

Quality Tools and Risk-Based Approaches in Analytical Method Validation and Bioequivalence Studies: A Comprehensive Review

Karthika K.U¹, Shahanas Fathima V.V²

^{1,2}M Pharm Pharmaceutical Quality Assurance, Students of Al Shifa College of Pharmacy, Kizhattur, Poonthavanam Post, Perinthalmanna, Malappuram, Kerala – 679325

Abstract

Analytical method validation and bioequivalence (BE) studies are important components of pharmaceutical development because they provide evidence that analytical procedures are fit for their intended purpose and that comparative product performance can be assessed using reliable measurements. The contemporary regulatory environment increasingly emphasizes scientific understanding, lifecycle management, quality risk management, and data integrity rather than validation as a one-time documentation exercise. This review examines practical quality tools that can be integrated into analytical method development, validation, routine analysis, bioanalytical sample analysis, and BE study documentation. Particular attention is given to checklists, risk matrices, Failure Mode and Effects Analysis (FMEA), Ishikawa or fishbone analysis, root-cause analysis (RCA), control charts, trend analysis, analytical run review, system suitability verification, and data-integrity checks. The review also considers how risk-based controls can be connected with validation characteristics such as specificity/selectivity, accuracy, precision, linearity, range, robustness, and detection or quantitation capability. For BE studies, quality controls are discussed across study planning, sample accountability, bioanalytical analysis, pharmacokinetic data handling, statistical evaluation, and final reporting. ICH Q2(R2), Q14 and Q9 provide an important quality framework, while ICH M10, ICH M13A and current FDA recommendations provide additional context for bioanalytical and BE activities. An integrated quality-tool framework can improve consistency, traceability, early detection of failure, and continual improvement without replacing scientific judgment or applicable regulatory requirements.

Keywords: Analytical method validation; Bioequivalence; Quality tools; Risk management; FMEA; ICH Q2(R2); ICH Q14; ICH Q9; ICH M10; Data integrity; System suitability; Pharmaceutical quality.

1. INTRODUCTION

Analytical procedures support pharmaceutical development, quality control, release testing, stability studies, impurity assessment and regulatory decision making. The reliability of an analytical result is determined by more than instrument performance: sample preparation, reference standards, reagents, method parameters, analyst execution, system suitability, calculations, software processing and documentation can all affect the final result. Analytical procedure validation therefore provides

documented evidence that the procedure is suitable for its intended purpose. Bioequivalence studies introduce an additional layer of quality requirements because analytical measurements are used to generate concentration–time data and pharmacokinetic parameters that support comparison of test and reference products. Errors in sample identification, storage, extraction, calibration, analytical runs, data processing or statistical analysis can compromise the interpretability of a study. A quality system should therefore identify important risks prospectively and apply proportionate controls. The purpose of quality tools is not to create documentation for its own sake. Properly designed tools convert quality principles into repeatable activities, make critical decisions visible, and help organizations detect and prevent avoidable failures. The value of a checklist, risk assessment or trend chart depends on its scientific basis, appropriate acceptance criteria, controlled implementation and meaningful review.

2. ANALYTICAL METHOD VALIDATION: CONCEPT AND LIFECYCLE

Analytical method validation demonstrates that an analytical procedure is fit for its intended purpose. ICH Q2(R2) describes validation as a science-based exercise in which the characteristics selected for evaluation depend on the intended use of the analytical procedure. This supports a lifecycle perspective in which method development, validation, transfer and ongoing performance are connected rather than treated as independent activities. ICH Q14 further emphasizes structured analytical procedure development and scientific understanding of method performance. [1,2] A validation strategy should begin with a clear analytical target and identification of the quality attribute being measured. The intended use determines which validation characteristics are relevant and the degree of evidence required. For example, an assay procedure and an impurity procedure may require different combinations of specificity, accuracy, precision, range and detection capability. Robustness is generally explored during development so that important method variables and their effects are understood before validation. [1,2]

2.1 Core validation characteristics

Characteristic	Quality objective	Useful quality-tool control
Specificity / selectivity	Demonstrate discrimination from relevant components, impurities, degradation products or matrix.	Interference checklist; chromatographic review; spectral evidence log
Accuracy	Assess closeness of measured value to an accepted reference value.	Recovery worksheet; reference-standard verification; calculation check
Precision	Assess agreement among repeated measurements.	Replicate-data checklist; analyst/day/instrument review; trend chart
Linearity / response	Evaluate analytical response across an appropriate concentration range.	Regression review; residual assessment; model-selection checklist
Range	Establish interval over which procedure has suitable performance.	Range justification record linked to intended use
Robustness	Evaluate sensitivity to deliberate changes in method variables.	Risk assessment; design-of-experiment worksheet;

		parameter-control matrix
Detection / quantitation capability	Establish capability where relevant to the analytical purpose.	Calculation verification; signal/noise or statistical approach review
System suitability	Confirm that the analytical system is appropriate for the run.	Pre-run checklist; SST acceptance record; run-release decision

