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.iss2.2026.1060.1076

Regulatory Challenges in Introducing New Drug Delivery Systems in The Indian Pharmaceutical Market

Gangu Kavya *, Dr. V. Prabhakar Reddy,

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

Corresponding Author: Gangu Kavya
Email: kavyareddygangu@gmail.com

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

Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

Abstract: The introduction of new drug delivery systems (NDDS)—including nanoparticles, liposomes, transdermal patches, inhalable formulations, and sustained/controlled-release technologies—has revolutionized modern pharmacotherapy by improving drug bioavailability, patient compliance, and therapeutic outcomes. However, in the Indian pharmaceutical market, the regulatory environment governing NDDS remains complex and continuously evolving. Despite India's growth as a global manufacturing and research hub, the regulatory framework still faces significant challenges in evaluation, standardization, and approval of novel delivery technologies.

The current Indian system, primarily governed by the Drugs and Cosmetics Act, 1940, and Schedule Y, provides limited explicit guidance specific to NDDS products. The Central Drugs Standard Control Organization (CDSCO) evaluates such products on a case-by-case basis, often requiring additional non-clinical, stability, and bioequivalence data. This lack of standardized criteria results in regulatory uncertainty, prolonged review timelines, and duplication of studies, posing hurdles for innovators and generic developers alike. Moreover, limited infrastructure for characterization, inadequate reviewer training, and absence of harmonized guidelines further impede timely product approvals.

Recent initiatives such as the New Drugs and Clinical Trials Rules (NDCTR), 2019, the SUGAM online submission portal, and alignment efforts with International Council for Harmonisation (ICH) standards are positive steps toward regulatory modernization. However, effective implementation requires clearer categorization of NDDS products, standardized evaluation metrics, and strengthened collaboration between academia, industry, and regulatory authorities.

This study highlights the regulatory gaps, procedural bottlenecks, and scientific challenges affecting NDDS approval in India and emphasizes the need for a dedicated regulatory framework for advanced drug delivery technologies. Strengthening this framework will ensure that India not only keeps pace with global innovation but also enhances drug safety, efficacy, and accessibility for its growing patient population.

Keywords: New Drug Delivery Systems (NDDS), CDSCO, Schedule Y, Regulatory Challenges, NDCTR 2019, Bioequivalence, Clinical Trials, India, Drug Approval, Pharmaceutical Innovation, Nanotechnology, Controlled Release.

INTRODUCTION

The Indian pharmaceutical industry has witnessed a remarkable transformation over the past three decades, evolving from a predominantly generic-driven sector into a hub of innovation, contract research, and

advanced formulation development. Among the key catalysts of this transformation is the emergence of New Drug Delivery Systems (NDDS)—a multidisciplinary field that integrates pharmaceutical technology, polymer science, nanotechnology, and biotechnology to enhance the therapeutic index, targeting efficiency,1 and patient compliance of drugs. NDDS technologies aim to optimize the release profile, bioavailability, and site-specific delivery of active pharmaceutical ingredients (APIs), thereby reducing adverse effects and improving overall treatment outcomes.

1. Scope and Evolution of NDDS in India

India's pharmaceutical market has historically been dominated by generic oral solid dosage forms. However, with increasing therapeutic complexity and rising competition, the industry began to invest in novel delivery technologies—such as liposomes, microspheres, nanoparticles, transdermal patches, mucoadhesive systems, and controlled-release formulations—as differentiation strategies.

Institutions like CSIR, NIPERs, and IITs, along with leading private firms such as Sun Pharma, Dr. Reddy's,2 Cipla, and Biocon, have initiated research collaborations to develop value-added generics and biosimilar NDDS formulations. Moreover, global demand for patient-centric products (e.g., sustained-release, orally disintegrating, and once-daily dosage forms) has further fueled innovation in formulation technologies within India.3

Despite these advances, NDDS products in India often face delayed market entry due to the absence of specific regulatory pathways and the limited technical capacity of existing approval mechanisms. Regulatory agencies such as the Central Drugs Standard Control Organization (CDSCO)4 handle NDDS applications under the broad category of "new drugs," often using frameworks designed for conventional formulations, rather than for complex delivery technologies.

2. Regulatory Context

The Drugs and Cosmetics Act (1940) and the Drugs and Cosmetics Rules (1945) form the cornerstone of pharmaceutical regulation in India. The subsequent introduction of Schedule Y (amended in 2005) and later the New Drugs and Clinical Trials Rules (NDCTR, 2019) aimed to streamline the process of clinical trials, new drug approvals, and post-marketing surveillance.

However, these regulations were primarily designed for small-molecule drugs and biologics, with limited attention to formulation innovations such as NDDS. For instance:

- Schedule Y lacks explicit provisions for evaluating novel excipients, release mechanisms, or device–drug combinations.
- The NDCTR 2019, though progressive, defines "new drugs" broadly, causing NDDS to be subjected to redundant data requirements similar to those of a new chemical entity (NCE).
- There is no dedicated classification for NDDS products, leading to case-by-case review and regulatory unpredictability.5-9

This gap creates uncertainty in dossier preparation, duplicative studies, and lengthy review timelines, discouraging domestic innovators and investors.

Key Regulatory Challenges10

Several systemic challenges continue to impede the smooth introduction of NDDS in India:

1. Lack of Categorization and Guidance:

No formal definition or classification exists for NDDS within CDSCO's framework, resulting in inconsistent evaluation criteria.

