differences in global regulatory frameworks, case studies of successful approvals, and areas for future improvements. By addressing these challenges, this article will offer insights for pharmaceutical scientists, regulatory professionals, and policymakers involved in the development and approval of complex generics.

4. Regulatory Landscape for Complex Generics

4.1. Key Regulatory Agencies and Guidelines

4.1.1. FDA (Office of Generic Drugs, Product-Specific Guidelines)

The U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) plays a pivotal role in regulating complex generics through the Office of Generic Drugs (OGD) under the Center for Drug Evaluation and Research (CDER)(2). The FDA issues Product-Specific Guidelines (PSGs) to help pharmaceutical manufacturers design appropriate bioequivalence (BE) studies for complex generics(1, 2). These guidelines outline physicochemical characterization, in vitro and in vivo BE studies, and immunogenicity assessments where necessary(30). The FDA's 505(j) Abbreviated New Drug Application (ANDA) pathway is applicable for complex generics, but additional comparative testing may be required to demonstrate sameness with the reference-listed drug (RLD)(31).

4.1.2. EMA (European Medicines Agency)

The European Medicines Agency (EMA) oversees the approval of complex generics within the European Union(32). Unlike the FDA, the EMA often requires comparative clinical studies in addition to in vitro and in vivo BE testing for certain complex formulations. The Committee for Medicinal Products for Human Use (CHMP) provides scientific guidance on liposomal and nanoparticulate formulations, focusing on critical quality attributes (CQAs), stability, and formulation equivalence(33, 34).

4.1.3. WHO and ICH Guidelines

The World Health Organization (WHO) provides global guidance for generic drug approvals, emphasizing bioequivalence and quality assurance in resource-limited settings. The International Council for Harmonisation (ICH) harmonizes regulatory standards across regions, ensuring consistent requirements for analytical testing, manufacturing processes, and risk assessment for complex generics(35). ICH guidelines such as ICH Q6B (Specifications for Biotechnological Products) and ICH M9 (Biopharmaceutics Classification System-based Biowaivers) are critical in evaluating nanoparticulate formulations(26).

5. Definition and Classification of Complex Generics

5.1.1. Drug Products Classified as Complex Generics

Complex generics are pharmaceutical products that exhibit structural, formulation, or delivery complexities that make standard bioequivalence (BE) assessment challenging(3). These products often have sophisticated drug delivery

mechanisms, complex active pharmaceutical ingredients (APIs), or specialized formulations that require advanced characterization techniques(36). The FDA defines complex generics as drugs that contain complex mixtures, peptide-based APIs, non-oral routes of administration, or complex dosage forms like liposomes and nanoparticles(37). Unlike traditional generics, which primarily require PK studies for approval, complex generics often necessitate comparative analytical characterization, in vitro release studies, and, in some cases, comparative clinical trials to establish equivalence with the reference-listed drug (RLD)(2).

5.1.2. Categories: Liposomes, Nanoparticles, Micelles, Polymeric Systems

Liposomes: Spherical vesicles with lipid bilayers that encapsulate drugs, enhancing solubility and targeted delivery (e.g., liposomal doxorubicin).

Nanoparticles: Nano-sized carriers designed for controlled drug release and enhanced bioavailability (e.g., albumin-bound paclitaxel).

Micelles: Amphiphilic molecules that self-assemble into nanostructures, used for solubilizing hydrophobic drugs (e.g., micellar paclitaxel formulations).

Polymeric Systems: Drug-loaded biodegradable polymers that offer sustained or targeted release (e.g., PLGA-based formulations).

6. Differences Between Small-Molecule Generics and Complex Generics

6.1. Bioequivalence Requirements

For small-molecule generics, bioequivalence (BE) is typically established through pharmacokinetic (PK) studies, comparing the generic drug's maximum concentration (Cmax) and area under the curve (AUC) with the reference-listed drug (RLD)(38). These studies are straightforward because small molecules exhibit predictable absorption, distribution, metabolism, and excretion (ADME) properties. However, complex generics require additional or alternative BE approaches due to their intricate formulations, delivery mechanisms, and physicochemical properties(39). In many cases, PK studies alone are insufficient, and in vitro release studies, physiologically based pharmacokinetic (PBPK) modeling, or even comparative clinical trials are required(40).

6.2. Additional Characterization Needed for Complex Generics

Unlike small molecules, complex generics require extensive analytical characterization to demonstrate pharmaceutical equivalence(6). Techniques such as dynamic light scattering (DLS), differential scanning calorimetry (DSC), zeta potential analysis, and electron microscopy are used to assess particle size, surface charge, encapsulation efficiency, and stability. Additionally, drug release kinetics, immunogenicity potential, and batch-to-batch consistency must be evaluated, making the approval process more challenging(41).

6.3. Challenges in Demonstrating Sameness

Complex generics must match the RLD in terms of composition, structural attributes, and therapeutic performance. However, even minor variations in liposomal bilayer composition, nanoparticle size, or excipient selection can significantly impact drug behavior(42). Manufacturing processes are critical, as slight differences in techniques like high-pressure homogenization or solvent evaporation can alter drug release profiles. Regulatory agencies often require comparative in vitro, in vivo, and, in some cases, clinical studies to confirm therapeutic equivalence, making the pathway to approval more rigorous than for traditional generics(43).

7. Liposomal Drug Products: Regulatory Challenges and Strategies

7.1. Regulatory Pathways for Liposomal Generics

7.1.1. FDA Guidance on Liposomal Drug Products

The FDA has established specific regulatory guidelines for liposomal drug products to ensure their safety, efficacy, and quality(44). The Product-Specific Guidelines (PSGs) provide a framework for demonstrating bioequivalence (BE) and pharmaceutical equivalence to the reference-listed drug (RLD)(3, 45). The FDA's guidance emphasizes the need for extensive physicochemical characterization, in vitro release testing, and in vivo studies where necessary. Since

liposomes influence drug distribution, stability, and release, manufacturers must provide detailed data on particle size, bilayer composition, surface charge, and encapsulation efficiency to gain regulatory approval.

7.1.2. Establishing Q1 (Qualitative) and Q2 (Quantitative) Sameness

To be considered bioequivalent to the RLD, a liposomal generic must demonstrate Q1 (qualitative) and Q2 (quantitative) sameness. Q1 sameness requires that the generic and reference drug contain the same active pharmaceutical ingredient (API) and excipients(24). Q2 sameness mandates that these components be present in the same concentrations. Minor variations in liposome composition can alter drug release, stability, and biodistribution, making Q1/Q2 sameness critical for regulatory approval(1).

7.1.3. Requirements for In Vitro and In Vivo Testing

Since traditional pharmacokinetic (PK) studies are insufficient for liposomal formulations, regulatory agencies mandate comprehensive in vitro and in vivo testing(46). In vitro studies include particle size analysis, zeta potential measurement, drug release kinetics, and stability testing. In vivo studies, such as comparative PK assessments or biodistribution studies, are required when in vitro methods cannot fully establish equivalence(47). Additionally, the retention and clearance profiles of liposomal drugs must be evaluated due to their extended circulation times and potential for altered organ accumulation(48).

