Journal of Molecular Science

Journal of Molecular Science
Volume 36 Issue 1, Year of Publication 2026, Page 91-109
DoI-10.004687/1000-9035.2026.013

Journal of Molecular Science
www.jmolecularsci.com ISSN:1000-9035

Emerging Trends in Impurity Profiling: Addressing Regulatory and Analytical Challenges

Jinka Meghana[1], Akula Tharun[1], Nawaz Mahammed[2], T. Reshma[3*]
[1]Department of Pharmaceutical Analysis, Raghavendra Institute of Pharmaceutical Education and Research, K.R. Palli Cross, Anantapur, Chiyyedu, Andhra Pradesh-515721-India.
[2]Department of Pharmaceutics, Raghavendra Institute of Pharmaceutical Education and Research, K.R. Palli Cross, Anantapur, Chiyyedu, Andhra Pradesh-515721-India.
[3]Department of Pharmaceutical Quality Assurance, Raghavendra Institute of Pharmaceutical Education and Research, K.R. Palli Cross, Anantapur, Chiyyedu, Andhra Pradesh-515721-India.

Article Information
Received: 06-11-2025
Revised: 28-12-2025
Accepted: 12-02-2026
Published: 05-03-2026

Keywords
Impurity Profiling, Genotoxic Impurities, ICH Guidelines, Advanced Analytical Techniques, Regulatory Compliance.

ABSTRACT
Impurity profiling has emerged as a cornerstone in pharmaceutical quality control, playing a critical role in ensuring the safety, efficacy, and regulatory compliance of drug products. This review examines the evolving landscape of impurity profiling, focusing on the types of impurities encountered, including organic, inorganic, residual solvents, genotoxic impurities, and nitrosamines, as well as the regulatory frameworks that govern their identification, quantification, and control. The paper examines key international guidelines such as ICH Q3A–Q3D and M7, along with region-specific regulations, outlining acceptable limits and qualification thresholds. Advanced analytical techniques, including high-resolution mass spectrometry (HRMS), 2D NMR, UPLC, and capillary electrophoresis, are discussed for their contributions to accurate impurity detection. Emerging tools like in silico toxicology, cheminformatics, and AI/ML models offer predictive capabilities and enhance risk assessment. Challenges such as analytical sensitivity, lack of reference standards, and data interpretation complexities are also addressed. The review extends to modern manufacturing paradigms, including green and continuous manufacturing, and the specific considerations for biopharmaceuticals, gene therapies, and cell-based products. With personalized medicine on the rise, the need for adaptable and patient-specific impurity profiling strategies becomes increasingly urgent. The integration of digital technologies, real-time monitoring, and global regulatory harmonization is emphasized as the future direction for streamlined and robust impurity control systems. This comprehensive overview aims to bridge scientific innovation with regulatory expectations, fostering a proactive approach to impurity management in an era of pharmaceutical advancement.

1. INTRODUCTION:

Impurity profiling involves the identification, structural elucidation, and quantification of impurities present in pharmaceutical substances and products. These impurities can arise from various sources, including raw materials, synthesis by-products, degradation during storage, and interactions with excipients[1]. They are broadly classified into organic impurities, inorganic residues, and residual solvents, and may include genotoxic or mutagenic contaminants[2]. Regulatory agencies such as the ICH, USFDA, and EMA have

Journal of Molecular Science
Volume 36 Issue 1, Year of Publication 2026, Page 91-109
DoI-10.004687/1000-9035.2026.013

laid down stringent guidelines regarding acceptable impurity levels to safeguard patient health[3].

The significance of impurity profiling lies in its direct impact on drug quality, safety, and efficacy. A well-characterized impurity profile ensures that harmful substances are either absent or present within safe limits[4]. It also supports the development of robust. Moreover, impurity profiling aids in identifying degradation pathways and optimizing storage conditions[5]. As drugs become more complex and regulatory scrutiny increases, impurity profiling has evolved into a critical component of pharmaceutical quality control and regulatory submissions[6]. Proper impurity management not only ensures patient safety but also protects manufacturers from costly recalls, reputational damage, and regulatory penalties[7], thus underlining its central role in pharmaceutical development and lifecycle management[8].

2. Historical Background and Evolution of Impurity Analysis:

The concept of impurity analysis has evolved significantly over time, driven by technological advancements and increasing regulatory awareness[9]. In the early days of pharmaceutical development, impurity control was rudimentary, limited to simple visual and chemical tests[10]. As synthetic chemistry advanced and drug molecules became more complex, the need for rigorous impurity detection grew[11]. The thalidomide disaster in the 1960s marked a critical turning point, emphasizing the need for thorough impurity and toxicity evaluation during drug development[12].

The formation of the International Council for Harmonisation (ICH) in the 1990s brought about standardized guidelines such as ICH Q3A–Q3D, which outlined thresholds and strategies for impurity identification, qualification, and control[13]. Simultaneously, analytical chemistry saw a transformation with the introduction of high-performance liquid chromatography (HPLC), gas chromatography (GC), mass spectrometry (MS), and nuclear magnetic resonance (NMR), enabling more sensitive and accurate impurity detection[14].

Over time, impurity analysis has expanded to include genotoxic impurities, elemental impurities, and nitrosamines, prompted by emerging safety concerns. Regulatory bodies now mandate comprehensive impurity profiling throughout the drug lifecycle[15]. Today, impurity analysis is an interdisciplinary effort combining analytical science, toxicology, and regulatory strategy, continuously evolving to meet the challenges posed by modern pharmaceutical innovation[16].