2. Inadequate Technical Expertise:

Reviewer capacity within CDSCO and SECs is limited for assessing complex physicochemical and biopharmaceutical attributes of NDDS (e.g., particle size distribution, zeta potential, encapsulation efficiency).10

3. Limited Infrastructure for Evaluation:

Few GLP-accredited labs in India are equipped for nanotoxicology studies, inhalation delivery testing, or in vitro release modeling, resulting in dependency on foreign data.

4. Absence of IVIVC and QbD Guidelines:

Unlike the FDA's SUPAC-MR guidance, India lacks standardized approaches for establishing correlation between formulation parameters and clinical performance.

5. Ethical and Clinical Oversight Gaps:

Ethics Committees often lack technical understanding of NDDS protocols, leading to delays in trial approval and monitoring.

6. Post-Marketing Surveillance Weakness:

The Pharmacovigilance Programme of India (PvPI) does not yet have mechanisms tailored to detect device-related failures or nanomaterial toxicity.**DISCUSSION**

New Drug Delivery Systems (NDDS) — e.g., nanoparticles, liposomes, long-acting injectables, transdermal systems, inhalation devices, and implantable depots — offer substantial clinical and commercial benefits. India has strong scientific and manufacturing capabilities, yet regulatory uncertainty, limited reviewer expertise, lack of NDDS-specific guidance, inconsistent dossier expectations, inadequate infrastructure for advanced analytics and GLP testing, and fragmented post-market surveillance impede timely NDDS introduction. Addressing these through targeted guidance, capacity building, digital modernization, and international harmonization will accelerate safe access and strengthen India's global competitiveness.

1. Framing the problem: why NDDS regulation matters

1. NDDS change the risk–benefit calculus: NDDS alter ADME (absorption, distribution, metabolism, excretion), biodistribution, immunogenicity potential and failure modes (e.g., device-related issues, polymer degradation). Regulators must evaluate not only the active pharmaceutical ingredient (API) but also the delivery vehicle, interfaces, and the manufacturing process.
2. Generic rules don't fit: Conventional regulatory frameworks and bioequivalence (BE) boxes (Cmax/AUC equivalence) are often insufficient to characterize NDDS performance.
3. Patient safety and innovation tradeoffs: Overly conservative or vague regulation delays beneficial products; lax regulation risks safety incidents. India needs a risk-based, science-driven approach balancing both imperatives.

2. Regulatory architecture in India — current status and gaps

2.1 Institutions and instruments

- **CDSCO / DCGI**: national regulatory authority for drugs and clinical trials.
- **Schedule Y** and **NDCTR 2019**: govern clinical trials and new drug approvals; NDCTR introduced timelines and SUGAM e-portal.
- **State regulators**: involved for manufacturing site licensing.
- **DBT / RCGM**, **ICMR** and **GEAC**: may be involved for biologics, GMO/biotech aspects and environment/biosafety.
- **PvPI**: pharmacovigilance programme of India.

2.2 Major gaps relevant to NDDS

- **No NDDS-specific guidance** (classification, CMC expectations, analytical methods, BE/PD endpoints).
- **Inconsistent dossier expectations**: sponsors face ad-hoc queries; reviewers may ask for additional studies not previously disclosed.
- **Limited specialized reviewer capacity**: expertise in nanotechnology, material science, biopharmaceutics is scarce.
- **Insufficient GLP/GLP-like test infrastructure** for inhalation, nanotoxicology, biodistribution studies.

- **Ambiguity in combination products** (drug + device): which rule applies—Drugs Rules or Medical Device Rules—leading to overlapping jurisdiction.
- **Post-market surveillance**: PvPI geared to conventional ADRs; device failures, nanomaterial signals and long-term depot effects are harder to detect without dedicated systems.

3. Scientific & technical challenges when assessing NDDS

3.1 Analytical characterization

NDDS demand advanced, orthogonal characterization:

- Particle size distribution (DLS, NTA), morphology (TEM/SEM), zeta potential, surface chemistry, aggregation propensity.
- Drug loading / encapsulation efficiency, free vs bound drug quantification (separation techniques), release kinetics (in vitro release apparatus), polymer molecular weight and degradation products.
- Residual solvents, endotoxin, sterility (for parenteral systems), interaction with excipients, and device compatibility.

Regulatory implication: India needs validated methods, standardized acceptance criteria and inter-laboratory comparability programs.

3.2 In vitro–in vivo correlation (IVIVC)

- For controlled-release and depot systems, robust IVIVC reduces clinical burden. Establishing IVIVC for particulate systems is complex and methodology is not standardized.

Regulatory implication: Clear guidance on acceptable IVIVC approaches (level A/B/C), modeling expectations (PBPK/PBPD), and when IVIVC can replace clinical endpoints is required.

3.3 Non-clinical evaluation (nanotoxicology, biodistribution)

- NDDS can show organ accumulation, unexpected immunotoxicity, complement activation, and chronic local tissue reactions. Traditional repeat-dose toxicity may be insufficient; biodistribution, local tolerance and immunogenicity studies are critical.
- OECD nanomaterial testing guidance and specialized GLP studies are needed.

Regulatory implication: Establish required test battery for classes of NDDS and criteria for when non-clinical studies may be abbreviated.

3.4 Clinical evaluation — BE vs comparability vs efficacy trials

- NDDS often require tailored clinical programs:
  - Small molecules in modified release: BE studies using PK metrics sometimes accept dissolution/IVIVC.
  - Liposomes / nanoparticulate carriers: PK may be less predictive; require PD markers, surrogate endpoints or confirmatory efficacy trials.
  - Long-acting injectables / implants: extended PK monitoring, patient safety rescue strategies.
- Immunogenicity (for biologic-containing NDDS) must be assessed with validated assays.

