ISSN: 2347-6567

International Journal of Allied Medical Sciences and Clinical Research (IJAMSCR)

IJAMSCR |Vol.14 | Issue 2| Apr - Jun - 2026

www.ijamscr.com

DOI : https://doi.org/10.61096/ijamscr.v14.iss2.2026.1045-1059

Comparative Study of Dossier Submission Requirements for ANDA in India Versus EMA

B. Anjitha Jasmine*, Dr. A. Eshwar

[1]*Department of Regulatory Affairs, Palamuru University, Mahbubnagar Bandameedipally, Telangana, 509001, India.*

*Corresponding Author: **B. Anjitha Jasmine**
Email: anjithajasmine24@gmail.com

Published on: 19.06.2026
Published by: Futuristic Publications
2026| All rights reserved.

Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

Abstract: This study compares the dossier submission requirements for Abbreviated New Drug Applications (ANDAs) in India and the European Medicines Agency (EMA) framework. Both regulatory authorities follow the Common Technical Document (CTD) format established by the International Council for Harmonisation (ICH); however, regional variations persist in administrative, technical, and procedural requirements.

In India, the Central Drugs Standard Control Organization (CDSCO) oversees ANDA submissions under the New Drugs and Clinical Trials Rules (NDCTR, 2019), emphasizing Zone IVb stability data, local bioequivalence studies, and API source verification. In contrast, the EMA mandates electronic CTD (eCTD) submissions, standardized review timelines, and publication of European Public Assessment Reports (EPARs) for transparency.

Despite structural similarities, key differences exist in dossier evaluation models, digital maturity, and reliance practices. India's system remains flexible and locally adaptive, whereas the EMA's framework demonstrates greater procedural standardization. The study concludes that enhanced regulatory convergence, digitalization, and mutual recognition mechanisms could streamline generic drug approvals globally.

Keywords: ANDA; CTD; CDSCO; EMA; NDCTR 2019; Bioequivalence; eCTD; Regulatory Harmonization; Generic Drug Approval.

INTRODUCTION

Background of the Study

The pharmaceutical industry operates within a highly regulated environment where the safety, efficacy, and quality of medicinal products are paramount. Regulatory agencies worldwide establish stringent frameworks to ensure that medicines reaching the public are both therapeutically effective and safe for consumption. These frameworks dictate the process of drug development, evaluation, and approval, thereby influencing the accessibility of pharmaceuticals in various markets (World Health Organization [WHO], 2021). Over the decades, the regulatory landscape has evolved significantly, particularly with respect to the approval of generic medicines that offer cost-effective alternatives to innovator drugs.

Generic drugs play a crucial role in healthcare systems by reducing expenditure while maintaining therapeutic equivalence to brand-name counterparts (U.S. Food and Drug Administration [FDA], 2022). The mechanism by which generic drugs are approved is primarily governed by the Abbreviated New Drug Application (ANDA) system, a process that emphasizes demonstration of bioequivalence (BE) rather than duplicative clinical efficacy and safety studies. The concept of ANDA, initially developed under the U.S. Hatch–Waxman Act of 1984, has influenced regulatory practices across several jurisdictions, including India and the European Union (EU) (Reddy & Thummala, 2020).

In India, the Central Drugs Standard Control Organization (CDSCO), functioning under the Ministry of Health and Family Welfare, is responsible for the approval of new drugs, including generics. The implementation of the New Drugs and Clinical Trials Rules (NDCTR), 2019, marked a significant modernization of the Indian regulatory framework by aligning national requirements more closely with international standards such as those of the International Council for Harmonisation of Technical Requirements for Pharmaceuticals for Human Use (ICH). This reform introduced structured dossier submissions in the Common Technical Document (CTD) format, streamlining data evaluation and facilitating transparency in the review process (Central Drugs Standard Control Organization [CDSCO], 2019).

The European Medicines Agency (EMA), on the other hand, has long established a harmonized regulatory mechanism across the European Union, wherein applications for generic medicinal products are submitted under Directive 2001/83/EC and evaluated through centralized, decentralized, or mutual recognition procedures. EMA's adoption of the CTD and electronic CTD (eCTD) formats has set a global benchmark for dossier standardization, ensuring efficient data assessment and regulatory consistency among member states (European Medicines Agency [EMA], 2022).

The globalization of the pharmaceutical market has created a growing need for regulatory convergence. Pharmaceutical manufacturers increasingly seek to register the same generic product across multiple jurisdictions, necessitating a clear understanding of the similarities and differences in dossier requirements. Despite global efforts toward harmonization, significant regional variations persist in dossier structure, administrative content, and technical expectations. These discrepancies often pose challenges for multinational companies aiming to synchronize submissions for India and the EU (Raut et al., 2021).

A comparative understanding of dossier submission requirements between India's ANDA system and the EMA framework is therefore essential for both regulators and industry stakeholders. Such a study not only aids in identifying redundancies and potential areas for harmonization but also enhances regulatory efficiency and promotes faster access to affordable medicines. Moreover, this comparative analysis contributes to the broader discourse on global pharmaceutical regulation and the implementation of ICH guidelines, which seek to unify technical requirements for the registration of medicinal products for human use (ICH, 2021).

In light of these developments, the present research undertakes a systematic examination of the dossier submission requirements for ANDA applications in India vis-à-vis those mandated by the EMA. By exploring structural and procedural distinctions, the study seeks to highlight pathways toward regulatory optimization and international alignment.

2. Overview of Regulatory Frameworks

2.1 Global Context of Drug Regulation

Pharmaceutical regulation serves as a cornerstone for ensuring that all medicinal products circulating in the global market meet defined standards of quality, safety, and efficacy. National Regulatory Authorities (NRAs) are mandated to protect public health through the control and supervision of medicines, including oversight of clinical trials, good manufacturing practices (GMP), and marketing authorization processes (World Health Organization [WHO], 2022).

Over the past three decades, regulatory science has transitioned from fragmented national standards to a more harmonized global system**,** largely influenced by the establishment of the International Council for Harmonisation of Technical Requirements for Pharmaceuticals for Human Use (ICH) in 1990. The ICH introduced the Common Technical Document (CTD) framework, a globally recognized dossier structure that standardizes submission content and facilitates parallel review by multiple regulatory agencies (International Council for Harmonisation [ICH], 2021).