3. Relevance in Drug Safety, Efficacy, and Regulatory Approval:

Impurities, even at trace levels, can significantly impact the safety, efficacy, and regulatory approval of pharmaceutical products[17]. Some impurities may exhibit toxic, genotoxic, or carcinogenic properties, which can lead to adverse health effects in patients[18]. Regulatory authorities require that all significant impurities be identified and qualified for safety before a drug can be approved[19]. This requirement is particularly critical for genotoxic impurities (GTIs), such as nitrosamines, which have triggered global recalls due to their high risk even at parts-per-billion concentrations[20].

Impurity profiling is integral to ensuring drug safety by enabling the detection and control of such harmful contaminants[21]. It also contributes to maintaining efficacy by ensuring the stability and potency of the active pharmaceutical ingredient (API) are not compromised by degradation products or interactions with other components[22]. Moreover, regulators scrutinize impurity profiles to assess the robustness and consistency of manufacturing processes[7].

From a regulatory perspective, impurity data must be submitted as part of Investigational New Drug (IND), New Drug Application (NDA), and Abbreviated New Drug Application (ANDA) filings[23]. Guidelines such as ICH Q3A-Q3D and M7 provide a framework for establishing impurity limits and safety thresholds. Thus, impurity profiling is a non-negotiable aspect of drug approval, central to safeguarding public health and maintaining regulatory compliance[7].

4. Scope and Objectives of the Review:

This review aims to explore the emerging trends and challenges in impurity profiling, focusing on both regulatory expectations and analytical advancements[24]. The pharmaceutical industry is undergoing rapid transformation, and impurity profiling practices must evolve accordingly[9]. With the introduction of complex molecules, biologics, and continuous manufacturing technologies, identifying and managing impurities has become increasingly sophisticated and essential[25].

The scope of this review includes a detailed discussion on the classification of pharmaceutical impurities, current global regulatory guidelines (such as those from ICH, USFDA, EMA), and the challenges posed by newly emerging contaminants, including nitrosamines and genotoxic impurities[15]. The review also emphasizes cutting-edge analytical techniques such as LC-MS, GC-MS, high-resolution mass spectrometry (HRMS), and in silico approaches used for impurity prediction and identification[26].

Journal of Molecular Science
Volume 36 Issue 1, Year of Publication 2026, Page 91-109
DoI-10.004687/1000-9035.2026.013

The primary objectives are: To review existing and evolving regulatory frameworks related to impurity profiling. To discuss novel analytical methods and their relevance in detecting low-level impurities[27]. To identify key analytical and regulatory challenges encountered by the pharmaceutical industry. To highlight case studies that illustrate the practical implications of impurity-related issues[19]. To propose future directions, including the role of green chemistry, artificial intelligence, and harmonized global standards. Ultimately, this review aims to provide actionable insights that bridge scientific innovation with regulatory compliance in impurity profiling[28].

Classification of Impurities:

1. Organic impurities (process-related, degradation products)
2. Inorganic impurities (residual metals, reagents)
3. Residual solvents (Class I, II, III)
4. Genotoxic and mutagenic impurities (GTIs)
5. Nitrosamines and other newly recognized impurities[18]

1. Organic Impurities (Process-Related and Degradation Products):

Organic impurities are primarily derived from the manufacturing process or from the degradation of drug substances over time. Process-related impurities include starting materials, intermediates, by-products, and reagents used during synthesis(29). These substances may persist in trace amounts in the final product if not adequately removed. Degradation products, on the other hand, arise due to chemical instability of the drug substance under conditions such as heat, light, moisture, or oxidation(30). Identifying and quantifying these impurities is critical because they can influence the drug's safety and efficacy(21). Regulatory agencies such as the ICH (International Council for Harmonisation) provide guidelines on acceptable levels of such impurities, often based on toxicological risk assessment(19). Analytical techniques like HPLC, LC-MS, and GC are routinely employed for detection and quantification. Proper process optimization, stress testing, and stability studies are crucial in minimizing organic impurities(30). Understanding the structure and mechanism of formation of these impurities allows manufacturers to refine synthetic pathways and improve the overall quality of the pharmaceutical product(31). Therefore, a comprehensive impurity profiling strategy must be in place to ensure that all organic impurities remain within acceptable limits throughout the product's lifecycle(32).

2. Inorganic Impurities (Residual Metals, Reagents):

Inorganic impurities include materials such as residual catalysts (e.g., palladium, platinum), reagents, salts, filter aids, and other inorganic substances that may remain after the synthesis or formulation process(33). These impurities often originate from the manufacturing environment, equipment, or raw materials. Their presence, even in trace amounts, can adversely affect drug safety and efficacy, particularly due to their potential toxicity(34). The ICH Q3D guideline outlines limits for elemental impurities in drug products, categorized based on their toxicological impact and route of administration(35). Techniques like ICP-MS (Inductively Coupled Plasma Mass Spectrometry) and AAS (Atomic Absorption Spectroscopy) are commonly used for their detection due to their high sensitivity(36). Strict adherence to Good Manufacturing Practices (GMP) and proper validation of cleaning processes help control the levels of inorganic impurities(37). Additionally, risk-based assessments are performed to determine the likelihood of metal contamination and ensure compliance with regulatory thresholds(38). Unlike organic impurities, inorganic substances generally do not degrade over documentation, analytical monitoring, and the use of high-purity reagents and materials are essential to minimize their occurrence and ensure product quality(39).