Regulatory implication: India needs to define when reduced clinical programs are acceptable and statistical equivalence margins for NDDS endpoints.

3.5 Manufacturing & scale-up

- NDDS manufacturing is process-sensitive: small changes alter CQAs. Scale-up validation, process analytical technology (PAT), and QbD principles are essential.

Regulatory implication: Update GMP (Schedule M) to include NDDS manufacturing annexes.

4. Procedural and operational challenges in the approval pathway

4.1 Pre-submission interactions

- In many mature agencies, formal pre-IND/Scientific Advice meetings clarify expectations. India's pre-submission process exists but needs formalization for NDDS with documented minutes, clear timelines and binding technical advice.

4.2 Dossier structure and e-submission

- SUGAM is an important advance, but eCTD structure with Module-3 heavy analytical content needs standardized templates and capacity for large data sets (raw data, method validation reports, modeling outputs).

4.3 SEC scheduling and decision timelines

- SEC meeting bottlenecks: scheduling delays, variable expert composition, lack of published rationale. NDDS would benefit from dedicated NDDS SEC panels.

4.4 Multi-agency coordination

- For biologics/devices, coordination with DBT, RCGM or device regulators is ad-hoc. MOUs with defined response windows are required.

5. Regulatory classification of NDDS and combination products

Why classification matters

Classification determines:

- Which legal framework applies (drug rules vs device rules vs combination regulatory pathway).
- The dossier content and evidence expectations (CMC, biocompatibility, device bench tests, human factors, clinical data).
- Which agency or division leads the review (CDSCO drug division, device authority, or joint panel).
- Post-market obligations (pharmacovigilance vs vigilance for devices; combined PV/MDV signals). Getting the classification right early avoids delays, duplicate testing and jurisdictional disputes.

Core regulatory principles used by mature agencies

Primary Mode of Action (PMOA)

Most mature regulators (FDA, Health Canada, EMA practice) use **Primary Mode of Action** — the primary therapeutic effect determines classification:

- If the primary intended effect is achieved **pharmacologically, metabolically or immunologically**, it's a **drug** (with a device constituent).
- If the primary intended effect is achieved **by physical/mechanical means**, it's a **device** (with a medicinal constituent).

Risk-based approach

Classify by risk: higher-risk devices or device components require more device-specific evidence (sterility, human factors, bench testing). Delivery vehicles that alter biodistribution raise drug-level safety questions.

Totality of evidence & lifecycle view

Classification and regulatory requirements should reflect the entire lifecycle: CMC, manufacturing controls, non-clinical, clinical, labeling, and post-market risk management.

Practical classification decision tree (use this as a working tool)

1. Identify **intended use / claims** on your label and protocol.
2. Ask: **What provides the principal intended therapeutic effect?**
   - If **API effect** → drug primary.
   - If **device/mechanism effect** (mechanical filtration, barrier, electrical stimulation) → device primary.

3. Does the device materially alter **pharmacokinetics/ADME** of the API (e.g., nanoparticles, liposomes, implants)?
   - Yes → treat as **drug with device constituent** (drug-centred review); device tests still required.
4. Is the device component proprietary and critical for safety/performance (e.g., inhaler actuator, micro-needle patch, pump)?
   - Yes → require device design controls, human factors and manufacturing quality for device component.
5. For borderline cases, default to **drug** classification if the therapeutic effect is pharmacological or if systemic exposure is altered.

Common NDDS/combo product classes and classification examples

Product type	Typical PMOA	Classification (usual)	Examples
Liposomal chemotherapeutic	Pharmacologic via drug	Drug (with device/excipient info)	Liposomal doxorubicin
Inhaled antibiotic (metered inhaler)	Drug delivered by device	Combination — drug primary, device evidence required	Tobramycin inhaler
Transdermal patch (drug in polymer matrix)	Systemic drug action via transdermal delivery	Drug (device/packaging evidence)	Nicotine patch
Implantable depot (polymer matrix)	Controlled drug release systemically	Drug (with implant/device testing)	Leuprorelin depot
Prefilled autoinjector (biologic in syringe + device)	Drug (biologic)	Drug primary; device human factors testing required	
Microneedle patch with no active ingredient (physical)	Barrier/disruption mechanical	Device	
Drug-eluting stent	Mechanical effect + local pharmacology	Predominantly device (with medicinal constituent review)	

Key regulatory evidence expectations by classification

If classified primarily as a drug (most NDDS)

- **CMC (Module 3):**
  - Detailed formulation and process controls for delivery system (particle size, drug loading, release profile, sterilization methods, endotoxin limits).
  - Device components description (material, supplier qualifications) and how they interact with drug.
- **Non-clinical:**
  - Biodistribution, local tolerance at administration site, immunotoxicology (if applicable), polymer degradation products.
- **Clinical:**
  - PK/PD comparability, surrogate endpoints or confirmatory efficacy depending on risk.
  - Human factors for device aspects (e.g., autoinjector) if they affect safe use.
- **Manufacturing:**
  - GMP for both drug and device manufacture sites (if co-manufactured).
- **Labeling:**
  - Instructions for use, device handling, disposal, storage conditions (including device).

If classified primarily as a device

- **Device technical file**: design, bench testing, sterilization validation, biocompatibility (ISO 10993), mechanical performance, aging tests.
- **Clinical data**: device performance, human factors studies, where drug is present, clinical safety/efficacy specific to device interaction.
- **Quality system**: QMS (ISO 13485) for device manufacturer.
- **Post-market vigilance**: complaint handling, device vigilance reporting.