8. Challenges in Bioequivalence (BE) Demonstration

8.1. Differences in Formulation Affecting Pharmacokinetics

Bioequivalence studies aim to show that two drug products—typically a brand-name and a generic—produce similar concentrations of the active ingredient in the bloodstream over time(49). However, differences in formulation between the two, such as excipients, particle size, or the release mechanism, can influence the drug's pharmacokinetics (PK)(50). For instance, variations in the dissolution rate or stability of the drug in the formulation may lead to differences in absorption, leading to discrepancies in the onset, peak concentration, or duration of effect(51). These pharmacokinetic differences may result in significant variations in the drug's efficacy and safety profile, even if the active ingredient is the same(52). Regulatory bodies often require a range of studies, including in-vitro and in-vivo analyses, to ensure formulations exhibit comparable pharmacokinetic profiles, which can be challenging for complex formulations like sustained-release or liposomal drugs(53).

8.2. Difficulty in Demonstrating Therapeutic Equivalence

Therapeutic equivalence refers to the clinical comparability of two products in terms of efficacy, safety, and expected clinical outcomes(54). While bioequivalence focuses on the pharmacokinetic aspects, demonstrating therapeutic equivalence can be more complicated. Variations in excipients, manufacturing processes, and minor differences in the formulation may not significantly impact the drug's pharmacokinetic profile but could affect its pharmacodynamic properties or clinical outcomes(55). This becomes especially evident with narrow therapeutic index (NTI) drugs or products that have complex pharmacodynamics. Regulatory agencies may require additional clinical studies or post-marketing surveillance to demonstrate that a generic product will have the same therapeutic effect as the branded product in real-world conditions, which adds an extra layer of complexity in drug approval processes(56).

8.3. Need for Comparative Clinical Studies

While bioequivalence studies primarily focus on the drug's pharmacokinetics, comparative clinical studies are often necessary to demonstrate that the clinical effect of the generic product matches that of the reference product(57). This becomes crucial in the case of drugs with complex pharmacokinetics, drugs with delayed-release mechanisms, or those with a narrow therapeutic index(58). In some cases, regulatory authorities may require clinical efficacy trials to prove that the two formulations lead to equivalent therapeutic outcomes. This adds significant time, cost, and effort to the development process(59). For certain specialized formulations, like biologics or liposomal drugs, these clinical studies are essential to confirm that the product behaves similarly in terms of both safety and effectiveness, making the approval process more intricate and resource-intensive(60).

9. Analytical and Characterization Requirements

9.1. Particle Size Distribution, Surface Charge, Encapsulation Efficiency

Characterizing nanoparticulate drug delivery systems requires a detailed analysis of several critical parameters. Particle size distribution is crucial, as it impacts the drug's bioavailability, release rate, and cellular uptake(61). A narrow size distribution is often desired for consistent drug delivery. Surface charge (zeta potential) influences the stability of nanoparticles in suspension and can affect interactions with cell membranes, which is vital for targeted drug delivery(62). Encapsulation efficiency measures the proportion of the drug successfully loaded into the nanoparticles compared to the total drug used, which directly impacts the therapeutic efficacy and the controlled release of the drug(63). Together, these parameters help ensure the formulation's stability, performance, and predictability, making them essential for regulatory approval(36).

9.2. Release Kinetics, Sterility, and Stability Studies

Release kinetics studies are critical to understanding how the drug is released from the formulation over time(64). These studies help establish the drug's release profile, whether it follows zero-order, first-order, or other kinetics, which influences its therapeutic effectiveness(64). Sterility testing is essential for ensuring that drug formulations, especially those for injection or inhalation, are free from microbial contamination, as this can lead to severe patient safety issues(65). Stability studies assess how the formulation's quality, potency, and safety evolve over time under various storage conditions, such as temperature, humidity, and light exposure. Stability data is critical for determining the shelf-life of the product and for regulatory approval, ensuring the formulation remains safe and effective for patient use during its marketed lifespan(66, 67).

9.3. Use of Advanced Techniques (DLS, TEM, HPLC, Cryo-EM)

Advanced techniques are essential for the in-depth characterization of drug delivery systems. Dynamic Light Scattering (DLS) is commonly used to measure the size, size distribution, and zeta potential of nanoparticles in suspension(68). Transmission Electron Microscopy (TEM) provides high-resolution imaging to observe the morphology and structure of nanoparticles at the nanometer scale, aiding in the design of formulations with optimized properties(69). High-Performance Liquid Chromatography (HPLC) is widely used for quantitative analysis of the encapsulated drug, its release profile, and impurities, ensuring the formulation's purity and potency(70). Cryo-Electron Microscopy (Cryo-EM) allows for the visualization of nanoscale structures in their native state without damaging the sample, providing insight into the formulation's architecture and stability(71). These advanced techniques provide comprehensive data, enabling researchers to refine formulations and ensure their performance aligns with regulatory standards and therapeutic goals(72).

10. Nanoparticulate Drug Products: Regulatory Considerations

10.1. Types of Nanoparticulate Formulations

Nanoparticulate drug formulations can be broadly categorized into polymeric nanoparticles, lipid-based nanoparticles, and nanosuspensions, each offering unique benefits and challenges in drug delivery.

- Polymeric Nanoparticles: These nanoparticles are made from biodegradable or biocompatible polymers like PLGA (poly(lactic-co-glycolic acid)) and are widely used for controlled and sustained drug release. They provide flexibility in drug release profiles and can be engineered for specific targeting to tissues or cells. However, their regulatory challenges include ensuring biocompatibility and degradation products that do not pose toxicological risks(73).
- Lipid-Based Nanoparticles: Comprising lipids or surfactants, these systems include liposomes, solid lipid nanoparticles (SLNs), and nanostructured lipid carriers (NLCs). They are advantageous for delivering lipophilic drugs and improving drug solubility and stability. Regulatory concerns often center around their stability, scalability, and safety profiles, especially for injectables(74).
- Nanosuspensions: These are colloidal dispersions of poorly water-soluble drugs, enhancing their solubility and bioavailability. Nanosuspensions are typically stabilized with surfactants, but their formulation stability and manufacturing processes require detailed regulatory scrutiny to prevent aggregation and ensure consistent quality(75).

10.2. Examples of Marketed Nanoparticulate Drug Products

Several nanoparticulate drug products have successfully transitioned to the market, demonstrating the potential of nanotechnology in drug delivery.

