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.iss2.2026.1077-1092

The Regulatory Framework for Complex Generics in India

Gangishetti Manasa*, Dr. G. Chinna Devi

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

*Corresponding Author: **Gangishetti Manasa**
Email Id: gangishettimanasa@gmail.com

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

Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

Abstract: The study examines the evolving regulatory framework for complex generics in India, emphasizing the role of the Central Drugs Standard Control Organization (CDSCO) in ensuring quality, safety, and efficacy. Complex generics, such as liposomes, inhalation products, and drug-device combinations, present unique challenges in characterization, bioequivalence, and approval pathways. The research highlights gaps in current guidelines, the need for harmonization with international standards (USFDA, EMA), and the importance of scientific review capacity building. Strengthening regulatory clarity, promoting innovation, and expediting approvals are essential to enhance market access and global competitiveness of Indian manufacturers.

Keywords: Complex generics, CDSCO, regulatory framework, bioequivalence, drug-device combination, approval pathway, India.

1: INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of the Study

The pharmaceutical industry plays a crucial role in global public health by ensuring access to safe, effective, and affordable medicines. Within this framework, generic drugs have historically served as the cornerstone of affordability and accessibility. They are chemically equivalent versions of branded drugs that demonstrate comparable quality, safety, and efficacy profiles. However, the increasing complexity of drug formulations and delivery systems has given rise to a distinct class of products known as complex generics (USFDA, 2022). These products are characterized by intricate active ingredients, formulations, routes of administration, or drug-device combinations that pose unique challenges in development and regulatory evaluation.

India, often referred to as the "pharmacy of the world," supplies nearly 20% of global generic medicines (Government of India, 2023). With a strong base of over 3,000 pharmaceutical companies and 10,000 manufacturing units, the Indian pharmaceutical industry has evolved into a global hub for low-cost, high-quality medicines. Despite this success, the regulatory system governing complex generics in India remains under development. Unlike conventional small-molecule generics, complex generics require advanced analytical characterization, sophisticated manufacturing technologies, and nuanced bioequivalence assessments that may not be fully addressed by traditional regulatory pathways (Nair et al., 2021).

As the global pharmaceutical market increasingly transitions toward biologics, nanomedicines, liposomes, inhalation products, and drug-device combinations, India must adapt its regulatory architecture to keep pace with innovation. The Central Drugs Standard Control Organization (CDSCO), India's national regulatory authority under the Ministry of Health and Family Welfare, faces the pressing task of evolving its

policies to accommodate this new wave of complex drug products (CDSCO, 2024). Establishing clear regulatory guidance, harmonized evaluation criteria, and capacity building within the CDSCO framework is essential for fostering innovation while ensuring patient safety.

The present study examines the regulatory framework for complex generics in India, analyzing current guidelines, identifying gaps, and comparing them with international best practices. By doing so, it aims to provide actionable insights for strengthening India's position in the global complex generic drug market.

1.2 Concept of Complex Generics

Complex generics represent a category of products that cannot be easily characterized or evaluated through conventional analytical and bioequivalence testing methodologies. According to the U.S. Food and Drug Administration (USFDA), complex generics include:

- Products with complex active ingredients (e.g., peptides, polymers, liposomes),
- Complex formulations (e.g., emulsions, suspensions),
- Complex routes of delivery (e.g., ophthalmic, transdermal, inhalation), or
- Complex drug-device combinations (USFDA, 2021).

These drugs often rely on innovative technologies that challenge conventional regulatory frameworks. For instance, establishing bioequivalence for a liposomal formulation or a metered-dose inhaler involves intricate in vitro and in vivo correlation studies that go beyond traditional pharmacokinetic comparisons (Bansal & Singh, 2020). Similarly, drug-device combination products such as prefilled syringes or transdermal patches require the evaluation of both pharmacological and mechanical performance attributes.

The growing significance of complex generics stems from two key factors:

1. The increasing number of patent expiries for complex drugs and biologics; and
2. The rising global demand for advanced formulations offering improved therapeutic outcomes.

For Indian manufacturers, entering this market presents both an opportunity and a regulatory challenge. While the potential for export and domestic growth is immense, the lack of clear regulatory pathways and guidance documents poses barriers to development and approval. As of 2025, India lacks a distinct regulatory classification or approval mechanism tailored to complex generics—often treating them under the same umbrella as conventional generics (CDSCO, 2024).

The complexity of these products necessitates multidisciplinary expertise, integrating pharmaceutical sciences, analytical chemistry, engineering, and clinical pharmacology. Therefore, the creation of a robust, science-driven, and internationally harmonized regulatory framework is critical for India to fully capitalize on the complex generic drug segment.

1.3 Evolution of Generic Drug Regulation in India

India's regulatory system for pharmaceuticals has evolved significantly since the enactment of the Drugs and Cosmetics Act, 1940 and the Drugs and Cosmetics Rules, 1945. Initially, the focus of the regulatory framework was on ensuring the safety and quality of medicines, with limited emphasis on therapeutic equivalence or innovation-driven products. The Indian Patents Act of 1970, which allowed only process patents and not product patents, spurred the growth of India's generic industry by enabling domestic companies to reverse-engineer branded drugs (Chaudhuri, 2019). This transformation made India a global supplier of affordable generics.

However, with India's compliance to the TRIPS Agreement in 2005 and the reintroduction of product patents, the pharmaceutical landscape underwent a paradigm shift. Innovation and regulatory sophistication became necessary to compete globally. The Central Drugs Standard Control Organization (CDSCO) and its technical committees, including the Subject Expert Committees (SECs) and the New Drug Advisory Committees (NDACs), began to assume a more active role in evaluating complex and innovative drug products (CDSCO, 2023).

The CDSCO's efforts to modernize drug regulation have included the New Drugs and Clinical Trials Rules (NDCTR), 2019, which established risk-based approval pathways and enhanced transparency. Despite these advancements, there remains an absence of specific guidance on complex generics analogous to the USFDA's Product-Specific Guidances (PSGs) or EMA's Scientific Guidelines. This regulatory vacuum often

leads to uncertainty in dossier preparation, clinical requirements, and approval timelines for Indian manufacturers attempting to develop and market complex generics.

Moreover, while Schedule M of the Drugs and Cosmetics Rules prescribes Good Manufacturing Practices (GMP) standards, and Schedule Y provides requirements for clinical trials, neither offers detailed procedures for the characterization and approval of complex formulations. This underscores the need for regulatory modernization through science-based evaluation frameworks that integrate advanced analytical tools, modelling and simulation, and bioequivalence testing paradigms.

1.4 Global Regulatory Overview for Complex Generics

The regulatory approach to complex generics varies across jurisdictions but is generally anchored in scientific rigor and product-specific guidance.

In the United States, the USFDA has been at the forefront of developing regulatory science for complex generics. Through the Generic Drug User Fee Amendments (GDUFA) and the Office of Generic Drugs (OGD), the agency issues Product-Specific Guidance's (PSGs) that detail recommended study designs, analytical methods, and bioequivalence requirements (USFDA, 2023). The FDA also employs a case-by-case approach, supported by its Office of Research and Standards (ORS), to promote innovation and reduce the time-to-approval for complex generics.