2.2 Lifecycle quality controls

A practical lifecycle model can include method development, risk assessment, validation planning, execution, method transfer where applicable, routine use, performance monitoring and change management. Quality tools should be updated when new knowledge becomes available, recurring deviations are observed, or a method is changed. This approach is consistent with the principle that analytical procedures should remain under control throughout their useful life rather than only at the point of initial validation. [1,2] An important distinction is that a quality tool does not itself establish analytical validity. A checklist may confirm that required evidence was reviewed, but the underlying scientific data still need to demonstrate suitability. Likewise, an FMEA can prioritize attention but cannot replace experimental investigation.

3. QUALITY TOOLS FOR ANALYTICAL METHOD VALIDATION

Quality tools provide a practical bridge between pharmaceutical quality principles and laboratory execution. Their design should be concise, controlled and linked to a defined decision. Tools that generate excessive administrative work without affecting decisions may become ineffective. The most useful tools focus on critical steps and create traceable evidence.

Tool	Primary purpose	Example application
Checklist	Standardize critical activities and prevent omission	Method readiness, sequence verification, SST, calculation and report review
Risk matrix	Classify risks using predefined criteria	Prioritize critical sample-preparation or instrument steps
FMEA	Identify failure modes prospectively and prioritize controls	Method parameters, sample preparation, data processing
Fishbone / Ishikawa	Explore possible causes of an observed problem	Unexpected precision, specificity or robustness failure
RCA	Identify underlying causes of deviations	Invalid run, calculation error, instrument event
Control chart	Monitor performance over time	QC results, SST metrics, recovery or precision trends
Trend analysis	Detect gradual or recurring changes	Assay, impurity, recovery or system performance
Data-integrity checklist	Confirm completeness and traceability	Audit trail, raw data, metadata, calculations and final report

3.1 Checklists

A checklist should identify only actions that are important enough to require explicit verification. Examples include instrument calibration status, reference-standard validity, reagent status, sample identity, sequence order, method version, SST criteria, integration review, calculations, electronic records and final report approval. A well-designed checklist can reduce omission errors and create a consistent minimum review standard.

3.2 FMEA and risk-priority assessment

FMEA is a prospective tool used to identify how a process might fail, understand the potential effect of each failure, identify causes and determine appropriate controls. Severity, occurrence and detectability are commonly considered. Where an organization uses a numerical risk-priority number (RPN), the scoring scale and action thresholds should be defined before assessment. RPN should support—not replace—scientific judgment; a low numerical score does not automatically mean that a serious risk is acceptable.

Process step	Potential failure	S	O	D	Illustrative control
Sample preparation	Incorrect dilution	4	3	2	Controlled worksheet; second-person verification
Instrument readiness	Calibration overdue	5	2	3	Calibration-status check before use
Sequence setup	Wrong sequence or injection order	4	2	3	Sequence verification checklist
Data processing	Incorrect integration or processing method	5	2	3	Audit-trail and chromatogram review
Report generation	Transcription/calculation error	4	2	2	Independent calculation review

Illustrative scoring only: actual scales, thresholds and risk decisions should be defined by the organization's approved quality-risk-management procedure.

4. RISK-BASED APPROACH AND ICH Q9 PRINCIPLES

ICH Q9 provides a structured framework for quality risk management. Risk management can be applied prospectively during development or retrospectively when investigating an event. The central principle is that the level of effort, formality and documentation should be commensurate with the level of risk. [3] For analytical procedures, risk assessment can begin by mapping the workflow and identifying critical steps: sample receipt, sample preparation, extraction, dilution, instrument setup, system

suitability, sequence execution, data processing, review and reporting. Each step can then be assessed for potential failure modes and linked to preventive or detective controls.