Despite these harmonization efforts, notable regional distinctions remain in terms of administrative requirements, data expectations, dossier format specifications, and evaluation timelines. These differences stem from variations in legal frameworks**,** regulatory capacity**,** and public health priorities. Consequently, pharmaceutical companies aiming for multi-market submissions often face challenges in adapting a single dossier to comply with divergent regional standards (Raut et al., 2021).

2.2 Regulatory Framework in India

India's pharmaceutical regulatory system is one of the most extensive in the world, given the nation's role as a leading global supplier of generic medicines. The legal foundation is established through the Drugs and Cosmetics Act, 1940**,** and the Drugs and Cosmetics Rules, 1945**,** which empower the Central Drugs

Standard Control Organization (CDSCO) to regulate the import, manufacture, distribution, and sale of pharmaceuticals. The Drugs Controller General of India (DCGI), functioning under the CDSCO, acts as the primary authority for granting marketing authorization for new and generic drugs.

2.2.1 Evolution of Regulatory Reforms

Prior to the New Drugs and Clinical Trials Rules (NDCTR), 2019, generic approvals in India were guided by Schedule Y of the Drugs and Cosmetics Rules, which lacked detailed dossier submission formats. The introduction of NDCTR 2019 modernized India's regulatory ecosystem by incorporating a structured CTD-based dossier submission system, aligning national processes with international norms such as those prescribed by the ICH and WHO (CDSCO, 2019).

This reform not only improved transparency but also introduced defined review timelines, provisions for expedited approvals, and digital submission mechanisms. It enabled the adoption of a risk-based review approach, emphasizing scientific evaluation of bioequivalence and pharmaceutical quality while minimizing redundant clinical data requirements (Sharma & Bansal, 2020).

2.2.2 ANDA-Type Submissions under NDCTR

In India, applications for generic drug approvals—comparable to Abbreviated New Drug Applications (ANDAs)—are submitted in CTD format under Form CT-21 (for import) or Form CT-22 (for manufacture). The supporting documents are organized into five modules:

1. **Module 1 – Administrative and Regional Information:** Includes application forms, manufacturing licenses, GMP certificates, labeling, proposed product inserts, and fee receipts. India-specific requirements, such as **Form 44** under the Drugs and Cosmetics Rules, are integrated within this section.
2. **Module 2 – CTD Summaries:** Summaries of quality, nonclinical, and clinical information, including Quality Overall Summary (QOS).
3. **Module 3 – Quality (CMC):** Comprehensive data on drug substance and drug product manufacturing, validation, stability studies (Zone IVb), and packaging.
4. **Module 4 – Nonclinical Study Reports:** Typically not required for generic products unless justified by changes in formulation or route of administration.
5. **Module 5 – Clinical Study Reports (Bioequivalence):** Contains bioequivalence (BE) study protocols, reports, and statistical analyses comparing the test product with the reference innovator drug (Singh & Verma, 2022).

The CDSCO mandates in-country BE studies for most generic products unless justified otherwise. BE studies must be conducted at approved clinical research organizations (CROs) and are evaluated by the Subject Expert Committee (SEC) and the Technical Committee of CDSCO before approval (Reddy & Thummala, 2020).

2.2.3 Review and Approval Process

Once the dossier is submitted via the SUGAM online portal, it undergoes administrative screening for completeness, followed by scientific review by the New Drugs Division of CDSCO. The evaluation process includes:

- Assessment of pharmaceutical equivalence and quality documentation;
- Verification of bioequivalence study data;
- GMP inspection of manufacturing facilities; and
- Labeling and product information review.

If the data are satisfactory, the DCGI issues a marketing authorization valid for five years, subject to post-marketing surveillance and renewal. For imported generics, prior approval of the manufacturing site by CDSCO inspectors is mandatory, ensuring compliance with Schedule M or WHO GMP standards (Gupta et al., 2021).

2.3 Regulatory Framework in the European Union

The European Union (EU) has developed one of the most comprehensive and harmonized pharmaceutical regulatory systems globally. The European Medicines Agency (EMA) coordinates the evaluation of

medicinal products across the EU, while national competent authorities (NCAs) handle applications under national, decentralized, and mutual recognition procedures.

2.3.1 Legislative Foundations

The fundamental legal instruments governing drug approval in the EU are:

- Directive 2001/83/EC (Community Code for medicinal products for human use), which outlines requirements for marketing authorization; and
- Regulation (EC) No. 726/2004, which establishes the EMA and sets forth the Centralised Procedure for EU-wide authorization (European Commission, 2021).

Generic medicines are approved under Article 10(1) of Directive 2001/83/EC, allowing applicants to reference the innovator's dossier without repeating preclinical or clinical studies, provided bioequivalence is demonstrated (European Medicines Agency [EMA], 2023).

2.3.2 Authorization Pathways

Applicants can choose among the following routes:

1. **Centralised Procedure (CP):** Single marketing authorization valid in all EU and EEA countries, evaluated by EMA's Committee for Medicinal Products for Human Use (CHMP).
2. **Decentralised Procedure (DCP):** For products not yet authorized in any EU member state; one member acts as the Reference Member State (RMS) coordinating review among **Concerned Member States (CMSs)**.
3. **Mutual Recognition Procedure (MRP):** Used when a medicine has already been approved in one member state; other states recognize the existing authorization.
4. **National Procedure (NP):** Applied only within one member state.

2.3.3 Dossier Format and Technical Requirements

EMA and all NCAs require submissions in **CTD/eCTD format**, mirroring the ICH structure:

1. **Module 1 (Regional Administrative Data)** includes application form, product information (SmPC, labeling, package leaflet), pharmacovigilance system summary, and Risk Management Plan (RMP).
2. **Module 3 (Quality)** adheres to ICH Q-series guidelines and EMA's product-specific quality guidance.
3. **Module 5 (Clinical)** focuses on bioequivalence data, with provisions for **biowaivers** under specific BCS criteria (EMA, 2022).