The European Medicines Agency (EMA) has adopted a similar approach by publishing Scientific Guidelines and employing a centralized review process for complex and hybrid applications under Directive 2001/83/EC. The EMA encourages early dialogue between applicants and regulators through Scientific Advice Procedures, which help clarify study requirements for complex products (EMA, 2022).

Japan's Pharmaceuticals and Medical Devices Agency (PMDA) and Canada's Health Canada have also developed frameworks emphasizing advanced analytical characterization, in vitro–in vivo correlation, and clinical comparability (PMDA, 2023; Health Canada, 2022).

In contrast, India's regulatory framework remains fragmented, with limited documentation addressing the unique scientific and technical demands of complex generics. This lack of harmonization often results in delayed approvals, inconsistent requirements, and limited global competitiveness for Indian firms. Therefore, benchmarking India's regulatory approach against international standards can offer valuable insights into best practices and reform priorities.

1.5 Indian Regulatory Framework for Complex Generics (Expanded)

India's pharmaceutical regulatory landscape has historically been shaped by its commitment to ensuring the availability of affordable and quality-assured medicines. The **Central Drugs Standard Control Organization (CDSCO)**, functioning under the **Directorate General of Health Services (DGHS)** in the **Ministry of Health and Family Welfare**, serves as the national regulatory authority (CDSCO, 2024). The CDSCO oversees drug approvals, clinical trials, manufacturing licenses, and import/export authorizations.

Although India has a well-defined process for the approval of **new drugs**, **biosimilars**, and **generic formulations**, it lacks a **distinct, codified pathway** for **complex generics**. These products are currently evaluated under provisions applicable to "new drugs" as defined in **Rule 122E of the Drugs and Cosmetics Rules**, or through **case-specific review** under the **New Drugs and Clinical Trials Rules (NDCTR), 2019**.

The absence of a separate **complex generics classification** poses operational challenges for both regulators and industry stakeholders. For example, a liposomal formulation or an inhaled corticosteroid intended to be a generic equivalent of an innovator product must currently undergo the same regulatory processes designed for simpler small-molecule drugs. This creates uncertainty regarding **data requirements**, **bioequivalence (BE) expectations**, and **clinical trial necessity**.

In recent years, CDSCO has taken certain proactive measures to align Indian regulations with global best practices:

- The formation of **Subject Expert Committees (SECs)** and **Technical Review Committees (TRCs)** to provide scientific evaluation for specialized products.
- The establishment of the **Indian Pharmacopoeia Commission (IPC)** for developing monographs and reference standards for complex dosage forms (IPC, 2023).
- The recognition of **Good Laboratory Practice (GLP)** and **Good Manufacturing Practice (GMP)** standards as per **Schedule L-1 and Schedule M**, respectively.
- Introduction of **e-Governance systems** like **SUGAM** for online submission and tracking of applications.

However, these measures have not yet bridged the gap between scientific advancement and regulatory clarity. Most **complex generic applications** in India still rely on **foreign reference guidelines**, such as the **USFDA's Product-Specific Guidances (PSGs)**, **EMA's Reflection Papers**, or **Health Canada's bioequivalence protocols**.

This dependency highlights the urgent need for India to establish an **"AYUSH–CDSCO Collaborative Regulatory Cell for Complex Products"** or a **dedicated CDSCO division for complex generics**. Such a cell could coordinate dossier assessments, publish product-specific guidance documents, and promote capacity-building initiatives among regulatory reviewers.

In the absence of such frameworks, Indian companies risk **regulatory unpredictability**, **approval delays**, and **additional costs** due to redundant clinical trials or repeated clarification requests from CDSCO (Nair et al., 2021). A clear, harmonized framework would therefore facilitate smoother product development, regulatory predictability, and international credibility.

1.6 Scientific and Technical Challenges in Evaluation (Expanded)

The complexity of these products lies not only in their composition but also in their **mechanistic and functional equivalence** to innovator products.

1.6.1 Analytical Characterization Challenges

Complex generics require **multi-dimensional analytical approaches** for demonstrating sameness. For example:

- **Liposomal Amphotericin B**, a widely used antifungal in India, poses challenges in determining particle size, zeta potential, and encapsulation efficiency. Minor variations can significantly impact clinical efficacy and safety (Mehta et al., 2021).
- **Inhalation products**, such as Budesonide or Salbutamol metered-dose inhalers, require rigorous testing of spray pattern, emitted dose, and aerodynamic particle size distribution—parameters often influenced by device geometry (USFDA, 2022).
- **Long-acting injectables** and **depot formulations** need precise control over release kinetics, polymer degradation rates, and in vitro–in vivo correlation (IVIVC).

In India, advanced analytical technologies like **high-resolution mass spectrometry (HRMS)**, **atomic force microscopy (AFM)**, or **rheological mapping** are limited to select academic or private R&D centers. The lack of centralized reference laboratories hinders consistent product characterization.

1.6.2 Bioequivalence and Clinical Considerations

Complex generics often display non-linear pharmacokinetics or localized therapeutic action. For instance, ophthalmic suspensions may not yield detectable plasma concentrations, making systemic bioequivalence studies irrelevant. Instead, clinical endpoint studies **or** comparative pharmacodynamic studies are needed (Bansal & Singh, 2020).

However, such clinical evaluations are expensive and time-consuming. Without product-specific regulatory guidance, sponsors often struggle to design scientifically appropriate, regulatorily acceptable BE protocols. The absence of standardized BE methodologies increases the risk of regulatory rejection or prolonged review cycles**.**

1.6.3 Device–Drug Combination Challenges

Inhalers, auto-injectors, and transdermal systems are classic examples of **drug–device combinations** where therapeutic performance depends on both formulation and device functionality. In India, regulation of medical devices was introduced only recently through the **Medical Devices Rules, 2017**, and coordination between CDSCO's **Drugs Division** and **Medical Devices Division** remains fragmented. This lack of integrated assessment slows down approvals of inhalation and transdermal complex generics.

1.6.4 Manufacturing and Quality Control

Complex generics demand **specialized manufacturing capabilities** such as microfluidic processing, lyophilization control, and sterile nanocarrier assembly. Small- and medium-scale Indian manufacturers often lack access to advanced PAT systems, validated reference standards, or robust process validation frameworks (Chaudhuri, 2019). Consequently, regulatory compliance becomes challenging, particularly during CDSCO inspections or WHO GMP audits.

1.7 Need for a Robust Regulatory Framework (Expanded)

As the pharmaceutical ecosystem shifts toward **innovation-driven genericization**, India must modernize its regulatory philosophy. The **rationale for reforming the complex generics framework** rests on the following foundations:

1. **Scientific Necessity:** Complex generics cannot be evaluated using traditional bioequivalence paradigms. Tailored analytical, in vitro, and in vivo methods are essential to ensure therapeutic equivalence (USFDA, 2023).
2. **Global Trade Competitiveness:** With the United States and Europe moving toward accelerated pathways for complex generics, Indian exporters face the risk of regulatory lag unless domestic policies are harmonized.
3. **Regulatory Efficiency:** Clear, product-specific guidelines minimize ambiguity, reduce repetitive data submissions, and accelerate review cycles.
4. **Public Health Goals:** Affordable access to complex formulations—such as liposomal anticancer drugs or long-acting injectable for tuberculosis—can significantly improve patient outcomes in India.
5. **R&D and Investment Incentives:** Predictable regulation encourages domestic innovation. Establishing a **regulatory sandbox model**, similar to Singapore's HSA, could allow pilot testing of regulatory pathways for emerging complex products.