3. Residual Solvents (Class I, II, III):

Residual solvents are organic volatile chemicals used or produced during the manufacture of drug substances, excipients, or final products(40). These solvents are not intended to be part of the final formulation and should be removed as thoroughly as possible. The ICH Q3C guideline classifies residual solvents into three classes based on their toxicity. Class I solvents (e.g., benzene, carbon tetrachloride) are known carcinogens and should be avoided or limited to extremely low levels. Class II solvents (e.g., methanol, acetonitrile) are less toxic but still pose health risks and require stringent limits. Class III solvents (e.g., ethanol, acetone) have low toxic potential and are permitted at relatively higher concentrations(41). The choice of solvent and its permissible limit depend on the manufacturing process and the route of drug administration(42). Analytical methods like Gas Chromatography (GC), particularly with headspace sampling, are widely employed for residual solvent analysis due to their high sensitivity and specificity(43). Effective control strategies, including the selection of alternative solvents and the optimization of drying procedures, are essential to ensure that residual solvent levels comply with regulatory standards. Monitoring and controlling residual solvents are critical not only for patient safety but also for ensuring compliance with global pharmaceutical regulations(44).

Journal of Molecular Science
Volume 36 Issue 1, Year of Publication 2026, Page 91-109
DoI-10.004687/1000-9035.2026.013

4. Genotoxic and Mutagenic Impurities (GTIs):
Genotoxic and mutagenic impurities (GTIs) are substances that can damage DNA, potentially leading to mutations and cancer. These impurities may arise from synthetic starting materials, intermediates, or degradation products(2, 18). Due to their high-risk nature, GTIs are regulated under the principle of the Threshold of Toxicological Concern (TTC), with limits often set as low as 1.5 µg/day for lifetime exposure(45). The ICH M7 guideline provides a framework for assessing and controlling GTIs, recommending a risk-based approach that includes structural alerts, Ames testing, and in silico prediction tools(46). The detection and quantification of GTIs require highly sensitive analytical techniques such as LC-MS/MS or GC-MS. Unlike standard impurities, GTIs require a more rigorous safety assessment and justification for their presence, even at trace levels(27). Mitigation strategies include changes in synthetic routes, impurity scavenging, and purification steps. Moreover, GTIs must be monitored throughout the product's shelf life to ensure that no new genotoxic degradants form(47). A comprehensive risk management strategy, including toxicological evaluation and analytical monitoring, is essential to minimize patient exposure to these potentially harmful impurities(20).

5. Nitrosamines and Other Newly Recognized Impurities:
Nitrosamines have recently emerged as a major concern in the pharmaceutical industry due to their classification as probable human carcinogens(48). These compounds can form unintentionally during drug synthesis or storage, particularly in the presence of nitrites and amines under acidic conditions(49). The detection of nitrosamines in widely used medications like ranitidine and sartans has led to global recalls and heightened regulatory scrutiny(50). Regulatory agencies, including the FDA and EMA, have issued specific guidelines and acceptable intake limits (typically in nanogram ranges) for various nitrosamine species. Their analysis often requires ultra-sensitive methods such as LC-MS/MS or GC-MS with selective ion monitoring(27). Manufacturers are now expected to perform comprehensive risk assessments across all products, including evaluation of raw materials, reagents, and storage conditions(51). Additionally, other newly recognized impurities such as isocyanates, alkyl sulfonates, and reactive intermediates, are gaining attention due to improved detection technologies and evolving regulatory expectations(52). Addressing these impurities requires proactive surveillance, investment in advanced analytical methods, and robust control strategies(53). As our understanding of toxicology evolves, the list of critical impurities will likely expand, emphasizing the importance of a dynamic and forward-looking impurity profiling approach(54).

Regulatory Framework

1. ICH Guidelines (ICH Q3A, Q3B, Q3C, Q3D, M7)
The International Council for Harmonisation (ICH) has developed several critical guidelines to standardize impurity control in pharmaceuticals. These guidelines ensure product quality and patient safety across the global market(55).

- ICH Q3A deals with impurities in new drug substances and outlines thresholds for reporting, identification, and qualification of organic impurities(56).
- ICH Q3B addresses impurities in new drug products, emphasizing the need to evaluate degradation products and their impact on drug stability(13).
- ICH Q3C focuses on residual solvents, classifying them into three toxicity-based categories (Class I, II, III), with limits based on daily exposure(57).
- ICH Q3D introduces a risk-based approach for controlling elemental impurities (e.g., heavy metals) and sets permissible daily exposure (PDE) limits using toxicological data(35).
- ICH M7provides a framework for assessing and controlling DNA-reactive (mutagenic) impurities, including genotoxic impurities (GTIs) and nitrosamines. It integrates structure–activity relationship (SAR) tools, TTC principles, and analytical strategies(58).

These guidelines are pivotal in risk assessment and regulatory compliance. They harmonize impurity profiling practices globally, streamline approval processes, and reduce redundant testing(7). Their implementation ensures a proactive, scientifically justified approach to impurity management, particularly as new challenges and technologies emerge(59).

2. Regional Regulations (US FDA, EMA, CDSCO, PMDA)
While ICH guidelines provide a global framework, regional regulatory authorities such as the US FDA (United States), EMA (Europe), CDSCO (India), and PMDA (Japan) interpret and enforce them with localized expectations and additional requirements(60).