Additional expectations in the EU include a Qualified Person (QP) declaration for GMP compliance, an Environmental Risk Assessment (ERA), and adherence to Good Pharmacovigilance Practices (GVP) post-authorization. These components illustrate the EMA's emphasis on product lifecycle management rather than a one-time approval.

2.3.4 Evaluation and Decision-Making

For centralized procedures, the CHMP appoints two rapporteurs who independently assess the dossier and prepare evaluation reports within 210 active days**. A** List of Questions (LoQ) may be issued to the applicant during the review cycle. Upon favorable assessment, the European Commission grants a marketing authorization valid throughout the EU (European Medicines Agency, 2023).

In contrast, for DCP or MRP, the RMS leads the evaluation, and CMSs may raise Potential Serious Risks to Public Health (PSRPH) within 90 days of receiving the assessment report. This structured, peer-reviewed evaluation ensures scientific rigor and mutual recognition across jurisdictions.

DISCUSSION

The globalization of pharmaceutical manufacturing and trade has intensified the need for regulatory harmonization in drug approval processes across jurisdictions. Among the most important regulatory submissions is the Abbreviated New Drug Application (ANDA), designed to facilitate the marketing of generic equivalents of innovator drugs after patent expiry. Both India and the European Medicines Agency (EMA) have adopted the International Council for Harmonisation (ICH) Common Technical Document

(CTD) structure for dossier submissions. However, despite this harmonization, differences remain in documentation content, review processes, digital maturity, and reliance practices.

This chapter discusses the comparative aspects of dossier submission requirements for ANDA-type applications in India and under the EMA framework. It interprets these findings in terms of regulatory efficiency, transparency, and harmonization. The discussion also explores key challenges and proposes pathways for convergence aligned with international best practices.

5.2 Overview of Regulatory Frameworks

The regulatory framework for ANDA submissions in both India and the European Union (EU) reflects each region's health governance philosophy and administrative maturity. In India, the Central Drugs Standard Control Organization (CDSCO) operates under the Ministry of Health and Family Welfare and is guided by the New Drugs and Clinical Trials Rules (NDCTR, 2019). The NDCTR established a structured yet flexible pathway for generic drugs, emphasizing bioequivalence (BE) data, stability testing, and local clinical validation.

Conversely, in the EU, the EMA functions as a centralized scientific evaluation body supported by national competent authorities (NCAs). Generic submissions fall under Article 10 of Directive 2001/83/EC, which defines simplified procedures for products proven to be bioequivalent to reference medicines. The EMA's system prioritizes standardized review timelines, transparency, and digital dossier management via the electronic Common Technical Document (eCTD) (EMA, 2023).

While both systems share a common structural base in the ICH CTD format, India's model remains transitional—gradually moving from paper-based submissions to eCTD—whereas the EMA has achieved full digitalization and regional integration through platforms such as Common European Submission Platform (CESP) and EU Telematics Gateway.

5.3 Comparative Interpretation of CTD Module Requirements

The CTD framework organizes the dossier into five modules. Although these modules are consistent globally, their content depth and regional annex requirements vary.

5.3.1 Module 1: Regional Administrative Information

In India, Module 1 includes forms such as Form 44, authorization letters, import/manufacturing licenses, product labels, and details of the local manufacturer. It requires submission through the SUGAM portal, which partially digitizes the application but often necessitates hard copy validation (CDSCO, 2022). Regional climatic conditions also dictate the inclusion of Zone IVb stability data, a critical difference from EMA submissions.

Under the EMA, Module 1 comprises a standardized application form, Summary of Product Characteristics (SmPC), labeling mock-ups, and pharmacovigilance system details. Applicants must provide an environmental risk assessment and Qualified Person (QP) declarations for GMP compliance (European Commission, 2001). Thus, EMA Module 1 places stronger emphasis on pharmacovigilance and environmental safety, while India prioritizes administrative completeness and manufacturing authenticity.

5.3.2 Module 2: CTD Summaries

Module 2 provides overviews of quality, nonclinical, and clinical information. In the context of generic applications, nonclinical and clinical summaries are abbreviated, relying primarily on bioequivalence data.

In India, the Quality Overall Summary (QOS) is a key document summarizing the chemistry, manufacturing, and controls (CMC) information. Reviewers from the Subject Expert Committee (SEC) assess its adequacy, focusing on formulation development and BE justification.

For EMA submissions, the QOS must align with ICH M4Q (R1) guidance. The EMA assessors evaluate scientific justification for BE waivers, comparability of excipients, and bioanalytical validation. The EU system places stronger emphasis on scientific rationale and risk-based assessment, while India's system values procedural completeness and regulatory consistency (Patra et al., 2022).

5.3.3 Module 3: Quality (Chemistry, Manufacturing, and Controls)

Module 3 represents the technical foundation of both regulatory systems. Both CDSCO and EMA require comprehensive documentation covering drug substance, drug product, manufacturing process validation, and stability studies.

The EMA mandates data in line with ICH Q8 (R2) and Q9, integrating Quality by Design (QbD) principles and lifecycle management. Applicants must provide GMP certification, CEP documentation, and a QP declaration confirming compliance with EU manufacturing standards.

In India, while Module 3 largely mirrors ICH expectations, emphasis is placed on local GMP certification and API verification. The CDSCO accepts Drug Master File (DMF) references or Certificate of Suitability (CEP) documents but often requires source verification of imported APIs. Stability testing under Zone IVb conditions (30°C/75% RH) remains a distinctive national requirement due to India's climatic classification (CDSCO, 2019).

5.3.4 Module 4: Nonclinical Studies

Both India and the EMA typically waive nonclinical data requirements for generic applications, given that the reference product's safety profile is established. However, additional nonclinical justification may be required if there are changes in formulation, manufacturing process, or excipient composition.

The EMA sometimes requires bridging toxicological data for hybrid applications (Article 10(3)), while India allows such data to be presented selectively when warranted. This reflects a shared reliance on scientific equivalence principles, though EMA standards are more formally codified and consistently applied across member states.