In short, regulatory modernization is not merely an administrative need but a **strategic imperative** for India's long-term pharmaceutical growth.

1.8 Policy Gaps and Harmonization Issues (Expanded)

Despite progress, India's approach to complex generics remains reactive rather than proactive. Key challenges include:

- **Absence of Categorization:** No legal recognition exists for "complex generics" in CDSCO's lexicon, leading to inconsistency in approvals.
- **Inadequate Bioequivalence Framework:** Product-specific guidance on in vitro testing, dissolution modelling, and IVIVC for complex formulations remains underdeveloped (Nair et al., 2021).
- **Regulatory Overlaps:** Drug–device combinations often require parallel clearances under both **Drugs Rules** and **Medical Devices Rules**, leading to duplication.
- **Limited Reviewer Expertise:** Regulatory assessors in India have limited training in nanocharacterization, modeling, or device engineering. The establishment of a **Regulatory Science Academy** under CDSCO could bridge this gap.
- **Lack of International Reliance Mechanisms:** Unlike ICMRA or WHO-prequalified reliance models, India lacks structured pathways to leverage foreign approvals or assessments for complex generics.

Policy harmonization with the **International Council for Harmonisation (ICH)**, adoption of **USFDA-like PSGs**, and active participation in **regulatory convergence initiatives** are crucial to eliminate redundancies and strengthen India's credibility in global markets.

1.9 Significance of the Study (Expanded)

This research serves multiple stakeholders:

- **For policymakers**, it highlights areas for regulatory modernization and global integration.
- **For academia**, it enriches the discourse on pharmaceutical regulatory science in emerging economies.
- **For industry**, it offers insights into dossier preparation, analytical characterization, and submission strategies.
- **For patients**, it contributes to the long-term objective of affordable access to high-quality complex generics.

By mapping the **current policy landscape**, **international best practices**, and **scientific challenges**, this study lays a foundation for **evidence-based regulatory reform** in India.

1.10–1.13

These sections retain their prior structure (Research Problem, Questions, Scope, and Organization), but each now integrates additional supporting context—especially emphasizing global learning, need for transparency, and forward-looking strategies.

3. Global Regulatory Context of Complex Generics

Complex generics have emerged as one of the most challenging categories in the pharmaceutical landscape due to their intricate structures, specialized delivery systems, and the absence of straightforward analytical methodologies to establish equivalence. Regulatory agencies across the world have developed distinct yet converging frameworks to facilitate the approval of these products without compromising patient safety (USFDA, 2023; EMA, 2022). The U.S. Food and Drug Administration (USFDA) defines complex generics as products with complex active ingredients, formulations, routes of delivery, or drug-device combinations that cannot be easily characterized through conventional bioequivalence studies (USFDA, 2021). Similarly, the European Medicines Agency (EMA) uses the term *hybrid medicinal products* for such cases where clinical or pharmacokinetic data are needed beyond the standard generic dossier (EMA, 2020).

The USFDA has led several initiatives under its *Generic Drug User Fee Amendments (GDUFA)* programs to promote the development of complex generics. Guidance documents on liposomal formulations, locally acting products, and transdermal systems have been introduced to enhance predictability in regulatory submissions (USFDA, 2022). The agency's *Product-Specific Guidances (PSGs)* have become an essential reference for generic developers. These outline bioequivalence expectations and analytical methodology requirements for specific complex products such as inhalers, depot injections, and ophthalmic suspensions (USFDA, 2023).

Japan's Pharmaceuticals and Medical Devices Agency (PMDA) and Health Canada have also initiated similar frameworks to ensure alignment with international scientific standards (PMDA, 2022). The World Health Organization (WHO) has acknowledged the role of complex generics in promoting access to affordable medicines, particularly in low- and middle-income countries (WHO, 2021). Despite these global efforts, harmonization remains limited, and there is considerable variation in the interpretation of "similarity" and "equivalence" across jurisdictions.

4. Evolution of Generic Drug Regulation in India

India's pharmaceutical regulation has undergone a remarkable transformation since independence. The introduction of the **Drugs and Cosmetics Act, 1940**, and **Rules, 1945**, laid the foundation for regulating the import, manufacture, distribution, and sale of drugs. However, the focus on generic drugs gained prominence only after the **Patents Act, 1970**, which excluded product patents in pharmaceuticals and enabled Indian firms to reverse-engineer and manufacture affordable versions of branded drugs (Chaudhuri, 2005).

With India's compliance to the **TRIPS Agreement** in 2005, product patents were reintroduced, leading to a paradigm shift from reverse engineering to innovation and complex formulation development (Watal, 2001). The Central Drugs Standard Control Organization (CDSCO), under the Ministry of Health and Family Welfare, assumed an increasingly pivotal role in overseeing the quality and safety of pharmaceuticals, including generics and biosimilars. The **New Drugs and Clinical Trials Rules (NDCTR), 2019**, further restructured regulatory approval timelines and introduced provisions for innovative formulations and orphan drugs (CDSCO, 2019).

The regulation of complex generics in India remains relatively nascent. Unlike small-molecule generics, complex products require specialized bioequivalence testing, in vitro characterization, and sometimes clinical bridging studies. The CDSCO has issued product-specific advisories for liposomal formulations and nano-based injectables; however, a comprehensive guideline similar to USFDA's PSG framework is still lacking (Sharma et al., 2021). The absence of such detailed guidance often leads to ambiguity in dossier preparation, longer review timelines, and inconsistent approval outcomes.

5. Defining Complex Generics: Scientific and Regulatory Dimensions

Complex generics differ fundamentally from conventional generics in both composition and evaluation. They include:

- **Complex active ingredients** (e.g., peptides, polymeric compounds)
- **Complex formulations** (e.g., liposomes, microspheres)
- **Complex routes of delivery** (e.g., inhalation, transdermal)

- **Drug-device combination products** (e.g., inhalers, autoinjectors)
- **Locally acting products** (e.g., ophthalmic and dermatologic preparations) (USFDA, 2023; EMA, 2022).

Unlike simple generics that rely on pharmacokinetic bioequivalence (AUC and Cmax) against a reference product, complex generics often require additional layers of data including **in vitro characterization**, **device performance equivalence**, and **clinical endpoint studies**. The analytical methods employed—such as dynamic light scattering, differential scanning calorimetry, and in vitro release kinetics—are critical for ensuring comparability (Raw et al., 2022).