For true combination products

- Prepare **integrated dossier**: modular CTD for drug aspects + device technical file annexes.
- Plan **cross-walk** mapping: where the same data supports both drug and device queries (e.g., sterility batch records used for both).

6. Post-marketing surveillance and risk management for NDDS

6.1 PV system enhancements

- Need to incorporate:
  - Batch-level traceability (serialization) for NDDS to track device and formulation.
  - Dedicated reporting templates capturing device malfunctions, adhesion failures, implant migration, polymer degradation signals.
  - Sentinel-style active surveillance programmes for long-acting/implantable systems.

6.2 Risk Management Plans (RMPs) and REMS-like approaches

- Require product-specific RMPs with registries, mandated post-marketing studies, patient education materials and mitigation strategies.

7. Case studies — practical lessons

Case A — Liposomal anticancer formulation (representative)

- Sponsor provided robust analytical comparability and quality data but lacked local in vivo biodistribution bridging. SEC requested additional non-clinical biodistribution study and small Phase I PK. Lesson: early regulatory dialogue to agree on bridging plan would have avoided delay.

Case B — Nanoparticle inhalation antibiotic

- Primary challenge: device-formulation aerodynamic characterisation and GLP inhalation toxicology. Regulatory delays were driven by shortage of domestic GLP inhalation labs. Lesson: investment in national inhalation testing centers and defined inhalation testing guidelines is critical.

Case C — Long-acting injectable depot antipsychotic

- Needed extended PK follow-up, risk mitigation strategy for overdose, and reversal plan. SEC required REMS-style risk management and patient registry. Lesson: anticipate lifecycle requirements and present PV plan at submission.

Case D — PEGylated Liposomal Doxorubicin Generic

- Major issue involved demonstrating equivalence in liposome size distribution, encapsulation efficiency, and release kinetics under physiological conditions. Regulators questioned whether minor particle-size differences could alter tumor targeting and cardiotoxicity profile. Additional accelerated stability data and animal tissue-distribution studies were requested before approval progression.
- **Lesson:** physicochemical similarity alone is insufficient for complex liposomal systems; sponsors should integrate orthogonal characterization methods and justify clinical relevance of nano-scale variability early in development.

Case E — Polymeric Micelle Paclitaxel Formulation

- The formulation showed improved solubility and reduced hypersensitivity reactions compared with conventional solvent-based paclitaxel. However, SEC raised concerns regarding excipient

accumulation and long-term polymer biodegradation products. Sponsors were required to submit chronic repeat-dose toxicity and immunogenicity assessments.

- **Lesson:** excipient safety becomes critical in NDDS products, especially when using novel polymers or surfactants not previously approved for chronic administration.

Case F — Nanostructured Lipid Carrier (NLC) Topical Formulation

- Regulatory review focused on dermal penetration, local irritation, and systemic absorption variability. In vitro permeation studies were considered inadequate without confirmatory human skin retention data. Questions were also raised regarding scale-up reproducibility of particle size during commercial manufacturing.
- **Lesson:** topical NDDS products require strong in vitro–in vivo correlation (IVIVC) and validated scale-up controls to ensure batch consistency.

Case G — mRNA Lipid Nanoparticle Vaccine Platform

- Sponsors demonstrated promising immunogenicity data, but regulators requested additional characterization of lipid nanoparticle composition, storage stability at different temperatures, and potential inflammatory responses. Cold-chain logistics and container-closure compatibility also became key review components.
- **Lesson:** for nucleic acid delivery systems, regulatory expectations extend beyond efficacy to include ultra-stability, immunogenicity monitoring, and distribution feasibility.

Case H — Albumin-Bound Nanoparticle Anticancer Drug

- Although the active ingredient was previously approved, the nano-albumin carrier altered biodistribution and plasma protein interactions. SEC required comparative pharmacokinetic studies and additional evidence regarding immunological safety and hypersensitivity reactions.
- **Lesson:** even when APIs are well established, nanocarriers may significantly alter biological behavior and therefore require independent clinical justification.

Case I — Transdermal Microneedle Patch for Peptide Delivery

- Primary concerns included needle fracture risk, sterility assurance, dose uniformity, and patient self-administration errors. Human factor studies and usability validation became major parts of regulatory review. Stability under high humidity conditions also required additional testing.
- **Lesson:** device-drug combination NDDS products require integrated evaluation of engineering controls, patient usability, and environmental stability.

Case J — Solid Lipid Nanoparticle Oral Delivery System

- The formulation improved oral bioavailability of a poorly soluble drug, but regulators requested food-effect studies because lipid digestion significantly altered absorption profiles. Concerns regarding polymorphic transitions during storage also delayed approval.
- **Lesson:** oral lipid-based NDDS products should include robust food-effect assessments and long-term polymorphic stability evaluation.

Case K — Dendrimer-Based Ophthalmic Delivery System

- Reviewers expressed concerns regarding ocular irritation, retention time, and potential corneal toxicity associated with repeated administration. Additional rabbit ocular tolerance studies and preservative interaction studies were requested.
- **Lesson:** ophthalmic nanocarriers require detailed local safety evaluation because small formulation changes may significantly affect ocular tissues.

(These are representative, anonymized lessons drawn from typical NDDS regulatory interactions.)

8. Stakeholder perspectives

8.1 Industry

- Requests: clear guidance, pre-submission scientific advice with timelines, stable regulatory expectations, and access to national reference standards.

8.2 Regulators

- Concerns: capacity constraints, need for validated laboratories, and managing high technical complexity without over reliance on foreign approvals.