5.3.5 Module 5: Clinical Data

Module 5 includes bioequivalence (BE) and clinical study reports. Both authorities require demonstration that the generic product is pharmacokinetically equivalent to the reference.

In India, BE studies must typically be conducted at CDSCO-approved centers using Indian populations, unless foreign data are scientifically justified. This ensures relevance to local therapeutic use and pharmacogenomic factors (Sharma et al., 2021).

In contrast, the EMA accepts BE data generated outside the EU, provided studies follow Good Clinical Practice (GCP) and Good Laboratory Practice (GLP). EMA assessors also evaluate biowaiver requests based on the Biopharmaceutics Classification System (BCS), promoting regulatory flexibility without compromising scientific rigor.

5.4 Comparative Review and Evaluation Models

While dossier structures show convergence, review and evaluation mechanisms differ fundamentally between India and the EMA.

In India, the CDSCO uses a multi-tiered evaluation model, incorporating administrative review, technical validation, and Subject Expert Committee (SEC) assessment. The SEC provides domain-specific expertise in pharmacology, toxicology, and clinical evaluation. This ensures contextual understanding of local healthcare needs but sometimes extends timelines due to variable committee scheduling (CDSCO, 2022).

The EMA, by contrast, employs a decentralized scientific assessment model under the Committee for Medicinal Products for Human Use (CHMP). Rapporteurs and co-rapporteurs from member states independently evaluate dossiers, followed by peer review within CHMP meetings. This system ensures scientific independence, peer validation, and procedural predictability, typically concluding within 210 days (excluding clock-stops) (EMA, 2023).

The EMA's use of standardized "clock-stop" timelines and formal List of Questions (LoQ) mechanism provides applicants with structured feedback cycles. India's process lacks a fixed review clock, often leading to variable approval times depending on dossier completeness and responsiveness to deficiency letters.

5.5 Key Challenges in Dossier Submission and Evaluation

Although both India and the EMA have aligned with the ICH CTD framework, the practical implementation of dossier submission and evaluation continues to present regulatory, infrastructural, and procedural challenges.

5.5.1 Regulatory Complexity and Lack of Harmonized Guidance

In India, frequent amendments to the Drugs and Cosmetics Rules and introduction of the NDCTR (2019) have modernized the system but also increased interpretational complexity. Applicants often face ambiguity regarding data expectations for BE studies, comparative dissolution testing, and justification for biowaivers.

Moreover, the absence of a single consolidated generic drug guideline equivalent to the EMA's "Guideline on the Investigation of Bioequivalence" creates inconsistency in dossier preparation (Patra et al., 2022).

In contrast, the EMA framework benefits from a centralized body of harmonized guidance, regularly updated under the European Commission and CHMP. Each revision of guidelines is publicly available through the EudraLex Volume 2A and 2B, ensuring transparency and predictability for applicants. Thus, while India's system is evolving rapidly, its regulatory predictability remains limited compared to the EMA.

5.5.2 Infrastructure and Digitalization Barriers

The electronic Common Technical Document (eCTD) submission format has revolutionized dossier management in the EU, enabling lifecycle tracking, structured data validation, and interoperability with pharmacovigilance systems. India's SUGAM portal has initiated digital transformation but remains limited in functionality. Applicants still need to provide physical copies of certain documents, and the portal lacks real-time tracking or communication features that are standard in the EU's Common European Submission Platform (CESP).

The EMA's integration of eCTD with telematics and pharmacovigilance databases enables efficient communication between regulators, industry, and health authorities. The Indian system, however, remains partially manual, increasing administrative burden and approval delays (CDSCO, 2022). This highlights the need for greater investment in regulatory informatics infrastructure.

5.5.3 Review Capacity and Expertise

India faces challenges in ensuring adequate regulatory review capacity. The Subject Expert Committees (SECs), while scientifically robust, are limited in number and often overburdened. Differences in interpretation among reviewers can lead to inconsistent outcomes.

In the EMA, assessment responsibilities are distributed among rapporteur and co-rapporteur member states, ensuring parallel review and peer validation. This division of labor improves review efficiency and scientific depth. Moreover, the EMA operates with clear performance metrics, monitoring timelines and decision-making consistency, which enhances regulatory credibility (EMA, 2023).

5.5.4 Transparency and Stakeholder Communication

A defining strength of the EMA system is its commitment to transparency. The publication of European Public Assessment Reports (EPARs) and access to clinical data summaries allows public scrutiny and promotes confidence in the regulatory process.

In India, the lack of publicly accessible review reports limits transparency. Although CDSCO has improved communication through circulars and press releases, detailed rationales for approval or rejection are rarely published. Greater transparency would foster trust and predictability in the Indian regulatory system and align it more closely with international best practices.

5.6 Harmonization Efforts and Regulatory Convergence

The movement toward global harmonization is essential to reduce duplication and facilitate faster access to quality generics. India and the EMA are both members or observers of several international harmonization platforms.

5.6.1 Role of ICH and WHO Initiatives

India formally joined the International Council for Harmonisation (ICH) as a full member in 2022, a significant milestone in regulatory modernization. This membership allows the CDSCO to adopt ICH guidelines on quality (Q-series), safety (S-series), and efficacy (E-series) standards. Implementation of these guidelines in the Indian context will gradually bridge technical gaps between India and EMA (ICH, 2023).

The World Health Organization (WHO) Global Benchmarking Tool (GBT) also plays a crucial role. India has advanced toward Maturity Level 3, indicating a well-functioning regulatory authority capable of international reliance and mutual recognition. These developments create the foundation for regulatory convergence with EMA systems.

5.6.2 Regional Harmonization and Mutual Recognition

The EMA operates within a framework of mutual recognition and decentralized procedures that integrate regulatory efforts across the European Economic Area (EEA). These mechanisms—Centralized Procedure (CP), Decentralized Procedure (DCP), and Mutual Recognition Procedure (MRP)—enable a single dossier submission to achieve authorization across multiple member states.

India, by contrast, lacks regional mutual recognition agreements with neighboring regulatory agencies. Establishing such collaborations with SAARC nations or ASEAN regulators could enhance India's role as a regional regulatory hub. Adoption of Good Reliance Practices (GRelP), as recommended by WHO (2021), can further streamline evaluations by leveraging EMA assessments.