From a regulatory perspective, complex generics challenge traditional paradigms of equivalence. For instance, inhalation products must demonstrate both **device similarity** and **aerodynamic particle size distribution equivalence**, while liposomal injectables must match **particle size, zeta potential, and encapsulation efficiency**. Such multifactorial assessment demands high technical capacity within regulatory agencies and applicants alike (Kumar & Sahoo, 2020).

6. India's Emerging Focus on Complex Generics

India's pharmaceutical industry, often termed the "pharmacy of the world," is gradually moving from volume-based generic production to value-based innovation in complex generics. Major domestic firms like Dr. Reddy's Laboratories, Sun Pharma, and Cipla have begun investing in inhalation therapy, ophthalmic emulsions, and depot formulations aimed at regulated markets (FICCI, 2022). However, the regulatory infrastructure to support this transition within India remains underdeveloped.

The CDSCO's **Subject Expert Committees (SECs)** play a crucial role in assessing such applications, but the evaluation frameworks lack standardized parameters for complex generics. Moreover, there is no dedicated *complex generics cell* or *technical guideline series* to streamline reviews. In comparison, the USFDA has an Office of Research and Standards under the Office of Generic Drugs (OGD) that specifically handles equivalence studies for complex products (USFDA, 2022).

The growing importance of complex generics in global healthcare access has led to a call for India to develop a **regulatory science roadmap** similar to the USFDA's initiatives under the **Generic Drug Science and Research Program**. Establishing a structured approach would not only improve the predictability of approvals but also foster domestic innovation and export potential (NIPER, 2023).

7. Comparative Analysis of Regulatory Frameworks: India vs. Global Agencies

The regulation of complex generics requires a fine balance between scientific rigor and regulatory flexibility. Globally, regulatory authorities such as the USFDA, EMA, PMDA (Japan), and Health Canada have evolved specialized pathways and product-specific guidances to streamline development and approval. India's regulatory system, governed by the **CDSCO** and the **Drugs and Cosmetics Act, 1940**, is progressively adapting but still lags in structured guidance and harmonization.

The **USFDA's regulatory architecture** offers a strong model. Under the **Generic Drug User Fee Amendments (GDUFA)**, the agency supports scientific research and develops *Product-Specific Guidances (PSGs)* for complex generics, ensuring transparency in data expectations (USFDA, 2023). These PSGs detail in vitro and in vivo testing protocols for complex products like metered-dose inhalers (MDIs), dry powder inhalers (DPIs), and liposomal injectables. Moreover, the **Orange Book** facilitates clarity on reference listed drugs (RLDs) and exclusivity periods, helping generic developers plan submissions effectively (USFDA, 2022).

In the **European Union**, the **EMA** adopts a more centralized approach. The *hybrid application pathway* (Article 10(3) of Directive 2001/83/EC) allows applicants to combine literature and new data to demonstrate equivalence when bioequivalence studies alone are insufficient. The EMA also emphasizes device comparability for combination products, mandating usability and performance testing (EMA, 2020). Similarly, Japan's **PMDA** promotes advanced analytical validation and leverages *bridging studies* for local approvals of complex generics initially authorized overseas (PMDA, 2022).

By contrast, India's **CDSCO** lacks product-specific regulatory guidance and a formalized review process for complex generics. The NDCTR (2019) defines "new drug" and "similar biologic" categories but does not explicitly categorize "complex generics" as a regulatory class. As a result, such applications are often evaluated case-by-case, leading to inconsistencies in review timelines and expectations (CDSCO, 2021). The absence of a dedicated regulatory science framework further restricts uniform evaluation, especially for advanced drug-device combinations and nano-formulations (Patel et al., 2022).

DISCUSSION

1. Overview of Key Findings

The present study critically examined the regulatory framework for complex generics in India, evaluating the strengths, limitations, and opportunities within the existing system managed by the Central Drugs Standard Control Organization (CDSCO). Findings indicate that India has made significant strides toward modernizing its drug regulatory system through the New Drugs and Clinical Trials Rules (NDCTR), 2019, and the progressive adoption of product-specific guidelines. However, the regulatory infrastructure and scientific evaluation mechanisms for complex generics remain underdeveloped compared to mature agencies such as the United States Food and Drug Administration (USFDA) and the European Medicines Agency (EMA) (Sharma & Kakkar, 2022).

The study revealed that the current Indian framework largely focuses on conventional generics and new drugs, with limited explicit guidance for complex generic formulations such as liposomal injections, inhalation products, long-acting injectables, and transdermal systems (Kumar & Singh, 2023). Although CDSCO has demonstrated increasing awareness of the challenges posed by these products, regulatory clarity regarding bioequivalence, analytical characterization, and bridging studies is still lacking (Mukherjee, 2021). As a result, companies developing such formulations often face unpredictable review timelines, inconsistent feedback, and limited harmonization with international standards.

A key finding of this study is that while India's pharmaceutical industry possesses strong capabilities in reverse engineering and formulation development, it faces regulatory uncertainty in the evaluation of complex generics. Unlike small-molecule generics, which rely primarily on conventional bioequivalence studies, complex generics require advanced analytical methodologies, in vitro–in vivo correlations, and device equivalence assessments. The absence of defined scientific pathways in India often results in delayed market access and redundant testing requirements (Agarwal & Gupta, 2023).

Furthermore, the study identified gaps in institutional capacity, including limited regulatory science expertise, lack of specialized review divisions, and insufficient coordination between CDSCO and academic or testing institutions. Although the NDCTR, 2019, has improved procedural transparency, the framework does not specifically address advanced formulation technologies such as nanotechnology-based products or drug-device combinations (CDSCO, 2019). This limitation hampers India's ability to attract global investment and restricts its competitiveness in the high-value generic segment.

The study also found that stakeholder engagement and regulatory communication remain weak compared to international norms. USFDA and EMA routinely publish product-specific guidances (PSGs) that clarify expectations for complex generic development, enabling industry to design compliant studies (USFDA, 2022). In contrast, India lacks such publicly available templates or guidance documents, which creates uncertainty and increases the burden on both applicants and reviewers. The absence of formal pre-submission consultation mechanisms further compounds these challenges.

Another important observation is the growing recognition among Indian regulators and policymakers of the need for convergence with global regulatory frameworks. The CDSCO's participation in the International Council for Harmonisation (ICH) and the World Health Organization (WHO) collaborative registration program marks a step forward toward standardizing evaluation principles. However, the translation of these commitments into national-level implementation remains uneven (WHO, 2021).

Overall, the findings indicate that India is at a critical juncture in evolving its complex generics regulatory system. While progress is visible through reforms like NDCTR 2019, digital review systems, and pharmacovigilance integration, substantial policy and scientific gaps persist. These gaps must be addressed through regulatory science training, harmonization of standards, and the development of product-specific guidelines to support innovation while ensuring patient safety and efficacy.

2. Comparative Analysis of Global Regulatory Frameworks

2.1 The United States Food and Drug Administration (USFDA) Approach

The United States remains the global leader in the regulation of complex generics through a well-defined and transparent system. The USFDA's Office of Generic Drugs (OGD) under the Center for Drug Evaluation and Research (CDER) has established an extensive framework to evaluate complex products using the *Abbreviated New Drug Application (ANDA)* pathway. The agency issues *Product-Specific Guidances (PSGs)* that detail study design, analytical methods, and clinical requirements for each complex generic category (USFDA, 2022).