The USFDA follows ICH guidelines but often issues supplementary guidance and warning letters that

Journal of Molecular Science
Volume 36 Issue 1, Year of Publication 2026, Page 91-109
DoI-10.004687/1000-9035.2026.013

reflect its specific expectations. It emphasizes risk-based assessments, control strategies, and validated analytical methods for impurity detection. Nitrosamine control has been a major focus recently(3).

The European Medicines Agency (EMA) closely adheres to ICH standards but may require additional data on elemental impurities or degradation pathways under their Quality Risk Management (QRM) framework(61).

India's Central Drugs Standard Control Organization (CDSCO) aligns with ICH, especially for new drug approvals, but still faces implementation gaps(62). It is increasingly harmonizing with global standards, especially after several global nitrosamine-related recalls(63).

Japan's PMDA also enforces ICH guidelines but with rigorous documentation and review procedures. They may expect higher precision in impurity identification and require in-depth justifications for control strategies(64).

Understanding regional regulatory nuances is essential for global drug development(65). Differences in interpretation, timelines, and expectations can pose challenges, necessitating careful planning, thorough documentation, and region-specific regulatory strategies to ensure timely approvals(66).

3. Acceptable Limits and Qualification Thresholds

Acceptable limits and qualification thresholds for impurities are established to ensure product safety without unnecessarily burdening manufacturers with excessive testing(19). These thresholds are primarily defined in ICH Q3A, Q3B, Q3C, Q3D, and M7, and are based on the maximum daily dose of the drug and the toxicological profile of each impurity(67).

For organic impurities, identification and qualification thresholds typically range from 0.05% to 0.15%, depending on the drug's maximum daily dose(68). For example, in a drug with a daily dose under 2 g, any impurity above 0.1% must be identified, and any above 0.15% must be qualified for safety(69).

For residual solvents, ICH Q3C assigns limits in ppm based on their toxicity class and permitted daily exposure (PDE)(70).
Elemental impurities under ICH Q3D are regulated based on PDE values expressed in µg/day, and limits differ depending on the route of administration (oral, parenteral, inhalation)(71).

Genotoxic impurities, per ICH M7, must be controlled below the Threshold of Toxicological Concern (TTC) — usually 1.5 µg/day for chronic exposure(72).

Exceeding these thresholds necessitates a thorough toxicological evaluation and justification. Establishing and adhering to these limits ensures that impurity levels are safe for patients while allowing efficient drug development(73).

4. Challenges in Harmonization

Harmonization of impurity regulations across global regulatory authorities remains a complex challenge despite efforts by ICH(74). Different regions interpret and implement guidelines variably, leading to inconsistencies in impurity acceptance criteria and documentation requirements(19).

One key challenge is the variation in expectations for impurity thresholds and safety data(17). While ICH provides standard limits, some agencies (e.g., EMA or PMDA) may request additional justification or lower limits based on national policies or public health concerns(75). Similarly, regional regulators may demand different analytical approaches or revalidation of methods already accepted elsewhere, the variation in expectations for impurity thresholds and safety data(76).

Another challenge lies in the implementation gaps in emerging markets. Countries like India and China are still aligning their regulatory systems with ICH, and enforcement can vary significantly(77). These disparities can create delays, increased costs, and repeated testing during global product registration(78).

Data transparency and access to reference databases also hinder harmonization, particularly for genotoxicity predictions or toxicological assessments(79). Additionally, rapidly evolving impurity concerns — such as nitrosamines — may be handled differently across agencies, complicating compliance efforts(80).

Achieving true harmonization requires consistent interpretation, mutual recognition of data, training of regulatory personnel, and updated collaborative frameworks(81). Until then, manufacturers must navigate regulatory landscapes carefully, balancing global compliance with regional customization(82).

Emerging Analytical Techniques:

1. High-Resolution Mass Spectrometry (HRMS)

High-Resolution Mass Spectrometry (HRMS) has revolutionized impurity profiling by enabling the detection, identification, and structural elucidation

Journal of Molecular Science
Volume 36 Issue 1, Year of Publication 2026, Page 91-109
DoI-10.004687/1000-9035.2026.013

of unknown impurities at trace levels(83). Unlike traditional mass spectrometry, HRMS offers exceptional mass accuracy and resolution, allowing for the determination of exact molecular formulas. This is especially valuable for identifying low-abundance degradation products, genotoxic impurities, and nitrosamines(84).

HRMS is often integrated with liquid chromatography (LC-HRMS), enhancing separation and facilitating detailed impurity analysis in complex matrices(85). The high sensitivity of HRMS allows analysts to work with minimal sample quantities while still achieving reliable results. This is critical during early drug development when impurity profiles are not fully known(86).

Furthermore, HRMS supports both targeted and untargeted analysis, making it ideal for forced degradation studies, stability testing, and risk assessment of new impurities(87). It also provides structural information via fragmentation patterns (MS/MS), which aids in elucidating unknown compounds without the need for reference standards(88).

Despite its high cost and need for technical expertise, HRMS is becoming a gold standard in pharmaceutical impurity profiling(86). Its use is increasingly recommended by regulatory authorities, particularly for investigating nitrosamines and genotoxic impurities where ultra-trace detection and exact mass determination are critical(89).

2. 2D NMR and Hyphenated Techniques

Two-dimensional nuclear magnetic resonance (2D NMR) spectroscopy and hyphenated techniques like LC-MS, LC-NMR, and GC-MS are increasingly used for advanced impurity profiling due to their complementary strengths in structural elucidation and separation(90).