5.7 Reliance and Recognition Models

5.7.1 EMA's Reliance Framework

The EMA engages in regulatory reliance primarily through cooperation with international authorities such as the U.S. FDA, Health Canada, and PMDA Japan. These collaborations include Good Manufacturing Practice (GMP) mutual recognition agreements that allow acceptance of inspection results across jurisdictions. This significantly reduces duplication of regulatory effort and accelerates market access.

5.7.2 India's Emerging Reliance Pathways

India's NDCTR (2019) introduced provisions for reliance on approvals granted by Stringent Regulatory Authorities (SRAs) for certain products. Section 75 of NDCTR allows waivers of local clinical trials if adequate global data exist, thus reducing drug lag. However, this reliance mechanism remains underutilized for generics. Expanding its application—especially for ANDAs referencing products approved by EMA or FDA—would enhance efficiency while maintaining safety.

5.7.3 Potential for Bilateral Collaboration

Future collaboration between CDSCO and EMA could include mutual GMP recognition and parallel scientific advice. Such initiatives would strengthen the global regulatory ecosystem and promote faster availability of affordable medicines.

5.8 Digital Transformation in Regulatory Submissions

The EMA has fully transitioned to eCTD 4.0, a format enabling dynamic lifecycle management of dossiers, automated validation, and real-time data exchange. The European Medicines Regulatory Network (EMRN) coordinates eCTD implementation across all member states, integrating it with pharmacovigilance and product databases (EMA, 2024).

India's SUGAM portal, though an important step, still relies on PDF uploads and manual validation. The next stage involves adopting structured eCTD submission, which would align CDSCO with global digital submission standards. Investment in regulatory informatics, reviewer training, and cybersecurity are critical to this transition.

Digital harmonization will not only enhance efficiency but also enable data-driven decision-making and integration with international regulatory databases, promoting transparency and traceability.

5.9 Case Discussions and Comparative Insights

5.9.1 Case 1: Generic Atorvastatin Approval

The EMA approved multiple generic versions of atorvastatin under the centralized procedure in 2012, with comprehensive BE data and complete lifecycle submissions in eCTD format. In India, similar approvals were processed through the CDSCO with local BE studies. However, review times varied between 8 and 14 months due to manual dossier handling and additional data requests. This case highlights the EMA's predictable review timelines compared to India's procedural variability.

5.9.2 Case 2: Reliance on Foreign Approvals

Under NDCTR, certain anti-HIV generics approved by EMA were later fast-tracked in India through reliance mechanisms, demonstrating the potential for **regulatory convergence** when global data are leveraged. However, such reliance remains the exception rather than the rule. The EMA's proactive collaboration with WHO prequalification programs offers a model for India to emulate.

5.10 Impact of Regulatory Differences on Generic Drug Availability

The dossier submission requirements and review frameworks in India and the EMA profoundly influence **generic drug availability**, **market entry timelines**, and **public health outcomes**.

In the **European Union**, harmonized procedures ensure predictable and consistent approval timelines, generally within **210 review days** (excluding clock stops). The uniformity of data requirements across member states minimizes duplication and facilitates **pan-European access**. Moreover, the EMA's

transparent assessment process, including publication of EPARs, supports confidence among healthcare professionals and patients (EMA, 2023).

In **India**, the ANDA-equivalent process, though conceptually similar, faces procedural variability due to differences in dossier completeness, communication delays, and inconsistent application of bioequivalence standards. This contributes to **"drug lag"**—the delay between first global and Indian approvals. Konwar et al. (2021) reported median delays of 2–4 years for several therapeutic categories, despite NDCTR reforms aimed at expedited approvals.

Nevertheless, India's lower barriers to entry and cost-efficient BE studies foster a highly competitive **generic manufacturing ecosystem**. Indian firms often serve as **contract manufacturers** or **co-developers** for products later submitted to EMA, demonstrating the potential for **reverse regulatory learning**—where global compliance standards uplift domestic practices.

5.11 Role of Quality, Safety, and Efficacy Standards

5.11.1 EMA's Integrated Quality System

The EMA framework mandates strict adherence to **ICH Q8–Q12 guidelines**, enforcing the **Quality by Design (QbD)** paradigm. This approach ensures consistent product performance and minimizes post-approval variations. EU regulators also demand **environmental risk assessments (ERAs)** and periodic safety update reports (PSURs), ensuring lifecycle oversight (European Commission, 2001).

5.11.2 India's Progressive Quality Oversight

In India, the CDSCO increasingly mandates **GMP compliance audits**, **stability zone-specific data**, and **stringent bioequivalence validation**. However, variability in manufacturing site inspections persists due to limited inspectorate capacity. Initiatives such as the **Pharma SUGAM portal** and **GMP Plus scheme (2024)** aim to digitize inspections and enhance traceability. Aligning these efforts with EMA's QbD framework will help Indian regulators transition from a **compliance-based** to a **risk-based** review system.

5.12 Harmonization Pathways and Strategic Convergence

5.12.1 Adoption of ICH and eCTD Standards

Both India and EMA now share a commitment to ICH convergence. India's move toward full eCTD 4.0 compliance, expected within the next regulatory cycle, will facilitate mutual recognition and reliance. Integration of eCTD data with pharmacovigilance (PV) systems will further align India with the EU regulatory network model.

The EMA's long experience with electronic submission validation (EVWeb) and XML-based metadata tracking offers a template for India to build its own regulatory data warehouse. This alignment will streamline lifecycle management and reduce administrative redundancy.

5.12.2 Strengthening Regulatory Reliance Mechanisms

Harmonization can be accelerated through bilateral cooperation between CDSCO and EMA in several areas:

- **Mutual GMP Recognition:** Acceptance of GMP inspections between CDSCO and EMA can reduce duplication for export-oriented manufacturers.
- **Joint Scientific Advice:** Collaborative pre-submission consultations can standardize expectations for dossier completeness and data integrity.
- **Regulatory Intelligence Exchange:** Establishing shared databases for adverse event monitoring, pharmacovigilance reports, and clinical outcomes would promote global safety surveillance.