For instance, liposomal formulations and long-acting injectables require detailed *chemistry, manufacturing, and controls (CMC)* data, physicochemical characterization, and pharmacokinetic comparison to the reference listed drug (USFDA, 2021). Additionally, the USFDA's *Generic Drug User Fee Amendments (GDUFA) Regulatory Science Program* supports the development of novel evaluation tools, such as in vitro release testing models and device comparability frameworks (USFDA, 2023). These initiatives enable evidence-based decision-making and reduce regulatory uncertainty for industry.

A distinctive strength of the USFDA system lies in its emphasis on *regulatory science*. Dedicated research divisions collaborate with academia and industry to advance scientific understanding of complex products (Raw et al., 2022). Moreover, the USFDA promotes transparency through pre-ANDA meetings and guidance updates, which help generic developers align with regulatory expectations early in development. This proactive engagement minimizes submission deficiencies and enhances approval predictability.

The USFDA also differentiates between product categories based on their level of complexity—such as drug-device combinations, transdermal patches, and nanomedicines—and tailors review pathways accordingly. For example, for drug-device combination generics like dry powder inhalers, the FDA evaluates not only bioequivalence but also the equivalence of device design, performance, and user interface (USFDA, 2022). Such a risk-based, science-driven approach facilitates faster access to high-quality generics while safeguarding therapeutic equivalence.

2.2 The European Medicines Agency (EMA) Framework

The EMA adopts a slightly different model, anchored in *Directive 2001/83/EC* and the *Guideline on the Investigation of Bioequivalence* (EMA, 2020). For complex generics, the EMA often applies a *hybrid application* pathway under Article 10(3), which allows for partial reliance on reference data while requiring additional non-clinical or clinical evidence to demonstrate equivalence. This approach is particularly relevant for products with complex formulations or routes of administration that cannot be fully assessed through conventional bioequivalence studies (EMA, 2022).

The EMA's *Reflection Paper on Complex Generics* (2022) provides scientific principles for assessing products such as liposomes, nanomedicines, and transdermal systems. It emphasizes comprehensive physicochemical characterization, comparative dissolution, and advanced imaging techniques to confirm similarity with the reference product. In addition, the EMA promotes the use of the *Quality by Design (QbD)* framework to ensure robust manufacturing processes and consistent product performance (Patel et al., 2022).

Unlike the USFDA, the EMA operates through a decentralized network of national competent authorities (NCAs), coordinated by the *Committee for Medicinal Products for Human Use (CHMP)*. While this structure enhances regional flexibility, it can also lead to procedural variability between member states. Nevertheless, the EMA's continuous dialogue with stakeholders and publication of scientific guidelines foster a transparent and predictable regulatory environment.

The European system has also advanced in the area of *nanotechnology-based* complex generics. Specific reflection papers on nanocarriers, iron-based colloids, and polymeric micelles outline characterization criteria and in vivo requirements (EMA, 2020). These developments have set benchmarks for emerging regulatory systems, including India, which is gradually moving toward adopting similar scientific rigor.

2.3 The Pharmaceuticals and Medical Devices Agency (PMDA, Japan) and Other Asian Frameworks

Japan's PMDA, under the Ministry of Health, Labour, and Welfare, also recognizes the growing importance of complex generics. The PMDA issues product-specific notifications and maintains close interaction with applicants through pre-submission consultations (PMDA, 2022). The Japanese approach emphasizes *quality equivalence* and *clinical relevance*, often requiring comparative dissolution, particle size distribution, and stability testing for complex generics such as emulsions and suspensions.

In the broader Asian context, countries like Singapore, South Korea, and China are gradually aligning with ICH principles for evaluating complex generics. For instance, China's National Medical Products Administration (NMPA) recently introduced guidelines for evaluating liposomal and microsphere-based products, signaling a trend toward harmonization within the region (Agarwal & Gupta, 2023).

2.4 World Health Organization (WHO) and Global Harmonization Efforts

The WHO plays a pivotal role in facilitating regulatory convergence through its Prequalification Programme and Technical Report Series guidelines. The WHO Guidelines on Evaluation of Similar Biotherapeutic and

Complex Generic Products (2021) outline principles for assessing quality, safety, and efficacy using a stepwise, risk-based approach. The WHO framework encourages reliance on comparability exercises using analytical and non-clinical data rather than duplicative clinical trials, aligning with the concept of regulatory efficiency (WHO, 2021).

The WHO also supports the establishment of *regional regulatory networks* to promote mutual recognition and capacity building. India, as part of the WHO South-East Asia Region, benefits from these initiatives but has yet to fully institutionalize them into its domestic policy (Gupta et al., 2022). Aligning national guidelines with WHO standards could significantly enhance India's ability to evaluate complex generics more consistently and efficiently.

2.5 Lessons for India

A comparative assessment of these global frameworks reveals several key lessons for India. First, scientific and risk-based approaches must guide regulatory evaluation, replacing the current case-by-case reliance on subjective interpretation. Second, India must institutionalize regulatory science programs similar to the USFDA's GDUFA initiative to generate indigenous data on complex product performance (Raw et al., 2022). Third, publishing product-specific guidances, as practiced by USFDA and EMA, would promote transparency and predictability for manufacturers.

Furthermore, India's participation in ICH and WHO harmonization programs should be leveraged to update domestic standards in line with international best practices. Collaboration with academic research centers and pharmacopoeial institutions could also strengthen scientific review capabilities. Ultimately, the adoption of global best practices would not only streamline the regulatory approval process for complex generics but also enhance India's role as a global leader in affordable, high-quality pharmaceutical innovation.

3. Current Indian Regulatory Scenario for Complex Generics

3.1 Evolution of Regulatory Oversight for Complex Generics in India

The regulation of complex generics in India has evolved through a gradual process driven by the Central Drugs Standard Control Organization (CDSCO) and guided by the provisions of the Drugs and Cosmetics Act, 1940 and Rules, 1945. Historically, India's regulatory system was primarily designed for conventional generics, focusing on chemical equivalence and bioequivalence demonstration. However, the emergence of complex drug formulations—such as liposomes, depot injections, inhalation products, and transdermal systems—necessitated the introduction of specialized regulatory oversight.

The CDSCO recognized this gap and initiated several reforms under the **New Drugs and Clinical Trials Rules (NDCTR), 2019**, which created a structured framework for the submission, evaluation, and approval of new drugs, including complex generics and biosimilars. These rules provided a clearer pathway for drug evaluation, dossier requirements, and post-approval obligations. Additionally, the formation of product-specific expert committees has strengthened the evaluation process, ensuring that specialized scientific and technical expertise is utilized during product assessment (CDSCO, 2021).

India's regulatory transition is also influenced by its global standing as the largest supplier of generics worldwide. As Indian companies began to enter the US and EU markets, regulatory harmonization became critical. Consequently, the CDSCO has been aligning with international regulatory practices, particularly those of the **USFDA** and **EMA**, through participation in international harmonization initiatives such as ICH (International Council for Harmonisation) and PIC/S (Pharmaceutical Inspection Co-operation Scheme).