8.3 Academia and labs

- Needs: funding and collaborative frameworks to develop GLP-validated NDDS testing capabilities and inter-laboratory proficiency networks.

8.4 Clinicians and patients

- Priorities: safety transparency, long-term data, and education about NDDS benefits and limitations.

9. International harmonization — where India stands and must go

9.1 Alignment targets

- Align with ICH quality and clinical guidelines: Q8–Q12 (QbD, drug substance/product lifecycle), M4 CTD structure, E17 for multiregional trial planning.
- Adopt WHO and OECD recommendations for nanomaterials and biodistribution testing.

9.2 Reliance and work-sharing

- Pilot reliance programs (recognizing FDA/EMA assessments for certain NDDS aspects) could expedite reviews for high-quality dossiers while India builds internal capacity.

10. Policy and regulatory recommendations (actionable)

Below are prioritized recommendations — short, medium and long term — with actors suggested.

Short term (0–12 months)

1. **Publish NDDS high-level guidance**: classification matrix (liposomes, nanoparticles, inhaled, transdermal, depot, implants), required CMC elements, and examples of acceptable non-clinical and clinical programs.
   - *Actor:* CDSCO technical division with academic inputs.
2. **Formalize pre-submission meetings** with documented minutes and binding technical advice on critical study design aspects.
   - *Actor:* CDSCO SEC secretariat.
3. **Establish a National NDDS reviewer pool** (rotating panel list of experts) to be called for SEC meetings.
   - *Actor:* CDSCO in collaboration with NIPER/IITs.

Medium term (1–3 years)

4. **Create NDDS analytical and GLP testing centers network**: public-private partnership to build inhalation, nanotoxicology, biodistribution and device testing capacity.
   - *Actor:* Department of Biotechnology (DBT), Ministry of Health, industry consortia.
5. **Issue Schedule M Annex** for NDDS manufacturing & sterile handling and specify device co-manufacture expectations.
   - *Actor:* CDSCO / MoHFW.
6. **Upgrade SUGAM to eCTD level 4** for structured Module-3 uploads and automated validation of analytics and stability data.
   - *Actor:* CDSCO IT unit.

Long term (3–5 years)

7. Create Centers of Excellence for NDDS regulatory science: training, method harmonization, and advisory support.
   - *Actor:* MoHFW / DBT funded.
8. **Implement reliance frameworks and worksharing pilots** with EMA/FDA for specified NDDS classes to fast-track approval.
   - *Actor:* CDSCO in bilateral agreements.

11. Implementation roadmap & KPIs

11.1 Roadmap (high level)

- **Phase 0 (0–3 months):** Stakeholder consultation, form NDDS working group.
- **Phase 1 (3–12 months):** Publish high-level guidance & formalize pre-submission SOPs.
- **Phase 2 (12–36 months):** Build analytical/GLP centers, eCTD upgrades, Schedule M annex.
- **Phase 3 (36–60 months):** Centers of excellence, reliance pilots, KPI public dashboards.

11.2 KPIs to monitor progress

- Median time from submission to first scientific query (target ≤30 days).
- Median time from submission to SEC decision (target ≤90 days).
- % dossiers accepted without major deficiency in first cycle (target ≥70%).
- Number of GLP NDDS labs available nationally.
- Number of NDDS pre-submissions with documented minutes.
- Time to resolve inter-agency inputs (target ≤30 days).

12. Economic, ethical and public health implications

12.1 Economic

- Predictable regulatory pathways reduce time-to-market and de-risk investment, attracting FDI and encouraging domestic R&D.
- NDDS commercialization can create high-value manufacturing jobs and export opportunities.

12.2 Ethical

- NDDS often offer irreversible or long-acting effects; informed consent processes must address long-term uncertainties.
- Equity considerations: ensure NDDS benefits reach public health programs, not only premium markets.

12.3 Public health

- NDDS can improve adherence (e.g., weekly or monthly dosing), reduce hospitalizations, and improve disease control, but necessitate robust PV systems to detect rare long-term adverse events.

13. Practical sponsor checklist (high-level)

Before submission, sponsors should:

1. Conduct an early pre-submission meeting and upload a 10–15 page briefing document.
2. Validate and transfer analytical methods to GLP labs; provide method inter-laboratory reproducibility data.
3. Provide a clear CMC narrative with QbD elements: critical quality attributes (CQAs), critical process parameters (CPPs), control strategy.
4. Provide non-clinical programs aligned with NDDS class (biodistribution, local tolerance, immunotoxicology).

5. Present clinical strategy with statistical justifications (equivalence margins, PK/PD endpoints, sample size rationales).
6. Prepare a comprehensive RMP including registry and batch traceability plans.

14. Annex suggestions for operationalization (to include in guidance)

- Template pre-submission briefing pack.
- NDDS Module-3 checklist (analytical, CMC specifics).
- SEC decision memo template to ensure transparency.
- PV reporting template capturing device malfunctions and nanomaterial signals.
- KPI reporting dashboard template.

15. Knowledge gaps and research priorities

- Develop validated IVIVC approaches for nanoparticulate and depot systems.
- Standardize immunogenicity assay validation for NDDS containing biologics.
- Generate Indian population PK/PD datasets for NDDS to address ethnic sensitivity questions.
- Conduct inter-laboratory validation studies for critical NDDS analytical methods.

Historical Perspective of Schedule Y

Schedule Y was first introduced in 1988, focusing primarily on ensuring basic ethical conduct and data validity in clinical trials. The 2005 amendment was a landmark reform—it expanded the document to cover:

- Definitions and classification of clinical trial phases (I–IV),
- Requirements for Ethics Committee approvals,
- Provisions for informed consent, and
- Data submission requirements for new drug approval.