4.1 Risk-management workflow

Problem or intended use → Process mapping → Critical-step identification → Hazard/failure-mode identification → Risk analysis → Control selection → Implementation → Monitoring → Review/update

Risk-management stage	Analytical application	Output
Define scope	Identify method, product, matrix and intended use	Risk-management scope
Map process	Break procedure into critical steps	Process map
Identify hazards	List possible failure modes and causes	Risk register
Analyze risk	Assess severity, occurrence and detectability or other approved criteria	Risk score/category
Control risk	Add preventive/detective controls	Mitigation plan
Monitor	Trend deviations, SST, QC and performance	Periodic review
Update	Reassess after changes or recurring failures	Revised risk assessment

4.2 Fishbone analysis and root-cause investigation

When a validation or routine analytical result fails unexpectedly, a fishbone diagram can organize possible causes under categories such as method, material, machine/instrument, measurement, environment and personnel. RCA should then use evidence to distinguish plausible causes from confirmed causes. Repeating the same action without establishing the actual cause may correct a symptom without preventing recurrence. For example, an unexpected precision failure may involve sample preparation variability, reference-standard preparation, pipetting technique, instrument performance, integration settings, environmental conditions or calculation. The investigation should review contemporaneous records, raw data, audit trails and system suitability rather than assuming that the method itself is the cause.

4.3 Risk controls and CAPA

Corrective and preventive action (CAPA) should be linked to the identified cause. Corrective action addresses the immediate issue; preventive action addresses recurrence. Examples include revised training, improved worksheets, additional verification, equipment maintenance, method clarification, software controls or changes to monitoring frequency. CAPA effectiveness should be checked rather than assumed.

5. BIOEQUIVALENCE STUDIES AND QUALITY MANAGEMENT

Bioequivalence studies compare the performance of a test product with an appropriate reference product under predefined conditions. For many systemic drug products, pharmacokinetic measures such as maximum concentration (C_{max}) and area under the concentration–time curve (AUC) contribute to the

assessment. The exact study design and acceptance criteria depend on the product, route, formulation, regulatory pathway and applicable guidance. Current FDA guidance includes recommendations on pharmacokinetic BE studies and statistical approaches, while ICH M13A provides harmonized recommendations for immediate-release solid oral dosage forms intended to deliver drug systemically. [4–6] Quality management in BE studies extends from study planning to sample collection, storage, chain of custody, bioanalytical measurement, data processing and statistical evaluation. A weakness in any stage can affect the reliability of the final dataset. ICH M10 addresses bioanalytical method validation and study sample analysis, making the analytical component a critical part of the overall study quality system. [7]

5.1 Quality-tool application across the BE workflow

Stage	Potential risk	Suggested quality tool
Study planning	Inappropriate design or incomplete predefined criteria	Protocol review checklist; risk assessment
Subject/sample identification	Mislabeling or reconciliation error	Sample-accountability checklist; barcode controls where validated
Collection/handling	Timing or handling deviation	Time-point checklist; deviation log
Storage	Temperature excursion or sample mix-up	Freezer monitoring; inventory reconciliation
Bioanalytical run	Calibration, QC or system-suitability failure	Analytical run checklist; run-acceptance form
Data processing	Incorrect integration or calculation	Audit-trail review; calculation verification
PK analysis	Incorrect dataset structure or parameter handling	Data-review checklist; independent review
Statistics	Incorrect model, transformation or interpretation	Statistical analysis plan; programming QC
Final report	Transcription or traceability error	Report-review checklist; source-data reconciliation

5.2 Bioanalytical method quality

Bioanalytical methods should be demonstrated to be fit for purpose using scientifically appropriate validation characteristics. Selectivity, calibration performance, accuracy, precision, carryover, dilution integrity, stability and other characteristics may be relevant depending on the method and analyte. The study-sample analysis phase should follow predefined acceptance criteria and documented procedures. Quality tools can ensure that run acceptance, repeat analysis and reinjection decisions are traceable. Data integrity is especially important because bioanalytical datasets may contain many samples, repeated analyses and electronic processing steps. Review should consider raw data, metadata, audit trails, integration, calculations and the linkage between sample identifiers and reported concentrations. FDA has also published draft recommendations specifically addressing data integrity in in vivo BA/BE studies. [8]

6. STATISTICAL AND DATA-REVIEW QUALITY CONTROLS

Statistical evaluation is not simply the final step in a quality system; it should be considered when designing the study and defining the data that will be collected. For BE studies, the statistical method should be prospectively specified and appropriate for the study design and regulatory context. FDA's May 2026 final guidance on statistical approaches to establishing bioequivalence superseded its 2001 guidance and addresses topics including study design, logarithmic transformation, multiple groups, carryover considerations and outliers. [5] For analytical validation, statistical review should examine the appropriateness of the model and the pattern of data rather than relying on a single summary statistic. For linearity, for example, residual behavior and the response model may provide useful information in addition to correlation. For precision and accuracy, the experimental design, concentration levels, replicates and predefined criteria should be considered together.