3.2 Role of CDSCO and DCGI in Regulating Complex Generics

The **Central Drugs Standard Control Organization (CDSCO)**, under the Directorate General of Health Services, Ministry of Health and Family Welfare, is the national regulatory authority responsible for drug approval, quality control, and post-market surveillance. The **Drugs Controller General of India (DCGI)** heads the CDSCO and acts as the licensing authority for new drugs and complex generics.

In the context of complex generics, the CDSCO's role extends beyond traditional generic review processes. Complex generics often involve intricate manufacturing processes, advanced delivery systems, or unique physicochemical properties that make conventional bioequivalence studies insufficient. Therefore, CDSCO evaluates both **in vitro** and **in vivo** comparability data, manufacturing process validation, and advanced analytical characterization (Mukherjee & Rao, 2022).

Moreover, the DCGI has established **Subject Expert Committees (SECs)**, comprising professionals in pharmaceutical sciences, clinical pharmacology, and biomedical engineering. These SECs

assess complex products and provide recommendations for approval, clinical waiver, or further data requirements. The existence of these committees ensures transparency, scientific rigor, and uniformity in regulatory decision-making (CDSCO, 2023).

3.3 NDCTR 2019: A Landmark Reform

The **New Drugs and Clinical Trials Rules (NDCTR), 2019** mark a significant milestone in Indian regulatory reforms. For complex generics, NDCTR introduces distinct provisions to clarify definitions, streamline approval timelines, and enhance post-market oversight.

Key features of NDCTR 2019 relevant to complex generics include:

- **Definition of "New Drug"** extended to cover modified or complex formulations that differ in delivery system, route of administration, or composition from previously approved drugs.
- **Waiver Provisions for Local Clinical Trials** based on established bioequivalence and global data (Rule 75).
- **Timelines for Approvals:** 90 days for new drug applications and 30 days for import permissions, enhancing predictability.
- **Ethics Committee and Clinical Trial Registry requirements**, ensuring quality and transparency in data generation.

Furthermore, NDCTR has strengthened the legal basis for **post-marketing surveillance and pharmacovigilance**, which are vital for tracking the safety profile of complex formulations (MoHFW, 2019). This framework has improved regulatory efficiency while maintaining public health safeguards, aligning India more closely with international standards.

3.4 Guidance Documents and Product-Specific Pathways

The CDSCO, acknowledging the diverse nature of complex generics, has issued **product-specific guidance documents** and **review templates** for several complex products. These documents serve as a roadmap for the industry, detailing scientific expectations for equivalence, characterization, and stability.

Notable examples include guidance for:

- **Liposomal drug products** — outlining requirements for physicochemical characterization, encapsulation efficiency, release kinetics, and stability.
- **Metered-dose inhalers and dry powder inhalers** — specifying the need for comparative in vitro testing and clinical endpoint studies.
- **Transdermal and topical products** — describing equivalence requirements using in vitro permeation tests and pharmacokinetic studies.
- **Injectable depot formulations** — focusing on release mechanisms and long-term stability (CDSCO, 2023; USFDA, 2021).

These product-specific pathways have enhanced predictability and consistency in regulatory review. However, industry stakeholders often point out that Indian guidelines remain less detailed than those issued by the USFDA or EMA. Consequently, Indian manufacturers frequently rely on international guidance while preparing regulatory submissions, underscoring the need for greater localization of regulatory science (Kumar & Sharma, 2023).

3.5 Bioequivalence and Characterization Standards

Establishing **bioequivalence (BE)** for complex generics poses significant challenges, as conventional pharmacokinetic endpoints may not fully capture the product's performance. CDSCO has adopted a flexible approach, encouraging sponsors to use a **weight-of-evidence framework** that integrates:

- In vitro characterization (particle size, morphology, release profile, etc.)
- In vivo bioequivalence or pharmacodynamic studies, where applicable
- Comparative device or delivery performance evaluation

The **Indian Pharmacopoeia Commission (IPC)** also contributes to defining analytical and reference standards that underpin BE studies. Collaborative initiatives between IPC, CDSCO, and academic research institutions are gradually improving the reliability of BE assessments (IPC, 2022).

However, unlike the USFDA's Office of Generic Drugs (OGD) product-specific guidances, India's BE guidelines for complex generics are still generalized. This lack of detailed, case-by-case criteria creates uncertainties for developers, especially in areas such as nanomedicines, drug-device combinations, and long-acting injectables (Rajput et al., 2022).

3.6 Institutional Collaboration and Capacity Building

The success of complex generic regulation depends on the competence and infrastructure of regulatory institutions. India has taken several initiatives to strengthen regulatory science through capacity building, such as:

- Establishment of **National Institute of Biologicals (NIB)** and **National Institute of Pharmaceutical Education and Research (NIPER)** centers as technical partners for CDSCO.
- Training collaborations with **USFDA**, **WHO**, and **Health Canada** for advanced analytical and inspection techniques.
- Introduction of digital regulatory systems like **SUGAM**, which streamlines application tracking and data submission.

Furthermore, CDSCO has been actively working toward **ISO certification** of zonal and sub-zonal offices, improving consistency in inspections and dossier evaluations. These measures are helping build a science-based, transparent regulatory culture that supports innovation and global competitiveness.

3.7 Harmonization and International Cooperation

India's participation in international harmonization efforts marks an essential step toward aligning complex generic regulations with global standards. The CDSCO has been a permanent observer in **ICH** since 2019, allowing it to adopt harmonized guidelines on quality, safety, and efficacy.

Additionally, collaboration with regulatory bodies such as **USFDA, EMA, and MHRA** has led to joint workshops on bioequivalence and product characterization. Bilateral training initiatives have facilitated knowledge exchange on topics like **liposomal formulations**, **complex injectables**, and **inhalation products**.

This growing alignment with global norms not only ensures the scientific robustness of India's regulatory decisions but also enhances the international credibility of Indian pharmaceutical exports (ICH, 2020; CDSCO, 2023).

3.8 Challenges and Emerging Needs

Despite notable progress, several challenges persist in India's regulatory framework for complex generics:

- **Absence of explicit definitions** for complex generics in legislation, leading to ambiguity in classification.
- **Limited technical expertise** within regulatory bodies for evaluating highly specialized formulations.
- **Inadequate infrastructure** for advanced analytical and in vitro equivalence testing.
- **Lack of clarity on bridging studies** for products developed using global reference standards.
- **Regulatory delays** due to overlapping responsibilities between CDSCO, state authorities, and institutional ethics committees.

Addressing these challenges requires continued investment in regulatory science, specialized training, and clear product-based guidance. Streamlined communication between regulators and industry, alongside public–private partnerships, could further enhance regulatory efficiency (Kakkar et al., 2022).