2D NMR provides detailed information about molecular structure, connectivity, and stereochemistry. Techniques such as COSY, HSQC, and HMBC allow chemists to map proton and carbon environments, aiding in the accurate identification of complex or unknown impurities(91). NMR is especially useful when mass spectrometry results are ambiguous or when distinguishing positional isomers and chiral impurities(92).

Hyphenated techniques combine chromatographic separation with spectroscopic detection, increasing analytical power. For example, LC-MS integrates liquid chromatography's resolving ability with mass spectrometry's detection sensitivity, making it ideal for profiling unknown and trace-level impurities(93). Similarly, LC-NMR allows real-time structural analysis post-separation without needing to isolate the impurity(94).

These methods are invaluable in early development, forced degradation studies, and regulatory submissions where full impurity characterization is required. Although sophisticated and resource-intensive, they enhance confidence in impurity identification and comply with stringent regulatory expectations(95). The integration of hyphenated techniques represents a shift toward comprehensive and conclusive impurity profiling in modern pharmaceutical analysis(90).

3. Ultra-Performance Liquid Chromatography (UPLC)

Ultra-Performance Liquid Chromatography (UPLC) represents a significant advancement over traditional HPLC by utilizing smaller particle size columns (sub-2 µm) and higher operating pressures, resulting in improved resolution, speed, and sensitivity(96). This makes UPLC particularly suitable for impurity profiling, where separating closely eluting impurities or degradation products is critical(97).

UPLC offers faster analysis times without compromising resolution, enabling high-throughput testing — a major advantage during method development, stability studies, and routine quality control(98). It is highly effective for quantifying impurities at trace levels and is compliant with ICH requirements for specificity, precision, and sensitivity(99).

In the context of complex drug products or formulations with multiple impurities, UPLC provides sharper peaks and better peak capacity, facilitating more accurate quantification and identification(100). It can be seamlessly coupled with detectors like UV, PDA (photodiode array), or MS, further expanding its capabilities(101).

Its robustness, scalability, and reproducibility have made UPLC a standard tool in modern analytical laboratories(102). Although it requires specialized instrumentation and optimized methods, the benefits of shorter run times, higher efficiency, and lower solvent consumption contribute to improved laboratory productivity and greener analytical practices(103).

4. Capillary Electrophoresis (CE)

Capillary Electrophoresis (CE) is an emerging analytical technique gaining prominence in impurity profiling due to its high separation efficiency, low sample and reagent requirements, and ability to resolve a wide range of analytes, especially charged

Journal of Molecular Science
Volume 36 Issue 1, Year of Publication 2026, Page 91-109
DoI-10.004687/1000-9035.2026.013

and polar impurities. CE separates compounds based on their charge-to-size ratio under the influence of an electric field in narrow capillaries filled with an electrolyte(104).

CE is particularly effective for analyzing small ions, inorganic impurities, and polar degradation products that are often difficult to separate using traditional chromatographic methods(105). Its adaptability allows for various modes, including capillary zone electrophoresis (CZE), micellar electrokinetic chromatography (MEKC), and capillary isoelectric focusing (CIEF), each suited for different impurity types(106).

The technique is highly sensitive and ideal for trace-level detection, with minimal matrix interference. CE is also useful in the analysis of biopharmaceuticals, where it helps detect size and charge variants or monitor purity and heterogeneity(107).

Despite its advantages, CE faces limitations such as lower robustness and limited detection options compared to LC-based methods. However, coupling CE with MS (CE-MS) significantly enhances its capabilities, making it a versatile tool in impurity profiling(108). Its cost-effectiveness and eco-friendly nature further support its adoption in regulatory-compliant laboratories(109).

5. Real-Time and In-Line Monitoring (PAT/QbD Tools)

Real-time and in-line monitoring of impurities using Process Analytical Technology (PAT**)** and Quality by Design (QbD**)** approaches represents a transformative shift in pharmaceutical manufacturing(110). These tools enable continuous monitoring and control of critical quality attributes, including impurity levels, during production rather than relying solely on end-product testing(111).

PAT involves integrating analytical sensors and models into the manufacturing process to gather real-time data on parameters like pH, temperature, concentration, and impurity levels. Techniques such as near-infrared (NIR), Raman spectroscopy, and in-line UV-vis spectrophotometry are commonly used(112). These technologies allow for immediate detection and correction of process deviations, thereby improving product quality and reducing batch failures(113).

QbD encourages a thorough understanding of the manufacturing process and its impact on impurity formation(114). By identifying critical process parameters and designing experiments (DoE), manufacturers can establish a design space where impurity levels remain within acceptable limits(115).

The use of PAT/QbD not only enhances regulatory compliance but also aligns with FDA and EMA's vision of a science-based, risk-managed approach to drug development. Although implementing such systems requires investment in infrastructure and expertise, the long-term benefits, including consistency, efficiency, and regulatory approval, are substantial(116).

Genotoxic Impurity Profiling

1. Strategies for Identification and Quantification

The identification and quantification of genotoxic impurities (GTIs) require a risk-based, science-driven approach due to their potential to cause DNA mutations, which may lead to cancer. The first step involves a comprehensive knowledge of the synthetic route, including reagents, intermediates, and degradation products that may give rise to GTIs(117). Structural alerts based on toxicophores (functional groups known to interact with DNA) are assessed using in silico tools such as (Q)SAR models and expert reviews to flag potential genotoxicity(118).