While the 2005 revision was progressive for its time, it has remained largely static in a rapidly evolving scientific and regulatory environment. Emerging concepts such as biologics, biosimilars, cell and gene therapies, digital health technologies, adaptive clinical designs, and global data integration were not envisioned in the original framework.

This stagnation has resulted in structural and procedural deficiencies that now impede India's ability to function as a globally competitive research hub.

Scientific and Technical Deficiencies

Lack of Provisions for Emerging Therapeutic Modalities

Schedule Y is primarily designed for chemical entities, offering minimal guidance for biological products, vaccines, biosimilars, gene therapies, and cell-based products.
Modern drug discovery increasingly focuses on these modalities, which require specialized preclinical studies (e.g., immunogenicity testing, viral vector safety, long-term gene expression monitoring). The absence of structured guidelines creates uncertainty for sponsors and regulatory reviewers.

In contrast, agencies like the U.S. FDA (CBER) and EMA have well-defined frameworks for such products—ensuring safety while facilitating innovation. India, however, continues to rely on scattered "guidance documents" from agencies like DBT or CDSCO, which lack statutory authority and consistency.

Inadequate Definition of Clinical Trial Designs

Schedule Y's descriptions of clinical trial phases are brief and rigid. It fails to accommodate:

- Adaptive trial designs that adjust parameters based on interim data,
- Seamless Phase I/II or II/III studies that save time and cost,

- Bayesian and model-based trial approaches,
- Real-world data and pragmatic clinical trials, and
- Use of decentralized or hybrid digital trial models.

This rigidity restricts innovation, delays study approvals, and leads multinational sponsors to shift advanced clinical research to more flexible regulatory jurisdictions.

Absence of Clear Bioequivalence and Bridging Study Norms

Although Schedule Y briefly mentions "bioavailability and bioequivalence" studies, it lacks specific scientific criteria such as:

- Statistical acceptance ranges (e.g., 80–125%),
- Study design for highly variable drugs,
- Requirements for fed/fasted studies, and
- Cross-over design specifications.

Similarly, there are no clear guidelines for bridging studies when extrapolating foreign data to Indian populations. These gaps reduce the predictability of regulatory outcomes and delay drug approvals.

Ethical and Participant Protection Deficiencies

Weak Ethical Committee (EC) Oversight

Schedule Y mandates Ethics Committee approval for every clinical trial but provides limited details on:

- Composition and qualification of EC members,
- Training requirements,
- Accreditation or registration, and
- Periodic inspection or audit mechanisms.

As a result, EC performance and ethical oversight vary widely across institutions. Some ECs lack scientific expertise or independence, which compromises participant safety and informed consent quality. Though the NDCT Rules, 2019 introduced EC registration under CDSCO, these provisions are not yet integrated into Schedule Y, causing legal ambiguity and duplication of processes.

Inadequate Provisions for Vulnerable Populations

Schedule Y briefly mentions that no trials should be conducted on pregnant women or children unless necessary. However, it lacks detailed ethical safeguards, such as:

- Assent requirements for minors,
- Parental consent formats,
- Compensation or insurance provisions for vulnerable participants.

Globally, ethical frameworks such as the Declaration of Helsinki (2013) and ICH E6 (R2) emphasize patient-centric and equitable participation—principles still underrepresented in India's Schedule Y.

Deficient Compensation and Post-Trial Access Mechanisms

The absence of integrated clauses on compensation for trial-related injury or death was a major criticism of Schedule Y for years. While subsequent CDSCO notifications addressed this issue (2013–2019), the lack of formal inclusion within Schedule Y creates confusion and weak enforceability.

Similarly, there is no mention of post-trial access to effective drugs, leaving participants without continued benefit after study completion—contradicting global ethical norms.

Post-Marketing and Pharmacovigilance Deficiencies

Weak Post-Marketing Surveillance (PMS)

Schedule Y identifies Phase IV studies but offers no structured plan for how these studies should be designed, conducted, or reported. Consequently, PMS remains inconsistent, and many manufacturers treat Phase IV obligations as optional.

Poor Integration with Pharmacovigilance Systems

Although India launched the Pharmacovigilance Programme of India (PvPI) in 2010, it operates largely independent of Schedule Y. The lack of binding provisions for ADR (Adverse Drug Reaction) reporting within Schedule Y reduces regulatory accountability.

Unlike the EMA's EudraVigilance or FDA's FAERS, which mandate electronic reporting, India's PMS system still relies on voluntary submissions—leading to underreporting of adverse events and inadequate risk signal detection.

Digital and Data Integrity Deficiencies

Absence of eCTD and Electronic Data Requirements

Modern regulatory systems have transitioned to electronic Common Technical Document (eCTD) submissions for consistency, traceability, and efficiency. Schedule Y still requires physical dossier submissions and lacks references to:

- Electronic Data Capture (EDC) validation,
- Data integrity requirements,
- e-signatures, and
- Audit trail maintenance.

No Guidance on Digital or Remote Clinical Trials

With the global shift toward telemedicine and decentralized clinical trials (DCTs)—especially after the COVID-19 pandemic—Schedule Y's silence on digital data collection, remote monitoring, and electronic informed consent poses major operational barriers.

Absence of AI and Real-World Evidence (RWE) Framework

Globally, regulators are adopting AI tools for clinical data analysis and leveraging real-world evidence for label expansions. India, however, lacks a legal structure to regulate or validate such technologies, resulting in uncertainty and lack of investor confidence.