6.1 Control charts and trend analysis

Control charts can be used to monitor analytical performance over time when sufficient historical data and appropriate statistical assumptions are available. Potential applications include assay or impurity QC results, system suitability parameters, recovery, internal-standard response or other validated indicators. The purpose is to detect meaningful shifts or trends before they become failures. Control limits should be statistically justified and should not be confused with specification or acceptance limits.

Metric	Possible trend signal	Potential action
QC recovery	Progressive drift	Review reagents, standard preparation and instrument response
Precision	Increasing variability	Investigate sample preparation, analyst or instrument factors
Retention time	Systematic shift	Check mobile phase, column condition, temperature and flow
Internal-standard response	Gradual decrease	Review instrument sensitivity, preparation and storage
SST resolution	Repeated deterioration	Review column performance and method conditions

6.2 Data-integrity review

Data-integrity element	Review question
Attributable	Can the action/result be linked to the responsible person or system?
Legible / contemporaneous	Was the record created and maintained in an understandable, timely form?
Original / true copy	Is the source record retained and controlled?
Accurate	Are calculations, transcriptions and reported results correct?
Complete / consistent	Are relevant records, repeat analyses and deviations included?
Available / retrievable	Can authorized reviewers reconstruct the analytical

	activity?
--	-----------

A data-integrity checklist should complement, not replace, validated systems and procedural controls. Where electronic records are used, audit-trail review and appropriate access control should be incorporated according to the organization's procedures and applicable regulations.

7. INTEGRATED QUALITY-TOOL FRAMEWORK FOR METHOD VALIDATION

AND BE An integrated framework can connect prospective risk management with routine analytical execution and retrospective learning. The following sequence is suitable as a conceptual model for pharmaceutical analytical laboratories: Problem Identification → Regulatory/Scientific Requirements → Critical-Step Identification → Risk Assessment → Quality-Tool Development → Implementation → Data Review → Deviation/RCA/CAPA → Trend Monitoring → Continuous Improvement

7.1 Development of a practical quality-tool package

Tool / record	Minimum content	Primary decision supported
Method-validation readiness checklist	Method version, scope, standards, instruments, protocols, personnel	Is the validation ready to start?
Critical-step checklist	Sample preparation, instrument setup, SST, processing	Were critical activities completed?
Risk assessment record	Risk, cause, effect, scoring, existing controls, mitigation	Which risks require additional control?
Analytical run review form	Sequence, SST, QC, chromatograms, deviations, calculations	Is the run acceptable?
RCA worksheet	Problem statement, evidence, possible causes, confirmed cause	What caused the event?
CAPA tracker	Action, owner, due date, effectiveness	Has recurrence risk been reduced?
Trend/control-chart record	Metric, baseline, limits, trends, review	Is performance changing over time?
Data-integrity checklist	Raw data, metadata, audit trail, calculations, report linkage	Can the result be reconstructed?

7.2 Example: analytical run review checklist

Review item	Yes/No/NA	Comment / evidence
Correct approved method and version used		
Instrument status and calibration verified		
Reference standard/reagent status acceptable		
Sample identity and preparation		

verified		
Sequence and injection order checked		
System suitability met predefined criteria		
QC results reviewed and acceptable		
Chromatograms/spectra reviewed for anomalies		
Integration and processing parameters verified		
Calculations independently checked where required		
Deviations/repeats/reintegrations documented		
Audit trail or electronic record review completed where applicable		
Final run disposition documented and approved		

The checklist above is a conceptual template. Each laboratory should customize it to the method, equipment, electronic systems, SOPs and applicable regulatory requirements. It should not be used as a substitute for an approved procedure.