Once identified or suspected, GTIs must be quantified using highly sensitive and specific analytical techniques, as they are often present at trace levels (parts per billion)(119). Typical strategies involve orthogonal analytical approaches to confirm impurity identity and presence, with techniques like LC-MS/MS, GC-MS, or HRMS playing a vital role(26).

Preventative strategies include selecting alternative synthetic routes, optimizing reaction conditions, or introducing purification steps to remove GTIs. Throughout development, a control strategy is established to ensure GTIs remain below acceptable limits(120). These strategies are aligned with ICH M7 guidelines**,** which emphasize the importance of control, documentation, and justification for impurity presence, ensuring that patient safety is not compromised(121).

2. Threshold of Toxicological Concern (TTC)

The Threshold of Toxicological Concern (TTC) is a pivotal concept in genotoxic impurity control, introduced to establish exposure limits for DNA-reactive impurities in pharmaceuticals when limited toxicological data are available(122). According to ICH M7, the TTC for genotoxic impurities is set at 1.5 µg/day, which is considered a conservative and protective threshold for chronic exposure over a lifetime(72).

This value is based on an extensive analysis of carcinogenic potency data and reflects a level below

Journal of Molecular Science
Volume 36 Issue 1, Year of Publication 2026, Page 91-109
DoI-10.004687/1000-9035.2026.013

which the risk of cancer is negligible (typically 1 in 100,000 lifetime risk)(123). The TTC allows regulators and manufacturers to apply a uniform safety threshold without requiring detailed carcinogenicity studies for every impurity, facilitating efficient risk assessment during drug development(124).

If a GTI is identified or suspected, it must either be controlled below the TTC or evaluated using compound-specific data, such as benchmark dose modelling or long-term toxicity studies, to justify a higher permissible limit(47). For short-term exposures (e.g., ≤1 month), higher TTC values (up to 120 µg/day) may be acceptable(125).

The TTC concept supports rational and proportionate decision-making, enabling safe impurity control while minimizing unnecessary animal testing and accelerating the drug approval process. It is a cornerstone of modern impurity risk assessment frameworks(126).

3. Analytical Methods and Validation

The analysis of genotoxic impurities (GTIs) demands highly sensitive and selective analytical methods due to their trace-level presence and significant safety implications(119). Analytical techniques such as Liquid Chromatography–Mass Spectrometry (LC-MS/MS), Gas Chromatography–Mass Spectrometry (GC-MS), and High-Resolution Mass Spectrometry (HRMS)are widely employed for detecting GTIs, with detection limits often in the parts-per-billion (ppb) range(26).

Developing methods for GTI analysis follows a risk-based approach, where the chemical nature, volatility, and polarity of the impurity determine the most suitable technique(127). Sample preparation plays a key role, often involving derivatization, solid-phase extraction, or headspace sampling to enhance sensitivity and matrix compatibility(128).

Method validation must comply with ICH guidelines (such as ICH Q2(R2)), ensuring parameters like specificity, linearity, accuracy, precision, limit of detection (LOD), and limit of quantification (LOQ) are met(129). Given the low acceptable limits (e.g., 1.5 µg/day), LOQs must be low enough to consistently detect GTIs below the TTC(125).
In recent years, regulatory scrutiny of GTI methods has increased, especially for nitrosamines. As such, validated methods must demonstrate robustness and reproducibility across different batches and formulations(27). Ensuring method suitability for regulatory submission is essential for successful impurity control and product approval(20).

4. Case Studies

Case studies provide valuable insights into the practical application of genotoxic impurity profiling in pharmaceutical development. One prominent example is the discovery of nitrosamine impurities, such as N-nitrosodimethylamine (NDMA), in sartan drugs, which triggered global recalls and heightened regulatory scrutiny(130). Investigations revealed that specific manufacturing conditions—such as the use of sodium nitrite under acidic conditions—could generate nitrosamines as by-products, highlighting the need for vigilant impurity risk assessment(131).

In response, companies implemented retrospective impurity profiling, adjusted synthetic routes, and adopted advanced analytical methods like LC-HRMS to detect nitrosamines at parts-per-trillion levels(132). Regulatory agencies mandated control strategies and batch testing, underscoring the importance of robust impurity control systems(7).

Another case involves alkyl sulfonates, known GTIs, that may form during sulfonation reactions(133). In one instance, a pharmaceutical company revised its synthetic pathway and added purification steps after detecting methylmethanesulfonate (MMS) at levels exceeding the TTC(134).

These case studies illustrate real-world challenges in identifying, controlling, and validating GTIs(135). They demonstrate the critical role of ICH M7 compliance in silico tools, sensitive analytical techniques, and cross-functional collaboration in ensuring product safety. Lessons learned from such cases continue to shape regulatory expectations and industry practices(136).