- Abraxane® (Paclitaxel albumin-bound nanoparticles): A marketed liposomal formulation, Abraxane offers enhanced solubility and improved therapeutic outcomes for breast cancer and other cancers. It demonstrates the use of nanoparticle-based formulations for overcoming drug solubility challenges(76).
- Doxil® (Doxorubicin liposome): This liposomal formulation encapsulates doxorubicin, a chemotherapy drug, to reduce toxicity and improve drug delivery to tumors, particularly in patients with breast cancer. The liposome enhances the drug's stability and controlled release, reducing side effects(77).
- Nanocrystals of Felodipine (Nanosuspension formulation): A marketed product that improves the bioavailability of the poorly soluble antihypertensive drug felodipine by reducing its particle size, allowing for faster dissolution and enhanced absorption in the body(77).

11. Regulatory Hurdles in Nanoparticulate Generics

11.1. Complexity in Ensuring Batch-to-Batch Consistency

Ensuring batch-to-batch consistency in nanoparticulate generics can be challenging due to the inherent complexity of manufacturing these formulations(41). Variability in the synthesis process, such as differences in the size, shape, surface charge, and encapsulation efficiency of nanoparticles, can lead to inconsistencies in the final product(78). Small deviations in these parameters can significantly impact the drug's pharmacokinetics, therapeutic effectiveness, and safety profile(79). Additionally, ensuring the stability and reproducibility of these formulations over time is essential, especially for lipid-based or polymeric nanoparticles that may undergo changes due to environmental conditions like temperature or pH(80). Regulatory agencies require rigorous testing and validation to ensure that every batch of a nanoparticulate product meets the same quality standards, which is often more difficult compared to conventional drug products(81).

11.2. Issues in Demonstrating Similarity to the Reference Product

Demonstrating similarity between a nanoparticulate generic and its reference product is challenging, as the complex nature of nanoparticles may result in differences that are difficult to assess using traditional bioequivalence methodologies(82). Unlike small molecule drugs, which can be compared based on simple pharmacokinetic parameters like Cmax and AUC, nanoparticulate formulations may require more extensive testing, including in-vitro release profiles, particle size distribution, and surface charge analysis(83). Even slight differences in formulation or manufacturing processes may lead to variations in the therapeutic effect, making it harder to establish clinical equivalence(84). This complicates the regulatory process, as agencies may require additional clinical trials to confirm that the generic formulation provides the same therapeutic benefit as the reference product, increasing development costs and time(85).

11.3. Lack of Standardized Regulatory Pathways for Nanoparticles

One of the most significant challenges in the regulation of nanoparticulate generics is the lack of standardized pathways and guidelines(28). Unlike traditional drug formulations, nanoparticles are more complex, requiring new approaches to safety, efficacy, and quality assessment(41). Regulatory bodies, such as the FDA and EMA, have yet to establish universally accepted frameworks for the approval of generic nanoparticulate drugs, leading to uncertainty in the approval process(3). The absence of standardized testing methods and criteria for demonstrating bioequivalence or therapeutic equivalence adds complexity for both manufacturers and regulators(86). While guidelines for nanomedicines are evolving, there is still no clear, uniform pathway that provides consistency across different types of nanoparticles, which creates barriers for the development of generic nanoparticulate products and delays their market entry(87).

12. Bioequivalence Challenges and Alternative Approaches

12.1. The Role of Physiologically Based Pharmacokinetic (PBPK) Modeling

Physiologically Based Pharmacokinetic (PBPK) modeling is an advanced approach used to simulate and predict the absorption, distribution, metabolism, and excretion (ADME) of drugs within the human body(40, 88). PBPK models incorporate physiological parameters, such as blood flow, organ sizes, and tissue characteristics, alongside drug-specific

properties, providing a detailed framework for predicting the pharmacokinetic behavior of a drug. In the context of bioequivalence, PBPK modeling can be particularly useful when traditional bioequivalence studies are challenging, such as for complex formulations like nanoparticulate drugs. By predicting how different formulations behave in the body, PBPK models can assist in evaluating whether a generic drug will exhibit similar pharmacokinetic profiles to the reference product. These models can help overcome the need for extensive clinical trials, offering a more cost-effective and efficient alternative to establishing bioequivalence in some cases(89, 90).

12.2. Surrogate Markers for *In Vitro–In Vivo Correlation* (IVIVC)

In Vitro–In Vivo Correlation (*IVIVC*) is a critical tool for assessing the relationship between *in-vitro* drug release profiles and *in-vivo* pharmacokinetic data(91). Surrogate markers are used to predict the *in-vivo* behavior of a drug based on in-vitro tests, which can be particularly helpful when clinical studies are difficult to conduct(92). Surrogate markers, such as dissolution rates, permeability, and enzyme activity, can act as predictors for drug absorption and bioavailability, thus aiding in the assessment of bioequivalence(93). This is especially useful for drugs with complex release mechanisms or in cases where conducting clinical trials is not feasible or ethical(94). A strong *IVIVC* can reduce the need for in vivo studies, making the development of generics faster and more cost-effective. However, the challenge lies in developing accurate surrogate markers that reliably predict clinical outcomes, as incorrect assumptions can lead to regulatory delays or rejections.

12.3. Case Studies of Regulatory Approvals and Rejections

Case studies of regulatory approvals and rejections provide valuable insights into the challenges of establishing bioequivalence for complex drug formulations. One example is the approval of Abraxane®, a nanoparticle albumin-bound paclitaxel formulation, which involved rigorous bioequivalence studies and extensive regulatory review(95, 96). Despite the complexity of its formulation, the drug was approved after demonstrating similar pharmacokinetics and efficacy compared to its reference product, Taxol®(97). On the other hand, Biosimilar Enbrel® (Etanercept) faced regulatory rejection in some regions due to issues with demonstrating equivalence in immunogenicity and clinical outcomes despite similar pharmacokinetics. These case studies highlight the importance of a comprehensive evaluation of pharmacokinetic data, clinical efficacy, and patient safety in securing regulatory approval for complex drugs, especially nanoparticulate or biologic formulations, where bioequivalence may not be easily established through traditional methods(98).

13. Quality Control and Manufacturing Challenges

13.1. Critical Quality Attributes (CQAs) for Complex Generics

- **Identification of Key CQAs for Liposomes and Nanoparticles:** For complex generics, ensuring consistent quality is crucial, and CQAs are the critical attributes that must be controlled. In liposomes, key CQAs include size, size distribution, surface charge (zeta potential), encapsulation efficiency, drug release profiles, and stability. Similarly, for nanoparticles, the particle size, surface area, and morphology are important to ensure uniform drug release and proper pharmacokinetic behaviour. The CQA determination is essential for maintaining the therapeutic equivalence of generic formulations to the reference product. Any variation in these CQAs can lead to different clinical outcomes or potential safety issues, necessitating careful monitoring and control during manufacturing(99).
- **Role of Process Parameters in Ensuring Product Consistency:** Process parameters, such as temperature, shear force, and pH, significantly influence the final product's quality. Maintaining consistent process conditions is essential for achieving the desired particle size, drug encapsulation, and stability. Variability in manufacturing processes can lead to batch-to-batch differences, affecting the CQAs and ultimately compromising the therapeutic efficacy and safety of the product(100). Therefore, controlling these parameters is critical for ensuring that the generic product performs equivalently to the reference product(99).