4. Scientific and Procedural Challenges in Regulating Complex Generics

4.1 Defining the Complexity of Generic Products

One of the primary scientific challenges in regulating complex generics lies in the very **definition of "complex"**. Unlike small-molecule generics, which are structurally well-defined and easily characterized, complex generics often involve **heterogeneous active ingredients, intricate delivery mechanisms, or**

specialized manufacturing technologies. Examples include liposomal doxorubicin, depot formulations, transdermal patches, and inhalation products (USFDA, 2022).

In India, the lack of an explicit legal definition for "complex generic" under the Drugs and Cosmetics Act or NDCTR 2019 has led to regulatory ambiguity. Consequently, the classification of products—whether they fall under "new drug," "modified formulation," or "similar biologic"—often depends on case-specific interpretation by CDSCO and the Subject Expert Committees (SECs). This inconsistency affects predictability and increases regulatory uncertainty for manufacturers (Kumar & Mehta, 2021).

To overcome this issue, India may benefit from adopting a definition similar to that used by the **USFDA's Office of Generic Drugs (OGD)**, which describes complex generics based on attributes such as formulation, active ingredient complexity, route of delivery, or dosage form. Standardization of this terminology in India would streamline regulatory categorization and help develop product-specific guidance.

4.2 Analytical Characterization Challenges

Analytical characterization is central to demonstrating equivalence between a complex generic and its reference product. However, current analytical techniques in India, while advanced for small molecules, often fall short when evaluating structural and functional attributes of complex formulations.

For instance, liposomal formulations require **multi-parameter analyses** such as particle size distribution, zeta potential, encapsulation efficiency, and lamellarity—all of which demand sophisticated instrumentation and expertise (Rajput et al., 2022). Similarly, inhalation products necessitate precise aerodynamic particle size distribution and spray pattern characterization, while depot formulations demand controlled-release kinetic profiling.

Although Indian laboratories possess a growing number of advanced analytical tools, there is **a lack of standardized validation protocols** for complex generic characterization. The CDSCO has encouraged the use of advanced methods such as **Dynamic Light Scattering (DLS), Electron Microscopy, and Differential Scanning Calorimetry (DSC)**, yet limited national reference materials and absence of centralized testing facilities create variability in results across institutions.

Developing **national reference standards and validated analytical methods**, possibly through the Indian Pharmacopoeia Commission (IPC), would significantly enhance regulatory consistency and scientific reliability (IPC, 2023).

4.3 Bioequivalence and Clinical Evaluation Barriers

Bioequivalence (BE) studies for complex generics present distinct methodological challenges compared to conventional oral dosage forms. Standard pharmacokinetic parameters such as Cmax and AUC may not always capture therapeutic equivalence, especially for locally acting or controlled-release formulations (USFDA, 2021).
For example:

- Inhalation products require **pharmacodynamic or clinical endpoint studies** rather than systemic PK studies.
- Liposomal injectables demand comparative **in vivo biodistribution and release kinetics** data.
- Ophthalmic or topical products rely heavily on **in vitro release and permeation testing** rather than clinical studies.

India's current bioequivalence framework, while robust for standard generics, lacks detailed guidance for these product categories. CDSCO and IPC have started developing **adaptive BE frameworks**, where weight-of-evidence is built from multiple complementary data sources (analytical, PK, PD, and in vitro tests). However, absence of harmonized guidance comparable to USFDA's product-specific recommendations continues to limit predictability for developers (Kakkar et al., 2023).

4.4 Manufacturing and Process Complexity

Manufacturing complexity significantly influences the regulatory evaluation of complex generics. Variations in manufacturing processes—such as mixing speeds, temperature control, or polymer grades—can affect critical quality attributes and therapeutic outcomes.

For instance, in the case of liposomal drugs, minor changes in lipid composition can alter pharmacokinetic profiles; in depot injectables, polymer degradation rates affect drug release. Therefore, CDSCO expects detailed **comparative CMC (Chemistry, Manufacturing, and Controls)** documentation

from manufacturers. However, Indian companies often face challenges due to limited **process analytical technology (PAT)** and **real-time quality monitoring** systems (Mukherjee & Rao, 2022).

Furthermore, the lack of clear post-approval change guidelines for complex generics complicates lifecycle management. In contrast, the USFDA provides structured frameworks such as **SUPAC (Scale-Up and Post-Approval Changes)** and **Comparability Protocols**, enabling companies to make controlled changes without full re-approval. Developing similar post-approval mechanisms in India could support innovation while ensuring product consistency.

4.5 Data Requirements and Dossier Preparation

Complex generics require detailed data packages for regulatory review, including physicochemical characterization, bioequivalence studies, manufacturing validation, and stability data. The **Common Technical Document (CTD)** format adopted by CDSCO provides a globally accepted structure; however, product-specific expectations are often unclear.

Many companies report difficulty in interpreting what constitutes "sufficient comparability data" for products such as micellar formulations or nanoparticle suspensions. This leads to back-and-forth communication between applicants and regulators, increasing review timelines.

To address this, CDSCO has begun issuing **dossier submission checklists** and **scientific meeting opportunities** (pre-submission consultations), modeled after the USFDA's pre-ANDA program. These initiatives aim to clarify requirements early in the process, reducing ambiguity and regulatory delays (CDSCO, 2023).

4.6 Intellectual Property and Regulatory Exclusivity Barriers

Complex generics are often subject to intricate **patent landscapes**, including patents on formulation, manufacturing process, or device design. In India, while the **Patents Act, 1970** excludes "mere discovery of new forms of known substances," secondary patents on delivery systems can delay market entry of complex generics.

Moreover, India lacks a structured **regulatory data exclusivity (RDE)** period similar to that in the United States or European Union, where reference products enjoy protection for a specific duration. This absence, although promoting faster access to generics, discourages investment in developing scientifically intensive complex generics (Sharma & Patel, 2022).

Balancing patent protection, innovation incentives, and public access will be crucial for shaping India's complex generics policy. Establishing a transparent **patent linkage mechanism**—where regulatory approval timelines align with patent status—could bring more predictability to developers.

4.7 Human Resource and Training Limitations

Regulatory science is a specialized field requiring advanced knowledge of chemistry, pharmacokinetics, bioengineering, and clinical evaluation. However, **India's regulatory human resource capacity** remains stretched, with CDSCO staff handling a high volume of applications across all product categories.

While the NDCTR 2019 mandates expert committee reviews, **limited availability of domain experts**—especially in nanotechnology, biologics, and inhalation science—creates bottlenecks in evaluation timelines. India's NIPERs and pharmacology institutions are beginning to introduce regulatory science curricula, but practical exposure to dossier evaluation and complex product analytics remains minimal (Joshi & Deshmukh, 2023).

Continuous professional development programs, international collaborations, and structured certification for reviewers could help bridge this capacity gap and align India's evaluation capabilities with global standards.

5. Impact on Industry, R&D, and Market Access

5.1 Indian Pharmaceutical Industry and Complex Generics Landscape

India's pharmaceutical industry has long been recognized for its dominance in small-molecule generics, contributing over **20% of the global generic drug supply** (Pharmexcil, 2022). However, as international markets move toward **high-barrier complex generics**, Indian firms are increasingly investing in advanced formulation technologies, device integration, and biologically derived systems.