Such initiatives mirror existing collaborations between EMA and other SRAs (e.g., FDA, PMDA), demonstrating feasibility and mutual benefit.

5.12.3 Policy Integration with WHO and PIC/S

India's accession to PIC/S (Pharmaceutical Inspection Co-operation Scheme) is under discussion. Membership would standardize GMP inspection practices with EMA, FDA, and other advanced agencies. Similarly, integrating WHO's Good Reliance Practices (GRelP) into national policy can institutionalize reliance pathways for ANDA approvals referencing EMA-approved generics.

5.13 Policy Recommendations

Based on the comparative analysis, several recommendations emerge for harmonizing ANDA dossier submission and evaluation between India and EMA:

1. **Implement Full eCTD Infrastructure:** CDSCO should expedite adoption of eCTD 4.0 with validation tools and lifecycle management, ensuring digital equivalence with EMA's submission system.
2. **Develop Comprehensive BE Guidance:** India should publish a unified "Guideline on the Investigation of Bioequivalence" mirroring EMA standards to reduce interpretational variability.
3. **Enhance Reviewer Capacity and Specialization:** Establishing a **Regulatory Science Academy** under CDSCO would build technical expertise in CTD review, GMP inspection, and QbD assessment.
4. **Institutionalize Reliance Practices:** Create formal frameworks allowing reliance on EMA or WHO-prequalified assessments for generic drugs, particularly for essential medicines.
5. **Promote Transparency:** Introduce publication of **Assessment Summaries** similar to EMA's EPARs to improve regulatory predictability and public confidence.
6. **Encourage Industry-Regulator Dialogue:** Routine pre-submission meetings and scientific consultations, modeled after EMA's scientific advice sessions, would reduce deficiencies and expedite reviews.
7. **Regional Collaboration:** Develop **South Asian Harmonization Initiatives**, using India as a regional reference authority to streamline approvals across emerging markets.

5.14 Summary of Discussion

This comparative discussion reveals that while India and the EMA share structural alignment through the CTD and ICH frameworks, notable operational, procedural, and digital differences persist. The EMA system exemplifies harmonization, transparency, and technological integration**,** whereas India's evolving system reflects pragmatic flexibility and adaptive regulation suited to its dynamic pharmaceutical market.

Bridging these systems requires investment in digital regulatory infrastructure**,** capacity building**, and** mutual reliance frameworks**.** The growing convergence through ICH participation and eCTD adoption signifies progress toward a globally harmonized regulatory landscape. Ultimately, harmonization will not only facilitate timely access to affordable generics but also strengthen public health protection **and** pharmaceutical innovation in both regions.

5.15 Comprehensive Discussion and Policy Outlook

5.15.1 Integrative Overview

The comparative study of dossier submission requirements for Abbreviated New Drug Applications (ANDAs) in India and the European Medicines Agency (EMA) framework offers profound insights into how regulatory maturity, procedural discipline, and scientific rigor influence the quality and timeliness of generic drug approvals. While both regulatory authorities follow the Common Technical Document (CTD) model as a global harmonization standard, the extent of implementation, review depth, and operational efficiency differ significantly.

EMA's dossier submission process reflects the culmination of decades of structured policy development, scientific dialogue, and inter-agency cooperation among member states. In contrast, India's CDSCO, though evolving rapidly under the NDCTR 2019, remains in a transitional stage — shifting from a predominantly paper-based, compliance-oriented model to a digitally enabled, risk-based evaluation system. This developmental phase underscores India's commitment to global best practices, yet also reveals existing limitations in regulatory capacity, consistency, and transparency.

5.15.2 Comparative Analysis of the Regulatory Framework

At the heart of the dossier submission process lies the regulatory philosophy guiding each agency. EMA operates within a supranational governance model under the European Union, where harmonized legislation (Directive 2001/83/EC) ensures uniformity across all member states. Its centralized procedure allows a single submission to yield authorization valid throughout the EU, reducing duplication and fostering efficiency.

India, however, operates a national regulatory structure, where dossier review and approval are centralized under CDSCO, supported by zonal and sub-zonal offices. While the NDCTR 2019 has streamlined the process, the lack of regional harmonization and variable interpretation of regulatory provisions across reviewers can still lead to inconsistencies. EMA's strength lies in its collective decision-making through the Committee for Medicinal Products for Human Use (CHMP), whereas CDSCO relies on Subject Expert Committees (SECs) that sometimes differ in scientific assessment approaches.

Moreover, EMA mandates public transparency, with assessment reports, scientific opinions, and variations published in the European Public Assessment Report (EPAR) database. This contrasts with India, where such data are not routinely disclosed, limiting opportunities for external scientific scrutiny and policy learning.

5.15.3 Technical Documentation and CTD Module Comparison

Although both regulators adopt the **Common Technical Document (CTD)** format, the depth and granularity of data requirements vary across modules:

- **Module 1 (Administrative and Regional):** EMA's Module 1 demands extensive pharmacovigilance documentation, labelling harmonization, and manufacturing site details in accordance with EU GMP and GDP regulations. In India, Module 1 requirements are outlined under Schedule Y and the NDCTR 2019, but lack a single harmonized checklist or template equivalent to EMA's submission guidelines.
- **Module 2 (Summaries and Overviews):** EMA mandates detailed clinical and non-clinical summaries, including expert justifications for biowaivers and analytical comparability data. CDSCO requires summaries but allows flexibility in formatting and justification style.
- **Module 3 (Quality):** EMA applies stringent controls through **Quality by Design (QbD)**, process validation data, and reference to ICH Q8–Q12 guidelines. In India, while these principles are recognized, dossier reviews often emphasize compliance over science-based evaluation.
- **Modules 4 and 5 (Non-Clinical and Clinical):** EMA insists on structured datasets, BE study protocols, and statistical validation in accordance with EMA/CPMP guidance. In India, BE data requirements exist but are sometimes accepted from limited sample-size studies or foreign reports without full methodological transparency.

Thus, while both systems nominally use CTD, EMA's dossier expectations are more **quantitative, standardized, and evidence-driven** than India's, which remain **qualitative and flexible**—a double-edged sword that encourages local adaptation but can compromise uniformity.