13.2. Regulatory Expectations for Manufacturing and Scale-Up

- **Process Control and Validation Challenges:** Regulatory bodies expect robust process control and validation to ensure product consistency and quality across all batches. Challenges arise when scaling up manufacturing processes for complex generics, such as liposomes or nanoparticles, from small laboratory batches to full-scale production. Small changes in production parameters, such as mixing time or temperature, can significantly affect product characteristics, leading to potential quality control issues. As such, stringent validation and real-time monitoring during scale-up are necessary to demonstrate that the process remains consistent and reproducible across all production scales(101).

- **Requirements for Technology Transfer:** Technology transfer from the development phase to large-scale manufacturing is another key regulatory challenge. It involves transferring all relevant knowledge, processes, and controls to the manufacturing site. Regulatory agencies require detailed documentation and validation of each step in the transfer process, including the equipment, process parameters, and raw materials. If the technology transfer process is not properly managed, it can lead to product inconsistencies, regulatory delays, or even rejection. The process must demonstrate that the scale-up does not affect the product's CQAs and that the final product meets the required quality standards(102).

13.3. Risk Assessment and Regulatory Compliance

Risk assessment is a critical aspect of ensuring regulatory compliance during the development and manufacturing of complex generics(103). Regulatory agencies expect manufacturers to conduct comprehensive risk assessments to identify potential hazards and evaluate the likelihood of these risks impacting the final product's safety, quality, and efficacy. This includes evaluating risks associated with raw materials, formulation, manufacturing processes, and packaging. Implementing risk management strategies such as Failure Mode and Effects Analysis (FMEA) or Process Analytical Technology (PAT) can help identify potential issues early in the development process(104). Regulatory agencies typically require detailed risk assessments to demonstrate proactive efforts to mitigate risks, ensuring the product meets the required safety and efficacy standards. Non-compliance with these expectations can lead to delays in approval, regulatory rejections, or recalls(105).

14. Comparative Case Studies: Approved vs. Rejected Complex Generics

14.1. Analysis of Approved Complex Generics and Their Regulatory Pathways

Approved complex generics, such as Abraxane® (albumin-bound paclitaxel) and Doxil® (liposomal doxorubicin), underwent rigorous bioequivalence and clinical trials to demonstrate their safety, efficacy, and therapeutic equivalence to the reference products. The regulatory pathways for these generics typically involved in-depth characterization of the nanoparticulate formulations, demonstrating comparable pharmacokinetic profiles, drug release rates, and therapeutic outcomes. Regulatory bodies such as the FDA and EMA assessed detailed data from preclinical studies, in-vitro release studies, and human clinical trials to confirm the generic's performance. The approval of these products was contingent on the successful establishment of bioequivalence, as well as the use of advanced techniques like PBPK modeling or in-vitro–in-vivo correlation (IVIVC) to support regulatory submissions(39).

14.2. Key Reasons for Rejection and Lessons Learned

Rejected complex generics, such as certain biosimilars and liposomal formulations, often faced hurdles in demonstrating equivalence to the reference product in terms of safety, efficacy, or product stability. In some cases, differences in the manufacturing process or formulation led to variability in critical quality attributes, such as particle size, encapsulation efficiency, or release profile. This made it challenging to prove bioequivalence or therapeutic equivalence. For instance, Biosimilars of Humira® were rejected in some markets due to issues with demonstrating consistent immunogenicity profiles or similar efficacy. The key lessons from these rejections include the importance of strict process control, in-depth characterization, and comprehensive clinical data to demonstrate equivalence. Regulatory agencies are increasingly demanding more robust data to support complex generic submissions, including additional clinical trials and advanced analytical techniques, to ensure that generics meet the high standards set by reference products(106).

15. Future Perspectives and Emerging Regulatory Trends

15.1. Advances in Characterization Techniques for Regulatory Approval

- **Role of AI and Machine Learning in Regulatory Decision-Making:** Artificial intelligence (AI) and machine learning (ML) are poised to revolutionize regulatory decision-making by enabling faster and more accurate analyses of large data sets, such as those generated during clinical trials and product testing(107). These technologies can identify patterns and predict outcomes more efficiently than traditional methods, helping regulatory agencies assess the safety, efficacy, and quality of complex generics. For instance, AI algorithms could be used to predict pharmacokinetic profiles or assess in-vitro–in-vivo correlations, streamlining the evaluation process. AI can also improve post-market surveillance by identifying potential safety issues or inefficiencies in drug formulations based on real-world data. By incorporating AI and ML, regulators can enhance their decision-

making speed and precision, potentially reducing approval timelines and improving product safety monitoring(108).

- **Development of Next-Generation Analytical Tools:** The development of advanced analytical tools, such as high-resolution mass spectrometry, single-particle tracking, and cryo-electron microscopy, is critical to improving the characterization of complex generics(109). These tools enable a more accurate and detailed understanding of nanoparticulate drug formulations, allowing for precise identification of critical quality attributes like particle size, surface characteristics, and drug loading. Next-generation analytical tools will enable manufacturers to better control product quality and consistency, which will be increasingly important as the pharmaceutical industry moves toward more personalized medicine and complex generics. These tools will also facilitate more robust and reliable in-vitro–in-vivo correlation studies, aiding regulatory approval by providing comprehensive data to support bioequivalence and therapeutic equivalence claims(110).

15.2. Potential Revisions in Regulatory Guidelines

- **FDA and EMA Efforts to Streamline Complex Generic Approvals:** Both the FDA and the EMA are working on revising and streamlining the approval pathways for complex generics, including nanoparticulate and biologic formulations. The FDA's Generic Drug User Fee Amendments (GDUFA) and the Biologics Control Act are examples of initiatives aimed at expediting the approval process for complex generics while ensuring rigorous safety and efficacy standards. These agencies are increasingly recognizing the need for advanced modeling techniques (such as PBPK) and real-world evidence to support regulatory submissions. The revisions may include more flexible frameworks that incorporate cutting-edge technologies like AI for risk assessments and bioequivalence determinations. This evolving regulatory approach aims to strike a balance between ensuring product quality and speeding up market access for generics, which will benefit both patients and the industry(2).
- **Role of Global Harmonization Efforts:** Global harmonization efforts, spearheaded by organizations like the International Council for Harmonisation (ICH) and the World Health Organization (WHO), are essential for ensuring that complex generics meet consistent standards across various markets. By aligning regulatory requirements for generic drugs, these efforts will help reduce discrepancies in approval processes, facilitating smoother market entry for generics worldwide. Harmonization will also encourage collaboration among regulatory bodies, ensuring that manufacturers can navigate multiple markets more efficiently. The focus will be on harmonizing guidelines for bioequivalence, safety testing, and clinical trial requirements, which will ultimately streamline the approval process for complex generics. Global harmonization is critical for reducing regulatory barriers, ensuring drug availability, and fostering innovation(111).