Administrative and Operational Deficiencies

Lack of Defined Review Timelines

Unlike the FDA (30-day IND review) or EMA (defined timeframes under Regulation EC No. 726/2004), Schedule Y offers no explicit timelines for:

- Reviewing clinical trial applications,
- Approving amendments, or
- Granting marketing authorization.

This absence leads to unpredictable delays, inconsistent decision-making, and loss of credibility for India as a preferred clinical research destination.

Inconsistent Enforcement and Inspection Systems

Schedule Y does not define uniform inspection procedures or regulatory audit mechanisms for sponsors, investigators, or CROs (Contract Research Organizations). Hence, trial quality can vary significantly across centers.

Moreover, state-level regulatory authorities often lack harmonized training, resulting in regional disparity in enforcement and data reliability.

Limited Regulatory Capacity and Manpower

The CDSCO continues to face resource constraints, including insufficient trained reviewers, lack of modern infrastructure, and outdated manual record-keeping systems. These administrative inefficiencies slow down innovation and compromise regulatory transparency.

Annexes – Regulatory Challenges in Introducing NDDS in India

Annex A: Pre-Submission Briefing Package Template

Purpose: This document provides a structured format for sponsors to prepare a pre-submission briefing package to the CDSCO or SEC when seeking advice or clarification on NDDS-related applications.
Recommended Sections:

1. Cover Page (Product Name, Applicant, Date, Submission Type)
2. Executive Summary (2 pages max)
3. Background Information (clinical, non-clinical, manufacturing overview)
4. Description of NDDS Technology (mechanism, innovation, benefits)
5. Regulatory Status (India & global)
6. Summary of Key Issues for Discussion (scientific and regulatory queries)
7. Proposed Study Design / Next Steps
8. Appendices (supporting data, references, or product photos if applicable)

Annex B: SEC Decision Memo Template

Purpose: To record the rationale and key considerations behind the Subject Expert Committee (SEC) recommendations for NDDS applications.

Template Fields:

1. Product Name / Application No.
2. Applicant / Sponsor Name
3. Meeting Date & Agenda No.
4. NDDS Type and Composition
5. Summary of Data Presented (preclinical, clinical, CMC)
6. Regulatory Pathway Considered (New Drug / NDDS modification / Device-drug combo)
7. Discussion Points and SEC Observations
8. Recommendation and Justification
9. Follow-up Requirements (if any)

Annex C: NDDS Chemistry, Manufacturing & Controls (CMC) Checklist

Purpose: This checklist assists applicants in ensuring completeness of CMC data for NDDS submissions to CDSCO.

1. Drug Substance: source, specifications, stability data
2. NDDS Formulation Components: polymers, excipients, adjuvants (GMP status)
3. Manufacturing Process Flow Diagram
4. Control Strategy for NDDS Parameters (particle size, zeta potential, encapsulation efficiency, release profile)
5. In-process controls and critical process parameters
6. Container Closure System

7. Validation Data (process and analytical methods)

8. Stability Protocol and Data Summary

9. Risk Assessment Summary (as per Q9/QbD principles)

Annex D: Regulatory KPI Dashboard Mockup

Purpose: To track the efficiency and transparency of NDDS regulatory reviews under CDSCO or SEC monitoring.

Example Table Format:

KPI Metric	Target Timeline	Performance (Qtr)	Remarks
Average Review Time (Pre-submission meeting)	30 days	28 days	On target
Average Review Time (NDDS CMC review)	60 days	72 days	Slight delay due to clarifications
% of Applications Reviewed within SLA	90%	85%	Improving trend
Transparency Score (published SEC minutes)	100%	95%	Pending upload of 2 meetings

Chart Descriptors:

- Bar chart: Average review time vs. target timeline (quarterly)
- Line chart: % of NDDS applications processed on time (annual trend)
- Pie chart: Distribution of delays by review stage (clinical, CMC, administrative)

CONCLUSION

The evolution of New Drug Delivery Systems (NDDS) has redefined modern therapeutics by offering enhanced bioavailability, reduced dosing frequency, targeted delivery, and improved patient compliance. However, despite India's strong position as a global pharmaceutical hub, the regulatory environment governing NDDS remains complex, fragmented, and insufficiently harmonized with international standards. The absence of a dedicated, structured regulatory framework specifically addressing NDDS has led to ambiguity in product classification, inconsistent evaluation procedures, and prolonged approval timelines.

While the Drugs and Cosmetics Act (1940) and Schedule Y, along with the New Drugs and Clinical Trials Rules (NDCTR), 2019, have provided the foundational regulatory basis for novel drug products, these frameworks were primarily designed for conventional formulations rather than complex drug delivery platforms. Consequently, regulatory authorities and applicants often face interpretational challenges when dealing with hybrid technologies—such as liposomes, nanoparticles, transdermal patches, and drug-device combinations—which require both pharmaceutical and engineering assessments.

In recent years, CDSCO has taken meaningful steps toward modernization through initiatives such as the SUGAM online submission portal, digitization of applications, and the adoption of ICH-aligned principles. However, gaps remain in defining clear classification pathways, data requirements, and performance standards for NDDS. In addition, limited institutional expertise in evaluating cutting-edge technologies like nanomedicine, implantable systems, and targeted delivery mechanisms continues to create inconsistencies in review outcomes and regulatory expectations.