5.15.4 Scientific Assessment and Review Mechanisms

EMA's scientific evaluation is conducted through a **multi-layered peer-review process** involving rapporteurs, co-rapporteurs, and expert working parties. Each dossier undergoes a pre-defined **210-day review clock**, with structured "clock-stops" to allow applicant responses. This mechanism ensures predictable timelines and accountability.

In India, SEC evaluations under CDSCO follow no fixed timeline. Review outcomes can vary based on committee composition, experience, and data completeness. However, recent reforms—such as the introduction of **timeline targets under NDCTR** and use of the **SUGAM online tracking system**—represent positive steps toward EMA-like predictability.

Moreover, EMA places substantial emphasis on **scientific advice procedures** before submission, allowing applicants to discuss dossier strategies early. CDSCO offers a pre-submission consultation process but without standardized guidance or published outcomes. Institutionalizing such advisory mechanisms in India would reduce post-submission deficiencies and delays.

5.15.5 Digitalization and eCTD Implementation

Digital transformation remains a defining differentiator between the two regulators. EMA's **eCTD 4.0** framework allows full digital integration of dossier lifecycle management, validation, and variation tracking. This has improved inter-departmental communication, reduced administrative burden, and ensured version control of submissions.

In contrast, India's CDSCO, through its **SUGAM platform**, accepts online submissions but still relies on manual verification and physical documentation for certain components. Achieving full eCTD

implementation will require adoption of **XML backbone technologies**, **data interoperability standards (ISO IDMP, HL7)**, and **training for regulatory staff** in digital dossier assessment.

The transition toward **eCTD 4.0** represents not only an efficiency gain but a paradigm shift—from document-centric to data-centric regulation—where machine-readable submissions enable data analytics, risk-based review, and faster decision-making.

5.15.6 Transparency, Ethics, and Public Accountability

Transparency forms the moral foundation of regulatory legitimacy. EMA's publication of EPARs, guidance updates, and post-marketing commitments enables a feedback loop between regulators, academia, and the public. This promotes trust and knowledge sharing.

India's regulatory system is improving in transparency but remains **administratively opaque** compared to EMA. Introducing a national repository of approval summaries and review rationales—an **Indian Public Assessment Report (IPAR)** initiative—would align India's system with global expectations and strengthen its reputation as a responsible regulator.

Furthermore, enforcing strict ethical standards in dossier evaluation and minimizing administrative discretion are critical to ensuring unbiased, scientifically grounded outcomes.

5.15.7 Harmonization and International Collaboration

The global pharmaceutical ecosystem increasingly values **regulatory convergence and reliance**. EMA's success in forging **Mutual Recognition Agreements (MRAs)** demonstrates the efficiency of shared assessments. India, as a WHO Maturity Level 3 regulator and ICH member, can leverage these partnerships to build capacity and credibility.

Potential areas for bilateral cooperation include:

- **Joint dossier review pilots** between CDSCO and EMA for select generic categories.
- **Mutual recognition of GMP inspections** to prevent duplication.
- **Collaborative pharmacovigilance databases** for post-market surveillance of generics.

Such partnerships would accelerate global access to affordable generics and reinforce India's position as a reliable source of quality-assured medicines.

5.15.8 Strengthening the Indian Regulatory Ecosystem

For India to achieve parity with EMA, several reforms are essential:

1. **Legislative Modernization:** Aligning NDCTR with evolving ICH Q-series guidelines and integrating reliance-based review mechanisms.
2. **Capacity Building:** Establishing a National Regulatory Academy for reviewer training and competency evaluation.
3. **Process Standardization:** Adopting standardized dossier templates, review checklists, and structured deficiency reporting systems.
4. **Digital Infrastructure:** Implementing full eCTD 4.0 compliance with AI-assisted validation and tracking tools.
5. **Transparency and Governance:** Publishing regulatory decisions and scientific rationales for all ANDA approvals.

These measures would not only enhance India's domestic regulatory efficiency but also strengthen its recognition within international regulatory networks.

5.15.9 Global Policy Perspective

From a policy standpoint, dossier harmonization promotes the **"One Quality, Global Market"** vision advocated by the World Health Organization and ICH. EMA's centralized procedure offers a model of integrated governance, while India's evolving system represents the dynamic growth of regulatory capability in emerging economies.

A global trend is emerging toward **risk-based dossier evaluation**, where regulators prioritize assessment based on product criticality, prior approval history, and inspection reliability. Adopting such a model in India could reduce review backlogs and optimize resource allocation.

Furthermore, implementing **regulatory reliance**—where India partially bases its assessments on EMA, USFDA, or WHO PQ evaluations—could significantly shorten approval times for products already approved by stringent regulatory authorities, without compromising patient safety.

5.15.10 Future Research and Regulatory Science Implications

This comparative analysis opens avenues for deeper research into regulatory performance metrics. Future studies could quantify dossier review times, identify correlation between dossier completeness and approval outcomes, and explore AI-driven dossier analytics to assist reviewers.

Expanding research collaboration between CDSCO, academic institutions, and global regulators could lead to the development of a **Regulatory Science Index** for continuous benchmarking.

CONCLUSION

The comparative evaluation of dossier submission requirements for Abbreviated New Drug Applications (ANDAs) in India and under the European Medicines Agency (EMA) reveals a shared foundation built on the Common Technical Document (CTD) format, yet significant regional distinctions remain in implementation, evaluation, and procedural rigor.

In India, the Central Drugs Standard Control Organization (CDSCO) functions under the **New** Drugs and Clinical Trials Rules (NDCTR, 2019), emphasizing local bioequivalence (BE) studies**,** Zone IVb stability data**,** and verification of active pharmaceutical ingredient (API) sources. The involvement of Subject Expert Committees (SECs) and the Drug Controller General of India (DCGI) ensures scientific evaluation, though the process still faces challenges related to digitalization, transparency, and review consistency.

Conversely, the EMA applies a harmonized, highly structured, and transparent evaluation model through the Committee for Medicinal Products for Human Use (CHMP)**,** mandating electronic CTD (eCTD) submissions and maintaining defined review clocks. The publication of European Public Assessment Reports (EPARs) further enhances regulatory accountability.