15.3. Opportunities for Industry and Academia Collaboration

- **Strategies for Reducing Regulatory Burden:** Industry and academia collaboration can play a crucial role in reducing the regulatory burden associated with complex generics. By working together on research and development, both sectors can create more efficient methods for demonstrating bioequivalence and ensuring product quality. Academic research can provide valuable insights into the latest scientific advances, while the industry can apply these innovations in real-world settings(112). Collaborative efforts can focus on developing standardized testing protocols, improving manufacturing processes, and utilizing advanced technologies, such as AI and automation, to streamline regulatory submissions. These efforts will help minimize delays in the approval process and reduce the cost and time associated with complex generic drug development(113).
- **Future Innovations in Complex Generics Development:** The future of complex generics lies in innovation driven by collaboration between industry and academia. New drug delivery technologies, such as targeted nanoparticles or RNA-based therapeutics, have the potential to redefine treatment paradigms. Industry-academia partnerships can accelerate the translation of these innovations into scalable, market-ready products. Additionally, advancements in precision medicine, personalized formulations, and digital therapeutics will further drive the development of complex generics(114, 115). As regulatory agencies evolve their guidelines to accommodate these innovations, collaborative efforts will help ensure that new generics meet high-quality standards while offering enhanced therapeutic outcomes. These partnerships will also help overcome regulatory challenges, ultimately improving patient access to affordable, cutting-edge treatments.

16. Conclusion

The approval and commercialization of complex generics, particularly liposomal and nanoparticulate formulations, remain significantly more challenging than conventional generics due to their structural and functional intricacies. Regulatory agencies worldwide have established stringent guidelines to ensure quality, safety, and therapeutic

equivalence; however, variability in global regulatory expectations creates additional hurdles for manufacturers. Demonstrating bioequivalence, ensuring manufacturing consistency, and addressing formulation variability require a multifaceted approach involving advanced characterization techniques, alternative bioequivalence methodologies, and computational modeling. The incorporation of AI and machine learning is poised to streamline regulatory decision-making, enhancing efficiency in data analysis and predictive modeling. Furthermore, collaborative efforts between industry and academia can foster innovation in complex generics while refining regulatory pathways. Harmonizing international regulatory frameworks will be key to simplifying approval processes and ensuring timely access to cost-effective complex generic alternatives. As technology advances, the pharmaceutical industry must adapt to emerging trends in nanotechnology, personalized medicine, and digital therapeutics to meet the growing demand for innovative, high-quality drug products. Addressing these regulatory challenges will ultimately improve patient access to advanced therapies, enhance treatment outcomes, and drive progress in pharmaceutical sciences.

Compliance with ethical standards

Acknowledgments

Authors are extremely thankful to Raghavendra Institute of Pharmaceutical Education and Research, Anantapur, Andhra Pradesh-India.

Disclosure of conflict of interest

The authors do not have any conflict of interest.

References

[1] Shaikh R, Yadav K, Thummar K, Maheriya B, Chauhan S. Development of complex generics: Insights into trends, challenges, and market opportunities. Journal of Generic Medicines. 2025:17411343251313962.

[2] Sreedevi A, Musmade PB, Bhat K, Dharmagadda S, Janodia MD, Bhat BB, Ligade VS. A deep dive into the development of complex generics: A comprehensive review. Journal of Applied Pharmaceutical Science. 2024;14(10):001-14.

[3] Patil S, Kumar S, Rao DM, Rewatkar K. Current Regulatory Framework and Challenges for the Approval of Complex Generics in the US and the EU. Current Indian Science. 2024;2(1):E2210299X269535.

[4] Shargel L, Kanfer I. 1 Generic Drug Product Development and Therapeutic Equivalence. Generic Drug Product Development: Solid Oral Dosage Forms. 2013:1.

[5] Marques L, Costa B, Pereira M, Silva A, Santos J, Saldanha L, et al. Advancing precision medicine: A review of innovative In Silico approaches for drug development, clinical pharmacology and personalized healthcare. Pharmaceutics. 2024;16(3):332.

[6] Schellekens H, Klinger E, Mühlebach S, Brin J-F, Storm G, Crommelin DJ. The therapeutic equivalence of complex drugs. Regulatory Toxicology and Pharmacology. 2011;59(1):176-83.

[7] Nation RL, Sansom LN. Bioequivalence requirements for generic products. Pharmacology & therapeutics. 1994;62(1-2):41-55.

[8] Al-Worafi YM. Generic Medicines Policy in Developing Countries. Handbook of Medical and Health Sciences in Developing Countries: Education, Practice, and Research: Springer; 2024. p. 1-35.

[9] Yetisgin AA, Cetinel S, Zuvin M, Kosar A, Kutlu O. Therapeutic nanoparticles and their targeted delivery applications. Molecules. 2020;25(9):2193.

[10] Colenzo A. The Lack of Generic Medications for Those with Rare Diseases; Brand Names or Death? Quality of Life Vs. Quantity of Life: Northcentral University; 2020.

[11] Chatterjee P, Dhibar S. Nanomaterial marvels: Pioneering applications and cutting-edge advancements in drug delivery. Nano and Medical Materials. 2023;3(2):220.

[12] Emeihe EV, Nwankwo EI, Ajegbile MD, Olaboye JA, Maha CC. Revolutionizing drug delivery systems: Nanotechnology-based approaches for targeted therapy. International Journal of Life Science Research Archive. 2024;7(1):040-58.

[13] Rizvi SA, Saleh AM. Applications of nanoparticle systems in drug delivery technology. Saudi pharmaceutical journal. 2018;26(1):64-70.

[14] Waheed S, Li Z, Zhang F, Chiarini A, Armato U, Wu J. Engineering nano-drug biointerface to overcome biological barriers toward precision drug delivery. Journal of Nanobiotechnology. 2022;20(1):395.

[15] Singh AP, Biswas A, Shukla A, Maiti P. Targeted therapy in chronic diseases using nanomaterial-based drug delivery vehicles. Signal transduction and targeted therapy. 2019;4(1):33.

[16] Thassu D, Pathak Y, Deleers M. Nanoparticulate drug-delivery systems: an overview. Nanoparticulate drug delivery systems. 2007:1-31.

[17] Chirmule N, Jawa V, Meibohm B. Immunogenicity to therapeutic proteins: impact on PK/PD and efficacy. The AAPS journal. 2012;14:296-302.

[18] Wang S, Chen Y, Guo J, Huang Q. Liposomes for tumor targeted therapy: a review. International journal of molecular sciences. 2023;24(3):2643.

[19] Pham TN, Loupias P, Dassonville-Klimpt A, Sonnet P. Drug delivery systems designed to overcome antimicrobial resistance. Medicinal research reviews. 2019;39(6):2343-96.

[20] Larabi M. NOPARTICLE THERAPY. Nanotherapeutics: Drug Delivery Concepts in Nanoscience. 2016:227.