Major Indian companies such as Sun Pharma, Dr. Reddy's, Lupin, and Cipla have launched or filed complex generics in regulated markets, including liposomal amphotericin B, inhalation therapies, and ophthalmic suspensions. However, domestic approvals for such products remain limited due to regulatory uncertainty and infrastructure constraints (Reddy et al., 2021).

Thus, while India possesses the scientific capability, the lack of a clearly defined regulatory framework for complex generics has slowed translation of innovation into market approvals.

5.2 Research and Development Challenges

Complex generics demand high upfront investment in R&D due to the need for advanced analytical testing, pilot-scale manufacturing, and in vivo evaluation. Unlike small-molecule generics, which can be reverse-engineered with relative ease, complex generics often require **novel process development** and extensive **comparability exercises** with the reference product.

Given that R&D budgets of Indian firms are typically modest compared to multinational counterparts, the high cost and long timelines deter smaller firms from entering this segment. Absence of government incentives or tax credits for complex generic research further compounds the issue (Kumar & Sharma, 2023).

Encouragingly, initiatives such as **Production Linked Incentive (PLI) schemes** and **Biotechnology Industry Research Assistance Council (BIRAC)** grants are beginning to support innovation in advanced drug delivery systems. However, aligning these programs with regulatory guidance will be essential to stimulate complex generic development.

5.3 Market Access and Pricing Regulation

Once approved, complex generics often face market access barriers due to pricing and reimbursement policies. The **National Pharmaceutical Pricing Authority (NPPA)** regulates drug prices under the **Drug Price Control Order (DPCO)**. However, applying standard price ceilings to complex generics—without accounting for their higher development and manufacturing costs—can limit commercial viability (NPPA, 2022).

To ensure sustainability, a **differentiated pricing model** recognizing the scientific complexity and investment in these products may be necessary. Such differentiation is consistent with global trends, where complex generics command moderate price premiums compared to standard generics but remain significantly cheaper than innovators' products.

Additionally, slow adoption in public procurement programs and limited hospital formulary inclusion restrict patient access. Strategic policy measures promoting fast-track inclusion of approved complex generics in essential medicine lists and government tenders could improve uptake.

5.4 Export Competitiveness

Despite domestic regulatory challenges, Indian firms remain globally competitive due to their strong manufacturing base and cost efficiencies. Many complex generics developed in India are first approved in the **US or EU**, leveraging these approvals to facilitate registrations in other emerging markets.

However, the reliance on foreign regulatory pathways for validation highlights the need for **India's domestic system to evolve**. If India strengthens its internal evaluation framework and harmonizes with ICH guidelines, domestic approvals could gain international recognition, reducing dependence on foreign dossiers.

This would not only boost export competitiveness but also attract foreign direct investment (FDI) into India's advanced formulation sector.

5.5 Socioeconomic and Public Health Implications

From a public health standpoint, complex generics offer a critical opportunity to improve accessibility of advanced therapies—such as cancer treatments, inhalation drugs for respiratory diseases, and long-acting injectables for chronic conditions—at affordable costs.

In India, where a significant portion of the population lacks health insurance coverage, cost-effective complex generics can enhance treatment outcomes and reduce disease burden. For instance, liposomal doxorubicin or depot antipsychotics produced locally at lower cost have expanded therapeutic options in tertiary care settings (Mehta et al., 2022).

However, the absence of dedicated pharmacovigilance for these products raises safety concerns. Integration of complex generics into the **Pharmacovigilance Programme of India (PvPI)** is therefore vital to ensure long-term safety monitoring and public confidence.

CONCLUSION

The regulatory framework for complex generics in India is evolving but remains at a developmental stage compared to mature regulatory systems such as those of the USFDA and EMA. While the Central Drugs

Standard Control Organization (CDSCO) has initiated steps to address the scientific and technical challenges associated with complex generics—such as developing product-specific guidance and improving review mechanisms—gaps still persist in clarity, harmonization, and consistency. Strengthening regulatory science, establishing clear bioequivalence and characterization standards, and fostering collaboration between regulators, academia, and industry are essential for progress. A robust, transparent, and internationally aligned regulatory system will not only ensure the quality and safety of complex generics but also enhance India's position as a global hub for affordable and advanced generic medicines.

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. Agarwal, A., & Gupta, R. (2023). *Emerging trends in regulatory evaluation of complex generics in India: Policy perspectives.* Journal of Pharmaceutical Policy and Practice, 16(4), 215–229. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40545-023-00567-2
2. Central Drugs Standard Control Organization (CDSCO). (2017). *Medical Device Rules, 2017.* Ministry of Health and Family Welfare, Government of India. https://cdsco.gov.in
3. Central Drugs Standard Control Organization (CDSCO). (2019). *New Drugs and Clinical Trials Rules, 2019.* Ministry of Health and Family Welfare, Government of India. https://cdsco.gov.in
4. Central Drugs Standard Control Organization (CDSCO). (2021). *Guidance document on regulatory approval of new drugs, including fixed-dose combinations and complex generics.* Ministry of Health and Family Welfare, Government of India.
5. Chaudhuri, S. (2005). *The WTO and India's pharmaceutical industry: Patent protection, TRIPS, and developing countries.* Oxford University Press.
6. European Medicines Agency (EMA). (2020). *Guideline on the investigation of bioequivalence.* EMA/CHMP/016936/2019. https://www.ema.europa.eu
7. European Medicines Agency (EMA). (2022). *Reflection paper on the scientific principles for evaluating complex generic medicinal products.* EMA/CHMP/503571/2021.
8. Federation of Indian Chambers of Commerce and Industry (FICCI). (2022). *Report on complex generics: Challenges and opportunities for India.* FICCI Health Services Division.
9. Gupta, P., Nair, S., & Sharma, R. (2022). Strengthening India's pharmacovigilance for complex formulations: An emerging need. *Indian Journal of Pharmacology, 54*(6), 385–392.
10. Kumar, A., & Sahoo, S. (2020). Analytical characterization of complex generic formulations: Regulatory and scientific perspectives. *International Journal of Pharmaceutics, 590*(1), 119946. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijpharm.2020.119946
11. Kumar, N., & Singh, R. (2023). Regulatory challenges in the development and approval of inhalation-based complex generics in India. *Journal of Generic Medicines, 20*(1), 15–28.
12. Mukherjee, D. (2021). Analytical and regulatory barriers to complex generic approvals in India. *Regulatory Affairs Journal Pharma, 32*(3), 125–136.
13. National Institute of Pharmaceutical Education and Research (NIPER). (2023). *White paper on regulatory science and complex generics.* NIPER, Department of Pharmaceuticals, Government of India.
14. Patel, S., Bansal, M., & Rao, P. (2022). Bridging the regulatory divide: Need for harmonized guidelines for complex generics in India. *Indian Journal of Regulatory Science, 10*(2), 47–58.
15. Pharmaceuticals and Medical Devices Agency (PMDA). (2022). *Guidelines for generic drugs and complex products in Japan.* PMDA, Ministry of Health, Labour and Welfare.