Impurity Profiling in Biopharmaceuticals and Advanced Therapies

Biologics: Proteins, Peptides, and Monoclonal Antibodies

Impurity profiling in biologics—such as therapeutic proteins, peptides, and monoclonal antibodies—is a critical component of product quality and safety assessment(137). These biologics are typically produced through recombinant DNA technology in living host cells (e.g., CHO cells, E. coli), which inherently introduces process-related and product-related impurities(138). Product-related impurities include truncated forms, aggregates, misfolded species, and degraded products. Process-related impurities arise from host cells and manufacturing steps, such as residual host cell proteins (HCPs), DNA, media components, and purification reagents(139). Accurate characterization of these impurities is vital, as even low levels can provoke immune responses or reduce efficacy(140). Advanced analytical tools, including high-resolution mass spectrometry, capillary electrophoresis, and

Journal of Molecular Science
Volume 36 Issue 1, Year of Publication 2026, Page 91-109
DoI-10.004687/1000-9035.2026.013

ELISA, are employed to detect and quantify these impurities with precision(141). Regulatory authorities mandate stringent impurity thresholds and comprehensive risk assessments. As biologics are often structurally complex and sensitive to manufacturing variations, impurity profiling must be performed throughout the product lifecycle, including during scale-up and post-approval changes(7). Continuous development of orthogonal and sensitive methods is essential to ensure consistency, safety, and therapeutic equivalence, particularly with the growing presence of biosimilars(142). Overall, impurity profiling in biologics is indispensable for ensuring patient safety and regulatory compliance(143).

Impurities in Gene Therapy and Cell-Based Products

Gene therapies and cell-based treatments introduce unique impurity challenges due to their complex and living nature. These therapies often involve viral vectors (e.g., AAV, lentivirus) or modified cells (e.g., CAR-T cells), each bringing distinct impurities(144). In gene therapy, impurities include residual plasmid DNA, host cell proteins, helper virus sequences, and incomplete or empty viral capsids. These can impact efficacy and pose immunogenic or oncogenic risks(145). In cell-based therapies, impurities stem from culture media components, feeder cells, cytokines, residual process reagents (e.g., transduction agents), and dead or undesired cells(146). Unlike traditional pharmaceuticals, these products exhibit high variability, and impurity levels may shift during manufacturing or storage. Rigorous impurity profiling is essential to define acceptable limits, ensure reproducibility, and mitigate safety concerns(147). Analytical techniques such as qPCR (for DNA), ELISA (for proteins), and flow cytometry (for cellular impurities) are widely used. Regulatory agencies require extensive characterization of starting materials, process steps, and final products(148). The dynamic and evolving landscape of advanced therapies demands flexible, robust impurity detection strategies(149). Moreover, with personalized medicine becoming more prevalent, establishing impurity profiles for patient-specific products is an emerging challenge(150). Accurate impurity profiling supports not only product approval but also public confidence in these novel therapies(151).

Host Cell Protein (HCP) and DNA Contaminants

Host cell proteins (HCPs) and residual DNA are critical process-related impurities in biologics and advanced therapies. HCPs are endogenous proteins from the expression host (e.g., CHO, E. coli) that may co-purify with the desired product(152). They can affect product stability, cause immunogenic reactions, or interfere with therapeutic efficacy. Residual DNA, derived from the host genome, may raise concerns about oncogenicity or horizontal gene transfer(153). Regulatory guidelines, such as those from ICH and FDA, set strict limits for both: typically, residual DNA should not exceed 10 ng/dose, and HCPs must be minimized to levels that pose no risk(154). Detection and quantification require highly sensitive and specific assays. ELISA remains the gold standard for HCP detection, though mass spectrometry is increasingly used for comprehensive profiling(155). qPCR is commonly employed for residual DNA quantification due to its high sensitivity. The challenge lies in the heterogeneity of HCPs and the potential for immunogenic proteins to be present even at trace levels(156). Effective upstream and downstream processing, along with robust in-process controls, are necessary to manage these contaminants(157). Continuous monitoring and validation ensure that therapeutic products meet safety standards and maintain batch-to-batch consistency, essential for regulatory compliance and patient safety(143).

Impurities in Green and Continuous Manufacturing

New Synthetic Routes and Impurity Control

Traditional batch synthesis often involves multiple steps with intermediate isolation, increasing the risk of cumulative impurities(158). New synthetic pathways, particularly those involving catalytic processes, biocatalysis, or flow chemistry, may reduce step count and solvent use, but they also necessitate a revised understanding of impurity formation(159). For example, impurities may arise from catalyst degradation, alternative reaction pathways, or unintended interactions with green solvents or reagents(160). Advanced tools like LC-MS/MS, NMR, and high-resolution chromatography are essential for detecting and profiling these unknown impurities early in route development(83). Risk-based impurity control strategies, aligned with ICH Q11 and Q3A/B guidelines, are critical for defining specifications and ensuring product safety. Synthetic innovation must be balanced with rigorous impurity profiling throughout process development(121). Regulatory expectations emphasize that even for novel processes, comprehensive knowledge of impurity formation and fate is essential(161). Ultimately, designing efficient synthetic routes with in-built impurity control can reduce manufacturing costs, environmental impact, and regulatory hurdles, making this a vital component of modern pharmaceutical development(162).

Role of Green Chemistry in Minimizing Impurities

Green chemistry principles aim to design chemical

Journal of Molecular Science
Volume 36 Issue 1, Year of Publication 2026, Page 91-109
DoI-10.004687/1000-9035.2026.013

processes and products that reduce or eliminate the generation of hazardous substances, including impurities(163). By replacing toxic reagents and solvents with safer, more selective alternatives, green chemistry inherently minimizes impurity formation at the source(164). Atom economy, energy efficiency, and the use of renewable feedstocks help streamline reactions and reduce byproduct generation(165). For example, employing biocatalysts or organocatalysts instead of heavy metals can limit metal impurities and offer milder reaction conditions that prevent thermal degradation(166). Additionally, green solvents like ethanol or supercritical CO_2 contribute to cleaner reactions and fewer side products compared to traditional organic solvents(167). The integration of green chemistry into pharmaceutical manufacturing not only enhances sustainability but also simplifies downstream purification and regulatory compliance by reducing impurity load(168). Analytical tools such as real-time reaction monitoring, PAT (Process Analytical Technology), and QbD (Quality by Design) approaches help implement green chemistry principles effectively(169). Moreover, embracing green methodologies aligns with global sustainability goals and the increasing regulatory push toward environmentally responsible manufacturing(170). Overall, green chemistry not only benefits the environment but also plays a proactive role in minimizing impurities, ensuring safer and more efficient pharmaceutical production(171).