[21] Amini MA, Faramarzi MA, Gilani K, Moazeni E, Esmaeilzadeh-Gharehdaghi E, Amani A. Production, characterisation, and in vitro nebulisation performance of budesonide-loaded PLA nanoparticles. Journal of Microencapsulation. 2014;31(5):422-9.

[22] Welage LS, Kirking DM, Ascione FJ, Gaither CA. Understanding the scientific issues embedded in the generic drug approval process. Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association (1996). 2001;41(6):856-67.

[23] Rahi S, Rana A. Role of ICH guidelines in registration of Pharmaceutical Products. International Journal of Drug Regulatory Affairs. 2019;7(4):14-27.

[24] Lourenço D, Miranda M, Sousa JJ, Vitorino C. Therapeutic-driven framework for bioequivalence assessment of complex topical generic drug products. International Journal of Pharmaceutics. 2024;661:124398.

[25] Demetzos C, Demetzos C. Regulatory framework for nanomedicines. Pharmaceutical Nanotechnology: Fundamentals and Practical Applications. 2016:189-203.

[26] Ojha A, Bhargava S. International council for harmonisation (ICH) guidelines. Regulatory affairs in the pharmaceutical industry: Elsevier; 2022. p. 47-74.

[27] Zagalo DM, Simões S, Sousa J. Regulatory science approach in pharmaceutical development of follow-on versions of non-biological complex drug products. Journal of Pharmaceutical Sciences. 2022;111(10):2687-713.

[28] Lousa IR. Pharmaceutical Regulation of Nanomedicines: Principles and Challenges: Universidade de Lisboa (Portugal); 2024.

[29] Rawal M, Singh A, Amiji MM. Quality-by-design concepts to improve nanotechnology-based drug development. Pharmaceutical research. 2019;36(11):153.

[30] Dey AK, Malyala P, Singh M. Physicochemical and functional characterization of vaccine antigens and adjuvants. Expert review of vaccines. 2014;13(5):671-85.

[31] PARASRAMPURIA S, SERTKAYA A, LORD A, BERGER C. COST OF GENERIC DRUG DEVELOPMENT AND APPROVAL FINAL. 2021.

[32] Haubenreisser S, Martin H-A. The European Medicines Agency and the Regulation of Medicines in the European Union. Food and Drug Regulation in an Era of Globalized Markets: Elsevier; 2015. p. 25-36.

[33] Dias AL, Ferreira NN, Ferreira LMB, Pedreiro LN, dos Santos AM, Gremião MPD. Regulation of nanotechnology-based products subject to health regulations: application of Quality by Design (QbD) and Quality Risk Management (QRM). Nanocarriers for drug delivery: concepts and applications. 2021:319-47.

[34] Csóka I, Ismail R, Jójárt-Laczkovich O, Pallagi E. Regulatory considerations, challenges and risk-based approach in nanomedicine development. Current Medicinal Chemistry. 2021;28(36):7461-76.

[35] Hock SC, Kian SM, Wah CL. Global challenges in the manufacture, regulation and international harmonization of GMP and quality standards for biopharmaceuticals. Generics and Biosimilars Initiative Journal. 2020;9(2):52-64.

[36] Vora LK, Gholap AD, Jetha K, Thakur RRS, Solanki HK, Chavda VP. Artificial intelligence in pharmaceutical technology and drug delivery design. Pharmaceutics. 2023;15(7):1916.

[37] Kumar S, Sanap SN, Vasoya M, Handa M, Pandey P, Khopade A, Sawant KK. USFDA-approved parenteral peptide formulations and excipients: Industrial perspective. Journal of Drug Delivery Science and Technology. 2024:105589.

[38] Newman B, Babiskin A, Bielski E, Boc S, Dhapare S, Fang L, et al. Scientific and regulatory activities initiated by the US food and drug administration to foster approvals of generic dry powder inhalers: bioequivalence perspective. Advanced Drug Delivery Reviews. 2022;190:114526.

[39] Zheng N, Sun DD, Zou P, Jiang W. Scientific and regulatory considerations for generic complex drug products containing nanomaterials. The AAPS journal. 2017;19:619-31.

[40] Espié P, Tytgat D, Sargentini-Maier M-L, Poggesi I, Watelet J-B. Physiologically based pharmacokinetics (PBPK). Drug metabolism reviews. 2009;41(3):391-407.

[41] Desai N. Challenges in development of nanoparticle-based therapeutics. The AAPS journal. 2012;14(2):282-95.

[42] Raychaudhuri R, Pandey A, Hegde A, Abdul Fayaz SM, Chellappan DK, Dua K, Mutalik S. Factors affecting the morphology of some organic and inorganic nanostructures for drug delivery: characterization, modifications, and toxicological perspectives. Expert opinion on drug delivery. 2020;17(12):1737-65.

[43] Jain S, Cherukupalli SK, Mahmood A, Gorantla S, Rapalli VK, Dubey SK, Singhvi G. Emerging nanoparticulate systems: Preparation techniques and stimuli responsive release characteristics. Journal of Applied Pharmaceutical Science. 2019;9(8):130-43.

[44] Liu P, Chen G, Zhang J. A review of liposomes as a drug delivery system: current status of approved products, regulatory environments, and future perspectives. Molecules. 2022;27(4):1372.

[45] Liu Y-H, Chen Y-S, Tseng T, Jiang M-L, Gau C-S, Chang L-C. Regulatory considerations for generic products of non-biological complex drugs. Journal of Food and Drug Analysis. 2023;31(1):20.

[46] Schlich M, Musazzi UM, Campani V, Biondi M, Franzé S, Lai F, et al. Design and development of topical liposomal formulations in a regulatory perspective. Drug Delivery and Translational Research. 2022:1-18.

[47] Neubert H, Fountain S, King L, Clark T, Weng Y, O 'Hara DM, et al. Tissue bioanalysis of biotherapeutics and drug targets to support PK/PD. Bioanalysis. 2012;4(21):2589-604.

[48] Gabizon AA. Liposome circulation time and tumor targeting: implications for cancer chemotherapy. Advanced drug delivery reviews. 1995;16(2-3):285-94.

[49] Jalali RK, Rasaily D. Generic drug and bioequivalence studies. Pharmaceutical medicine and translational clinical research: Elsevier; 2018. p. 327-39.

[50] Pilcer G, Amighi K. Formulation strategy and use of excipients in pulmonary drug delivery. International journal of pharmaceutics. 2010;392(1-2):1-19.

[51] Davies NM, Takemoto JK, Brocks DR, Yáñez JA. Multiple peaking phenomena in pharmacokinetic disposition. Clinical pharmacokinetics. 2010;49:351-77.

[52] Toutain P-L, Ferran A, Bousquet-Mélou A. Species differences in pharmacokinetics and pharmacodynamics. Comparative and veterinary pharmacology. 2010:19-48.

[53] Zylberberg C, Matosevic S. Pharmaceutical liposomal drug delivery: a review of new delivery systems and a look at the regulatory landscape. Drug delivery. 2016;23(9):3319-29.