A major challenge is the lack of inter-disciplinary coordination between drug, device, and biotechnology divisions, leading to duplication of assessments and extended approval cycles. Further, absence of specific guidance documents, model evaluation templates, and structured pre-submission consultation mechanisms often forces applicants to rely on ad hoc scientific discussions, delaying innovation and market introduction.

To foster a supportive regulatory environment, India must implement a risk-based, science-driven regulatory framework tailored to NDDS. This includes issuing NDDS-specific guidance documents, developing specialized review cells within CDSCO, enhancing reviewer training in advanced formulation sciences, and promoting harmonization with international best practices such as those followed by the US

FDA, EMA, and PMDA. Strengthening post-market surveillance, establishing integrated evaluation for combination products, and leveraging digital tools for tracking key performance indicators (KPIs) would further enhance transparency and predictability.

In conclusion, NDDS technologies represent the future of pharmaceutical innovation in India, but their full potential can only be realized through a regulatory system that balances innovation facilitation with robust scientific evaluation and patient safety assurance. By embracing harmonization, capacity building, and digital transformation, India can position itself as a global leader in the development, regulation, and commercialization of next-generation drug delivery systems—ultimately benefiting both industry and public health.

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 (CDSCO). *Schedule Y – Requirements and Guidelines for Clinical Trials for Import and Manufacture of New Drugs.* Ministry of Health & Family Welfare, Government of India.
2. ICH E6 (R2): *Good Clinical Practice: Integrated Addendum to ICH E6 (R1).* International Council for Harmonisation, 2016.
3. ICH E8 (R1): *General Considerations for Clinical Studies.* ICH, 2021.
4. WHO. *Handbook for Good Clinical Research Practice (GCP): Guidance for Implementation.* World Health Organization, 2021.
5. U.S. FDA. *21 CFR Parts 312, 314, and 50 – Clinical Trials and New Drug Applications.*
6. EMA. *Guideline on Advanced Therapy Medicinal Products (ATMPs).* European Medicines Agency, 2020.
7. ICMR. *National Ethical Guidelines for Biomedical and Health Research Involving Human Participants.* Indian Council of Medical Research, 2017.
8. Ministry of Health and Family Welfare. *New Drugs and Clinical Trials Rules (NDCT), 2019.* Government of India.
9. Pharmacovigilance Programme of India (PvPI). *Annual Performance Report*, 2023.
10. . Ogden CL, Yanovski SZ, Carroll MD, Flegal KM. The epidemiology of obesity. Gastroenterology 2007;132:2087–102.
11. Douketis JD, Macie C, Thabane L, Williamson DF. Systematic review of long-term weight loss studies in obese adults: clinical significance and applicability to clinical practice. Int J Obes 2005;29:1153–67.
12. Buchwald H, Williams SE. Bariatric surgery worldwide 2003. Obes Surg 2004;14:1157–64.
13. Sjostrom L, Lindroos AK, Peltonen M, et al. Lifestyle, diabetes and cardiovascular risk factors 10 years after bariatric surgery. N Engl J Med 2004;351:2683–93
14. DeMaria EJ, Sugerman HJ, Meador JG, et al. High failure rate after laparoscopic adjustable silicone gastric banding for treatment of morbid obesity. Ann Surg 2001;233:809–18.
15. Suter M, Calmes JM, Paroz A, Giusti V. A 10-year experience with laparoscopic gastric banding for morbid obesity: high long-term complication and failure rates. Obes Surg 2006;16:829–35.
16. Suter M, Giusti V, Héraief E, Zysset F, Calmes JM. Laparoscopic Rouxen-Y gastric bypass: initial 2-year experience. Surg Endosc 2003;17: 603–9.
17. Schauer PR, Ikramuddin S, Gourash W, Ramanathan R, Luketich J. Outcomes after laparoscopic Roux-en-Y gastric bypass for morbid obesity. Ann Surg 2000;232:515–29.

18. Fisher BL, Barber AE. Gastric bypass procedures. Eur J Gastroenterol Hepatol 1999;11:93–7.
19. Alvarez-Leite JI. Nutrient deficiencies secondary to bariatric surgery. Curr Opin Clin Nutr Metab Care 2004;7:569–75.
20. Bloomberg RD, Fleishman A, Nalle JE, Herron DM, Kini S. Nutritional deficiencies following bariatric surgery: what have we learned? Obes Surg 2005;15:145–54.
21. Kluetz PG, O'connor DJ, Soltys K. Incorporating the patient experi-ence into regulatory decision making in the USA, Europe, andCanada.Lancet Oncol.2018;19(5):e267–e274. doi:10.1016/S1470-2045(18)30097-4
22. US Department of Health and Human Services, Food and DrugAdministration, Center for Devices and Radiological Health, Centerfor Biologics Evaluation and Research.Guidance for Industry:Patient Preference Information–Voluntary Submission, Review inPremarket Approval Applications, Humanitarian Device ExemptionApplications, and De Novo Requests, and Inclusion in DecisionSummaries and Device Labeling;2016.
23. Postmus D, Mavris M, Hillege HL, et al. Incorporating patient pre-ferences into drug development and regulatory decision making:results from a quantitative pilot study with cancer patients, carers,and regulators.Clin Pharmacol Ther.2016;99(5):548–554. doi:10.1002/cpt.v99.5
24. healthcare Ifqaei. Background: what are patient preferences?Accessed 24 June,2019.5. UK R. NICE given grant to research patient preference;2016.Accessed 24 June, 2019.
25. Louviere JJ, Flynn TN, Carson RT. Discrete choice experiments arenot conjoint analysis.JChoiceModell.2010;3(3):57–72.doi:10.1016/S1755-5345(13)70014-9