Despite differences, both systems strive toward the same goal—ensuring the quality, safety, and efficacy of generic medicines. India's regulatory reforms, particularly the move toward full eCTD adoption and reliance on Stringent Regulatory Authorities (SRAs)**,** demonstrate significant progress toward global harmonization.

The study concludes that achieving true regulatory convergence will depend on continued capacity building, digital transformation, mutual recognition mechanisms, and alignment with ICH standards. Strengthening collaboration between CDSCO and EMA can reduce duplication, accelerate access to affordable generics, and promote public health globally.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The Authors are thankful to the Management and Principal, Palamuru University, Mahbubnagar B. Andameedipally, Telangana, 509001, India, for extending support to carry out the research work. Finally, the authors express their gratitude to the Sura Pharma Labs, Dilsukhnagar, Hyderabad, for providing research equipment and facilities.

REFRENCES

1. Central Drugs Standard Control Organization. (2019). *New Drugs and Clinical Trials Rules, 2019.* Ministry of Health and Family Welfare, Government of India.
2. European Medicines Agency. (2022). *Guideline on the requirements for the chemical and pharmaceutical quality documentation concerning investigational medicinal products in clinical trials*. EMA.
3. International Council for Harmonisation (ICH). (2021). *M4: Common Technical Document for the Registration of Pharmaceuticals for Human Use.*
4. Raut, S., Kumar, A., & Kulkarni, P. (2021). Regulatory convergence in pharmaceutical dossier submission: A comparative analysis of global practices. *Journal of Pharmaceutical Policy and Practice, 14*(3), 210–223.
5. Reddy, V., & Thummala, R. (2020). The evolution of the generic drug approval system: Lessons from the U.S. and implications for India. *Indian Journal of Regulatory Affairs, 8*(2), 56–65.

6. U.S. Food and Drug Administration. (2022). *Abbreviated New Drug Application (ANDA): Generics.* U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.
7. World Health Organization. (2021). *WHO guidelines on regulatory practices: Harmonization and reliance.* Geneva: WHO.
8. Central Drugs Standard Control Organization. (2019). *New Drugs and Clinical Trials Rules, 2019.* Ministry of Health and Family Welfare, Government of India.
9. European Commission. (2021). *Directive 2001/83/EC on the Community code relating to medicinal products for human use.* Official Journal of the European Union.
10. European Medicines Agency. (2022). *Guideline on the investigation of bioequivalence.* EMA/CHMP/EWP/QWP/1401/98 Rev. 1.
11. European Medicines Agency. (2023). *Procedures for marketing authorisation.* https://www.ema.europa.eu
12. Gupta, A., Patel, S., & Kumar, R. (2021). Comparative stability data requirements across climatic zones: Implications for dossier submissions in India. *International Journal of Regulatory Science, 9*(2), 88–96.
13. International Council for Harmonisation. (2021). *M4: Common Technical Document for the Registration of Pharmaceuticals for Human Use.* ICH Secretariat.
14. Raut, S., Kumar, A., & Kulkarni, P. (2021). Regulatory convergence in pharmaceutical dossier submission: A comparative analysis of global practices. *Journal of Pharmaceutical Policy and Practice, 14*(3), 210–223.
15. Reddy, V., & Thummala, R. (2020). The evolution of the generic drug approval system: Lessons from the U.S. and implications for India. *Indian Journal of Regulatory Affairs, 8*(2), 56–65.
16. Sharma, P., & Bansal, V. (2020). Implementation of NDCTR 2019 and its impact on generic drug approvals in India. *Journal of Pharmaceutical Policy and Practice, 13*(4), 312–320.
17. Singh, N., & Verma, S. (2022). Review of dossier submission process for generic drug approvals under NDCTR 2019. *Indian Journal of Regulatory Affairs, 10*(1), 25–33.
18. World Health Organization. (2022). *Good regulatory practices: Guidelines for national regulatory authorities.* Geneva: WHO.
19. Amidon, G. L., Lennernäs, H., Shah, V. P., & Crison, J. R. (1995). A theoretical basis for a biopharmaceutic drug classification: The correlation of in vitro drug product dissolution and in vivo bioavailability. *Pharmaceutical Research, 12*(3), 413–420.
20. Central Drugs Standard Control Organization. (2019). *New Drugs and Clinical Trials Rules, 2019.* Ministry of Health and Family Welfare, Government of India.
21. European Commission. (2021). *Directive 2001/83/EC on the Community code relating to medicinal products for human use.* Official Journal of the European Union.
22. European Medicines Agency. (2022). *Guideline on the investigation of bioequivalence.* EMA/CHMP/EWP/QWP/1401/98 Rev. 1.
23. European Medicines Agency. (2023). *Generic and hybrid applications (Article 10 of Directive 2001/83/EC).* https://www.ema.europa.eu
24. Grabowski, H. (2007). The market for follow-on biologics: How will it evolve? *Health Affairs, 26*(3), 129–140.
25. Grabowski, H., & Vernon, J. (1986). Longer patents for increased generic competition in the U.S.: The Hatch–Waxman Act. *PharmacoEconomics, 4*(1), 45–54.
26. Gupta, A., & Saran, N. (2021). A comparative evaluation of bioequivalence standards among major regulatory authorities. *Journal of Regulatory Science, 9*(2), 54–62.

27. Nagarajan, S., & Gopinath, R. (2020). Generic pharmaceutical exports from India: Challenges and opportunities. *Journal of Global Pharmacy Regulation, 6*(1), 21–29.
28. Patel, R., & Shah, D. (2022). Data integrity in pharmaceutical bioequivalence studies: A regulatory perspective. *Indian Journal of Regulatory Affairs, 10*(4), 88–97.
29. Pharmaceutical Inspection Co-operation Scheme. (2021). *PIC/S guide to good manufacturing practice for medicinal products.*
30. Reich, M. (2019). The interplay of patents and data exclusivity in the EU generic medicines framework. *European Journal of Health Law, 26*(3), 237–256.