8. REGULATORY PERSPECTIVE, RESEARCH GAP AND FUTURE

DIRECTIONS Regulatory expectations increasingly emphasize scientific understanding, risk-based decision making, data integrity and lifecycle management. ICH Q2(R2) addresses analytical procedure validation, ICH Q14 addresses analytical procedure development, and ICH Q9 provides principles for quality risk management. ICH M10 addresses bioanalytical method validation and study sample analysis, while ICH M13A addresses BE for immediate-release solid oral dosage forms. Applicable regional regulations and product-specific guidance must always be considered in addition to these general frameworks. [1–7]

8.1 Regulatory alignment of quality tools

Regulatory/scientific area	Relevant quality-tool contribution
Analytical procedure validation	Validation planning checklist, parameter matrix, evidence review
Analytical procedure development	Risk assessment, method-variable matrix, robustness planning
Quality risk management	FMEA, risk matrix, process mapping, mitigation records
Bioanalytical method validation	Run-review checklist, QC review, stability and

	carryover checks
Bioequivalence	Study/sample accountability, analytical run review, data-review checklist
Data integrity	Raw-data reconciliation, audit-trail review, controlled documentation
Lifecycle management	Trend monitoring, change-impact assessment, periodic review

8.2 Research gap

Although individual quality tools are common in pharmaceutical quality systems, published approaches often discuss tools separately. There is scope for integrated frameworks that connect method development knowledge, validation planning, laboratory execution, bioanalytical run review, risk assessment and continued performance monitoring. More research is also needed on how risk-based review can be standardized without creating excessive administrative burden. Another area for development is digital quality management. Automated checks can identify missing metadata, inconsistent sample identifiers, unexpected sequence changes, calculation anomalies or recurring trends. However, automation should be validated and appropriately governed. Human scientific review remains essential, particularly for atypical chromatographic behavior, deviations and complex investigations.

8.3 Future perspective

Future analytical quality systems are likely to combine lifecycle management, structured risk assessment, electronic workflows, statistical process monitoring and targeted review. Machine-assisted pattern recognition may support trend detection, but the resulting alerts should be evaluated within a controlled quality system. Quality tools may also become increasingly integrated with laboratory information management systems and electronic laboratory notebooks. For bioequivalence studies, future improvements may include stronger electronic sample traceability, automated reconciliation, standardized analytical-run review, programming quality control and risk-based data review. The objective should remain the same: reliable evidence, transparent decisions and protection of data integrity.

9. CONCLUSION

Analytical method validation and bioequivalence studies depend on reliable scientific measurements and controlled processes. Quality tools provide practical mechanisms for translating pharmaceutical quality principles into repeatable laboratory activities. Checklists can reduce omission errors; FMEA and risk matrices can prioritize critical risks; fishbone analysis and RCA can support structured investigations; control charts and trend analysis can identify changes over time; and data-integrity reviews can improve traceability of electronic and paper records. The strongest approach is not to apply every available quality tool to every process. Instead, tools should be selected according to the intended purpose, complexity and risk of the activity. A proportionate system can focus review effort on steps with greater potential to affect analytical reliability or study conclusions. Scientific judgment remains necessary when defining acceptance criteria, interpreting atypical results and deciding whether a risk has been adequately controlled. An integrated framework linking method development, validation, bioanalytical analysis, BE study execution, data review, risk management, CAPA and continued monitoring can strengthen the pharmaceutical quality system. The framework proposed in this review may serve as a

basis for developing practical laboratory templates such as validation-readiness checklists, analytical run review forms, risk registers, RCA records, data-integrity checklists and performance-monitoring dashboards. Overall, quality tools should be viewed as decision-support mechanisms within a scientifically justified quality system rather than as standalone compliance documents. Their effective use can improve consistency, traceability, early identification of failure and continual improvement across the analytical lifecycle.

REFERENCES

1. **International Council for Harmonisation (ICH). ICH Q2(R2): Validation of Analytical Procedures. Geneva: ICH; 2023.**
2. **International Council for Harmonisation (ICH). ICH Q14: Analytical Procedure Development. Geneva: ICH; 2023.**
3. **International Council for Harmonisation (ICH). ICH Q9(R1): Quality Risk Management. Geneva: ICH; 2023.**
4. **International Council for Harmonisation (ICH). ICH M13A: Bioequivalence for Immediate-Release Solid Oral Dosage Forms. Geneva: ICH; 2024.**
5. **U.S. Food and Drug Administration. Statistical Approaches to Establishing Bioequivalence. Guidance for Industry. Rockville, MD: FDA; 2026.**
6. **U.S. Food and Drug Administration. Bioequivalence Studies With Pharmacokinetic Endpoints for Drugs Submitted Under an ANDA. Guidance for Industry. Rockville, MD: FDA; 2026.**
7. **International Council for Harmonisation (ICH). ICH M10: Bioanalytical Method Validation and Study Sample Analysis. Geneva: ICH; 2022.**
8. **U.S. Food and Drug Administration. Bioanalytical Method Validation: Guidance for Industry. Rockville, MD: FDA; 2018.**
9. **U.S. Food and Drug Administration. Data Integrity for In Vivo Bioavailability and Bioequivalence Studies. Draft Guidance for Industry. Rockville, MD: FDA; 2024.**
10. **European Medicines Agency. Guideline on the Investigation of Bioequivalence. Amsterdam: EMA.**
11. **World Health Organization. Multisource (generic) pharmaceutical products: guidelines on registration requirements to establish interchangeability. Geneva: WHO.**
12. **United States Pharmacopeia. General Chapter <1225>: Validation of Compendial Procedures. USP–NF.**
13. **United States Pharmacopeia. General Chapter <1226>: Verification of Compendial Procedures. USP–NF.**
14. **Verch T, Campa C, Chéry CC, et al. Analytical quality by design, life cycle management, and method control. AAPS J. 2022;24:34.**