[54] McKinnon RA, Cook M, Liauw W, Marabani M, Marschner IC, Packer NH, Prins JB. Biosimilarity and interchangeability: principles and evidence: a systematic review. BioDrugs. 2018;32:27-52.

[55] Chen M-L. Lipid excipients and delivery systems for pharmaceutical development: a regulatory perspective. Advanced drug delivery reviews. 2008;60(6):768-77.

[56] Donnelly M, Fang L, Madabushi R, Zhu H, Luke M, Canterbury C, et al. Narrow Therapeutic Index Drugs: FDA Experience, Views, and Operations. Clinical Pharmacology & Therapeutics. 2025;117(1):116-29.

[57] Kesselheim AS, Misono AS, Lee JL, Stedman MR, Brookhart MA, Choudhry NK, Shrank WH. Clinical equivalence of generic and brand-name drugs used in cardiovascular disease: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Jama. 2008;300(21):2514-26.

[58] Wen H, Jung H, Li X. Drug delivery approaches in addressing clinical pharmacology-related issues: opportunities and challenges. The AAPS journal. 2015;17:1327-40.

[59] Gaspar R, Duncan R. Polymeric carriers: preclinical safety and the regulatory implications for design and development of polymer therapeutics. Advanced drug delivery reviews. 2009;61(13):1220-31.

[60] Talwar A. Principles of Pharmaceutical Biotechnology: Educohack Press; 2025.

[61] Narang A, Chang R-K, Hussain MA. Pharmaceutical development and regulatory considerations for nanoparticles and nanoparticulate drug delivery systems. Journal of pharmaceutical sciences. 2013;102(11):3867-82.

[62] Kaasalainen M, Mäkilä E, Riikonen J, Kovalainen M, Järvinen K, Herzig K-H, et al. Effect of isotonic solutions and peptide adsorption on zeta potential of porous silicon nanoparticle drug delivery formulations. International journal of pharmaceutics. 2012;431(1-2):230-6.

[63] Cun D, Jensen DK, Maltesen MJ, Bunker M, Whiteside P, Scurr D, et al. High loading efficiency and sustained release of siRNA encapsulated in PLGA nanoparticles: quality by design optimization and characterization. European journal of pharmaceutics and biopharmaceutics. 2011;77(1):26-35.

[64] Paarakh MP, Jose PA, Setty C, Peterchristoper G. Release kinetics–concepts and applications. International Journal of Pharmacy Research & Technology (IJPRT). 2018;8(1):12-20.

[65] Sandle T. Sterility, sterilisation and sterility assurance for pharmaceuticals: technology, validation and current regulations: Elsevier; 2013.

[66] Bajaj S, Singla D, Sakhuja N. Stability testing of pharmaceutical products. Journal of applied pharmaceutical science. 2012(Issue):129-38.

[67] Cha J, Gilmor T, Lane P, Ranweiler JS. Stability studies. Separation Science and Technology. 10: Elsevier; 2011. p. 459-505.

[68] Caputo F, Clogston J, Calzolai L, Rösslein M, Prina-Mello A. Measuring particle size distribution of nanoparticle enabled medicinal products, the joint view of EUNCL and NCI-NCL. A step by step approach combining orthogonal measurements with increasing complexity. Journal of Controlled Release. 2019;299:31-43.

[69] Bhatia N, Malik P, Sampathi S. Characterization Tools for current drug delivery systems. Biosystems, Biomedical & Drug Delivery Systems: Characterization, Restoration and Optimization: Springer; 2024. p. 11-42.

[70] Packer M, Gyawali D, Yerabolu R, Schariter J, White P. A novel mechanism for the loss of mRNA activity in lipid nanoparticle delivery systems. Nature communications. 2021;12(1):6777.

[71] Jyoti B, Jha AM, Dhamodharan J, Subramanian A. Cryo-Electron Microscopy for Cancer: Oncology-Cryo Electron. International Journal of Trends in OncoScience. 2023:52-7.

[72] Desai N, Pande S, Gholap AD, Rana D, Salave S, Vora LK. Regulatory processes involved in clinical trials and intellectual property rights around vaccine development. Advanced Vaccination Technologies for Infectious and Chronic Diseases: Elsevier; 2024. p. 279-309.

[73] Bhatia S, Bhatia S. Nanoparticles types, classification, characterization, fabrication methods and drug delivery applications. Natural polymer drug delivery systems: Nanoparticles, plants, and algae. 2016:33-93.

[74] Jacob S, Nair AB, Shah J, Gupta S, Boddu SH, Sreeharsha N, et al. Lipid nanoparticles as a promising drug delivery carrier for topical ocular therapy—an overview on recent advances. Pharmaceutics. 2022;14(3):533.

[75] Jacob S, Kather FS, Boddu SH, Attimarad M, Nair AB. Nanosuspension Innovations: Expanding Horizons in Drug Delivery Techniques. Pharmaceutics. 2025;17(1):136.

[76] Sarkar M, Wang Y, Ekpenyong O, Liang D, Xie H. Pharmacokinetic behaviors of soft nanoparticulate formulations of chemotherapeutics. Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Nanomedicine and Nanobiotechnology. 2023;15(2):e1846.

[77] Lao J, Madani J, Puértolas T, Álvarez M, Hernández A, Pazo-Cid R, et al. Liposomal doxorubicin in the treatment of breast cancer patients: a review. Journal of drug delivery. 2013;2013(1):456409.

[78] Rabanel J-M, Adibnia V, Tehrani SF, Sanche S, Hildgen P, Banquy X, Ramassamy C. Nanoparticle heterogeneity: an emerging structural parameter influencing particle fate in biological media? Nanoscale. 2019;11(2):383-406.

[79] Rousseau A, Marquet P. Application of pharmacokinetic modelling to the routine therapeutic drug monitoring of anticancer drugs. Fundamental & clinical pharmacology. 2002;16(4):253-62.

[80] Lim SB, Banerjee A, Önyüksel H. Improvement of drug safety by the use of lipid-based nanocarriers. Journal of controlled release. 2012;163(1):34-45.

[81] de Vlieger JS, Crommelin DJ, Tyner K, Drummond DC, Jiang W, McNeil SE, et al. Report of the AAPS guidance forum on the FDA draft guidance for industry:"Drug products, including biological products, that contain nanomaterials". Springer; 2019.

[82] Mühlebach S, Borchard G, Yildiz S. Regulatory challenges and approaches to characterize nanomedicines and their follow-on similars. Nanomedicine. 2015;10(4):659-74.

[83] Feitosa RC, Geraldes DC, Beraldo-de-Araújo VL, Costa JSR, Oliveira-Nascimento L. Pharmacokinetic aspects of nanoparticle-in-matrix drug delivery systems for oral/buccal delivery. Frontiers in pharmacology. 2019;10:1057.

[84] Kabir ER, Moreino SS, Sharif Siam MK. The breakthrough of biosimilars: a twist in the narrative of biological therapy. Biomolecules. 2019;9(9):410.

