Process Validation Challenges: Learnings from Complete Response Letters

Complete Response Letters (CRLs) issued by the U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) provide a uniquely candid window into the most critical deficiencies identified during application review. Historically, the limited public availability of CRLs constrained the industry's ability to systematically learn from these regulatory decisions. However, a relatively recent shift toward increased transparency—driven by FDA initiatives and greater voluntary disclosure—has expanded access to CRL content and summaries. This development has enabled more robust analysis of recurring deficiencies, particularly those related to manufacturing and process validation, which continue to rank among the most common and consequential reasons for delayed approvals.

Industry focus has shifted to Contamination Control Strategies (CCS) in recent years, likely in response to the 2022 revision of EU Annex 1, Manufacture of Sterile Medicinal Products, while attention on Process Control Strategies (PCS) has waned. This lack of attention to the PCS is evident not only in inspection outcomes (e.g. 483s and warning letters), but also in the rejection of New Drug Applications (NDA) and Biologics License Applications (BLA). Analysis of publicly available CRLs and related disclosures reveals a consistent and concerning trend: failure to adequately demonstrate process robustness and reproducibility. FDA frequently cites insufficient evidence that a process can consistently produce product meeting it's predefined specifications. These issues often manifest as inadequate process performance qualification (PPQ), limited commercial-scale batch data, or insufficient justification of scale-up from development to commercial manufacturing. The increased availability of CRLs has made clear that such deficiencies are not isolated incidents but systemic challenges across both small molecules and biologics.

Another prominent theme is poor definition and control of critical process parameters (CPPs) and critical quality attributes (CQAs). CRLs frequently highlight gaps in product and process characterization and understanding, including weak scientific rationale linking CPPs to CQAs and insufficiently justified control strategies. With more CRLs now accessible, it is evident that regulators expect a far deeper level of process knowledge than might have been the norm historically. This aligns with FDA's long-standing emphasis on Quality by Design (QbD) and Quality Risk Management (QRM), yet the persistence of these findings suggests that implementation across the industry remains a challenge.

Analytical method readiness continues to be a major contributor to process validation-related CRLs. The expanded visibility into CRLs shows repeated concerns surrounding method validation, robustness, and comparability. In many cases, deficiencies in analytical methods undermine confidence in process validation data, creating a cascading effect that delays application approval. This reinforces the principle that process validation and analytical method validation are inseparable components of a comprehensive PCS.

The increased transparency around CRLs has also shed light on challenges in technology transfer and site readiness. A significant number of CRLs cite issues identified during pre-approval inspections (PAIs), including inadequate facility qualification, data integrity concerns, and incomplete implementation of quality system requirements. These findings emphasize that process validation is not limited to process design and qualification but extends to the operational and QRM maturity of the manufacturing site. The ability to compare CRLs across multiple applications has made it clear that gaps in site readiness remain a frequent and preventable cause of regulatory delay.

(Continued)

Importantly, the release of more CRL information has highlighted emerging issues associated with advanced manufacturing and digitalization. Regulators are increasingly scrutinizing the use of data-driven models, including AI-supported approaches, in process development and control. CRLs have begun to reflect concerns about model validation, data governance, and lifecycle management of these systems. This trend underscores the need to apply traditional validation principles—such as transparency, traceability, and change control—to novel technologies.

With respect to QRM, many CRLs suggest that risk assessments are superficial, incomplete, or absent—that is, they fail to meaningfully inform control strategies. The ability to analyze multiple CRLs side by side reveals a pattern: risk assessments are often treated as documentation exercises rather than as dynamic tools for decision-making. This gap reduces regulator confidence in the overall process control strategy and increases the likelihood of deficiencies.

The implications of these findings are substantial. Manufacturing and process validation issues cited in CRLs can delay product approval by months or years, with significant financial implications and, more importantly, delayed patient access to potentially life-saving therapies. The broader availability of CRLs has made it increasingly difficult to dismiss these issues as isolated missteps; instead, they represent persistent, industry-wide challenges that demand systematic attention.

Addressing these challenges requires a proactive and disciplined approach. Companies must invest early in process characterization and control strategy definition, using tools such as design of experiments (DoE), mechanistic modeling, and multivariate analysis to establish robust design spaces and control strategies. Lifecycle process validation—encompassing process design, process qualification, and continued process verification—must be rigorously implemented and supported by well-validated analytical methods. Equally critical is the meaningful integration of QRM principles to ensure that risks are not only identified but effectively mitigated.

In parallel, organizations must prioritize inspection readiness and manufacturing execution. The increased visibility of CRL findings related to PAIs underscores the importance of ensuring that facilities, systems, and personnel are fully prepared for regulatory scrutiny well in advance of submission. For companies leveraging advanced or AI-enabled technologies, early engagement with FDA is essential to align on expectations and reduce regulatory uncertainty.

In conclusion, the growing availability of CRLs marks an important step forward in regulatory transparency and provides the pharmaceutical industry with a valuable learning tool. The trends revealed—particularly those related to process validation and manufacturing issues—highlight persistent gaps that can delay or prevent product approval. By systematically learning from these insights and reinforcing a science- and risk-based approach to process validation, companies can improve regulatory outcomes and, ultimately, ensure more reliable delivery of high-quality medicines to patients.

Kelly Waldron, PhD
Business Unit Manager
kwaldron@valsource.com | 508.380.0243