- 15. Szoleczky R, Budai-Szűcs M, Csányi E, et al. Analytical quality by design approach to the development of in vitro release test for topical hydrogel. Pharmaceutics. 2022;14:707.**
- 16. Lionberger RA. FDA critical path initiatives: opportunities for generic drug development. AAPS J. 2008;10:81–88.**

REFERENCES (CONTINUED)

- 17. Ermer J, Nethercote P. Method validation and regulatory expectations in pharmaceutical analysis. J Pharm Biomed Anal.**
- 18. Rozet E, Ceccato A, Hubert C, et al. Analysis of regulatory requirements for analytical method validation and transfer.**
- 19. Hubert C, Nguyen-Huu JJ, Boulanger B, Chapuzet E, Cohen N, Compagnon PA, et al. Harmonization of strategies for the validation of quantitative analytical procedures: a SFSTP proposal. J Pharm Biomed Anal.**
- 20. Taverniers I, De Loose M, Van Bockstaele E. Trends in quality in the analytical laboratory. Trends Anal Chem.**
- 21. Montgomery DC. Introduction to Statistical Quality Control. 8th ed. Wiley; 2019.**
- 22. Stamatis DH. Failure Mode and Effect Analysis: FMEA from Theory to Execution. 2nd ed. ASQ Quality Press.**
- 23. International Council for Harmonisation (ICH). ICH Q10: Pharmaceutical Quality System. Geneva: ICH.**
- 24. International Council for Harmonisation (ICH). ICH Q8(R2): Pharmaceutical Development. Geneva: ICH.**
- 25. International Council for Harmonisation (ICH). ICH Q12: Technical and Regulatory Considerations for Pharmaceutical Product Lifecycle Management. Geneva: ICH.**
- 26. U.S. Food and Drug Administration. Analytical Procedures and Methods Validation for Drugs and Biologics. Guidance for Industry. Rockville, MD: FDA; 2015.**
- 27. U.S. Food and Drug Administration. Guidance for Industry: Bioequivalence Studies With Pharmacokinetic Endpoints for Drugs Submitted Under an ANDA. Rockville, MD: FDA.**
- 28. U.S. Food and Drug Administration. General Principles for Evaluating the Abuse Deterrence of Generic Solid Oral Opioid Drug Products. Rockville, MD: FDA.**
- 29. U.S. Food and Drug Administration. Guidance for Industry: General Principles for Planning and Design of Multi-Regional Clinical Trials. Rockville, MD: FDA.**
- 30. European Medicines Agency. Guideline on the Investigation of Bioequivalence. Committee for Medicinal Products for Human Use.**
- 31. United States Pharmacopeia. General Chapter <621>: Chromatography. USP–NF.**
- 32. United States Pharmacopeia. General Chapter <1058>: Analytical Instrument Qualification. USP–NF.**
- 33. United States Pharmacopeia. General Chapter <1088>: Sample Preparation for Chromatographic Analysis. USP–NF.**
- 34. United States Pharmacopeia. General Chapter <1224>: Transfer of Analytical Procedures. USP–NF.**

35. International Organization for Standardization. ISO 9001:2015 Quality Management Systems — Requirements. Geneva: ISO;

2015.

SELECTED CURRENT REGULATORY SOURCES USED FOR THIS REVIEW

ICH Q2(R2) states that analytical procedure validation should demonstrate suitability for the intended purpose and links validation with analytical procedure development. ICH Q14 addresses analytical procedure development, while ICH Q9 provides quality-risk-management principles. Current FDA materials also include final 2026 guidance on statistical approaches to BE and pharmacokinetic-endpoint BE studies. These documents should be checked in their current versions for any submission or regulated implementation. END OF REVIEW ARTICLE