[85] Dranitsaris G, Amir E, Dorward K. Biosimilars of biological drug therapies: regulatory, clinical and commercial considerations. Drugs. 2011;71:1527-36.

[86] Chen M-L, Shah V, Patnaik R, Adams W, Hussain A, Conner D, et al. Bioavailability and bioequivalence: an FDA regulatory overview. Pharmaceutical research. 2001;18:1645-50.

[87] Tinkle S, McNeil SE, Mühlebach S, Bawa R, Borchard G, Barenholz Y, et al. Nanomedicines: addressing the scientific and regulatory gap. Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences. 2014;1313(1):35-56.

[88] Li M, Zou P, Tyner K, Lee S. Physiologically based pharmacokinetic (PBPK) modeling of pharmaceutical nanoparticles. The AAPS journal. 2017;19:26-42.

[89] Nestorov I. Whole body pharmacokinetic models. Clinical pharmacokinetics. 2003;42:883-908.

[90] Wu D, Sanghavi M, Kollipara S, Ahmed T, Saini AK, Heimbach T. Physiologically based pharmacokinetics modeling in biopharmaceutics: case studies for establishing the bioequivalence safe space for innovator and generic drugs. Pharmaceutical Research. 2023;40(2):337-57.

[91] Emami J. In vitro-in vivo correlation: from theory to applications. J Pharm Pharm Sci. 2006;9(2):169-89.

[92] Cook N, Jodrell DI, Tuveson DA. Predictive in vivo animal models and translation to clinical trials. Drug discovery today. 2012;17(5-6):253-60.

[93] Zhang F, Jia R, Gao H, Wu X, Liu B, Wang H. In silico modeling and simulation to guide bioequivalence testing for oral drugs in a virtual population. Clinical Pharmacokinetics. 2021;60(11):1373-85.

[94] Chow S-C, Liu J-p. Design and analysis of clinical trials: concepts and methodologies: John Wiley & Sons; 2008.

[95] Desai N. Nanoparticle albumin-bound anticancer agents. Non-biological complex drugs: the science and the regulatory landscape. 2015:335-54.

[96] Jensen GM, Hoo LS. Regulatory aspects of pharmaceutical nanopreparations. HANDBOOK OF NANOBIOMEDICAL RESEARCH: Fundamentals, Applications and Recent Developments: Volume 4 Biological Requirement and Safety Assessment of Nanomedicines: World Scientific; 2014. p. 119-43.

[97] Sparreboom A, Scripture CD, Trieu V, Williams PJ, De T, Yang A, et al. Comparative preclinical and clinical pharmacokinetics of a cremophor-free, nanoparticle albumin-bound paclitaxel (ABI-007) and paclitaxel formulated in Cremophor (Taxol). Clinical cancer research. 2005;11(11):4136-43.

[98] Tania U. Concepts and challenges of biosimilars to mitigate the oncology drug expenses: Brac University; 2021.

[99] Sreelekha S, Kumar KV, Mahammed N, Reshma T, Sree GU, Basha SS, Bhuvaneswari M. Quality by Design Approaches in Pharmaceutical Development and Solid Dosage Forms Production: A Narrative Overview. Jordan Journal of Pharmaceutical Sciences. 2023;16(4):770-84.

[100] Zagalo DM, Sousa J, Simões S. Quality by design (QbD) approach in marketing authorization procedures of non-biological complex drugs: a critical evaluation. European Journal of Pharmaceutics and Biopharmaceutics. 2022;178:1-24.

[101] Allison G, Cain YT, Cooney C, Garcia T, Bizjak TG, Holte O, et al. Regulatory and quality considerations for continuous manufacturing. May 20–21, 2014 continuous manufacturing symposium. Journal of pharmaceutical sciences. 2015;104(3):803-12.

[102] Jatto E, Okhamafe AO. An Overview of Pharmaceutical Validation and Process Controls in Drug Development. Tropical Journal of Pharmaceutical Research. 2002;1(2):115-22.

[103] ALI A, SINHA K. Regulatory Landscape for Generic Drugs in India: Assessing Quality, Safety, and Efficacy Standards. Biotechnology Law Report. 2024;43(3):131-41.

[104] Dickens JE. Overview of process analysis and PAT. Process analytical technology: Spectroscopic tools and implementation strategies for the chemical and pharmaceutical industries. 2010:1-15.

[105] Schaefer C, Clicq D, Lecomte C, Merschaert A, Norrant E, Fotiadu F. A Process Analytical Technology (PAT) approach to control a new API manufacturing process: Development, validation and implementation. Talanta. 2014;120:114-25.

[106] Jarab AS, Abu Heshmeh SR, Al Meslamani AZ. Biosimilars and immunogenicity: a matter of concern? Expert Opinion on Drug Safety. 2025:1-9.

[107] Mirakhori F, Niazi SK. Harnessing the AI/ML in Drug and Biological Products Discovery and Development: The Regulatory Perspective. Pharmaceuticals. 2025;18(1):47.

[108] Niazi SK. The coming of age of AI/ML in drug discovery, development, clinical testing, and manufacturing: the FDA perspectives. Drug Design, Development and Therapy. 2023:2691-725.

[109] Poger D, Yen L, Braet F. Big data in contemporary electron microscopy: challenges and opportunities in data transfer, compute and management. Histochemistry and Cell Biology. 2023;160(3):169-92.

[110] Ogbuagu OO, Mbata AO, Balogun OD, Oladapo O, Ojo OO, Muonde M. Quality assurance in pharmaceutical manufacturing: bridging the gap between regulations, supply chain, and innovations. 2023.

[111] Raut N, Bajaj K, Matte P, Vhora M, Kale V, Umekar M, Harane S. Building bridges: harmonization efforts for enhanced collaboration between developed and developing countries. Int J Drug Regul Aff. 2023;11(3):68-79.

[112] Gronde Tvd, Uyl-de Groot CA, Pieters T. Addressing the challenge of high-priced prescription drugs in the era of precision medicine: a systematic review of drug life cycles, therapeutic drug markets and regulatory frameworks. PloS one. 2017;12(8):e0182613.

[113] Ajmal C, Yerram S, Abishek V, Nizam VM, Aglave G, Patnam JD, et al. Innovative Approaches in Regulatory Affairs: Leveraging Artificial Intelligence and Machine Learning for Efficient Compliance and Decision-Making. The AAPS Journal. 2025;27(1):22.

[114] Bhatt MS, Maurya MA, Maurya MV. EMERGING TRENDS IN PHARMACEUTICAL DEVELOPMENT. MOLECULES TO MEDICINES: A Comprehensive Look at Pharmaceutical Development. 2024:111.

[115] Babu MM, Nurshanti NLP, Wijaya HM, Tjandrawinata RR. Harnessing Artificial Intelligence in Generic Formulation Development and Life Cycle Management-A Comprehensive Review. Al Makki Health Informatics Journal. 2025;3(1).