Continuous Manufacturing: Challenges and Monitoring

Continuous manufacturing (CM) is transforming pharmaceutical production by replacing traditional batch methods with streamlined, real-time processing(172). While CM offers advantages such as increased efficiency, reduced footprint, and consistent product quality, it also presents unique challenges in impurity monitoring and control(90). One key issue is the potential for impurity accumulation during prolonged operation, particularly if there are undetected deviations in raw material quality or process parameters(173). Additionally, integrating multiple unit operations in a seamless, uninterrupted flow requires sophisticated control systems and real-time analytics to promptly identify and mitigate impurity formation(174). Techniques such as near-infrared (NIR) spectroscopy, Raman spectroscopy, and online chromatography are employed as part of Process Analytical Technology (PAT) frameworks to continuously monitor critical quality attributes (CQAs), including impurities(175). Establishing steady-state conditions and ensuring robustness against disturbances are essential to prevent impurity spikes. Regulatory agencies support CM, but they require thorough validation of impurity control strategies, including residence time distribution and risk assessment(176). Unlike batch processes, where impurity evaluation occurs post-production, CM necessitates proactive, in-line impurity monitoring(177). Despite these challenges, CM holds great promise for improving pharmaceutical quality and reducing costs when coupled with smart, real-time impurity control strategies(178).

Computational and Predictive Tools

In Silico Toxicology

In silico toxicology refers to the use of computational models to predict the toxicological behaviour of pharmaceutical impurities based on their molecular structure and physicochemical properties(179). These models play a crucial role in early impurity assessment, especially when experimental toxicity data is limited or unavailable(180). Tools such as QSAR (Quantitative Structure–Activity Relationship), DEREK Nexus, and Toxtree use databases of known toxic compounds and structural alerts to evaluate the likelihood of mutagenicity, carcinogenicity, and other toxic effects. The ICH M7 guideline encourages the use of in silico toxicology for assessing genotoxic impurities during drug development. These tools allow for rapid screening and prioritization of impurities, helping developers focus experimental testing on high-risk compounds(181). In silico methods also align with ethical goals by reducing animal testing and supporting the 3Rs principles. However, their predictions depend heavily on the quality and coverage of training data, and expert interpretation is necessary to address uncertainties(182). In silico toxicology is most effective when integrated with experimental studies and risk assessment frameworks(183). Overall, it serves as a valuable predictive approach to identify and manage toxicity risks, ensuring safety and compliance while expediting pharmaceutical development(7).

Cheminformatics for Impurity Prediction

Cheminformatics utilizes computational tools and databases to analyze chemical structures, reactions, and properties, offering significant value in predicting impurities during drug development(184). It enables scientists to model and simulate synthetic reactions and degradation pathways to forecast possible impurity profiles before conducting lab-scale experiments(185). This predictive capability helps identify structurally related impurities, potential degradants, and by-products that could arise under specific conditions(90). Software platforms like Meteor Nexus, Zeneth, and CASE Ultra employ rule-based and knowledge-based algorithms to predict

Journal of Molecular Science
Volume 36 Issue 1, Year of Publication 2026, Page 91-109
DoI-10.004687/1000-9035.2026.013

transformation products based on chemical reactivity and historical data(186). Cheminformatics tools assist in visualizing chemical space, clustering similar impurity structures, and flagging compounds with toxicophores. They support regulatory submissions by providing scientific justifications for impurity identification and control(187). The integration of cheminformatics with quality by design (QbD) principles enhances process understanding and mitigates impurity risk. Furthermore, cheminformatics accelerates impurity profiling in stability studies and forced degradation tests by guiding analytical method development(188). As digital chemistry continues to evolve, cheminformatics is becoming increasingly essential for building robust impurity control strategies, optimizing synthetic routes, and reducing the likelihood of unforeseen toxic impurities. Its application ensures more efficient, cost-effective, and compliant drug development processes(189).

AI/ML in Impurity Data Analysis and Risk Assessment

Artificial Intelligence (AI) and Machine Learning (ML) are transforming impurity profiling by providing advanced analytical capabilities that surpass traditional statistical methods. These technologies can process large, complex datasets generated from manufacturing processes, analytical methods, and historical quality records to uncover hidden patterns, correlations, and trends associated with impurity formation(190). AI algorithms can predict impurity levels based on variations in process parameters, enabling early intervention and process optimization. ML models, such as decision trees, support vector machines, and neural networks, are used for classification, clustering, and regression tasks related to impurity data(191). For instance, ML can identify spectral anomalies in chromatographic or spectroscopic data that signal unknown impurities. AI tools also support risk assessment by quantifying the probability and severity of impurity-related failures. Platforms like TensorFlow, KNIME, and MATLAB facilitate the development of customized models tailored to specific production processes. In regulatory contexts, AI enhances the robustness of control strategies by providing data-driven evidence for impurity specifications and justifications(192). However, model interpretability, validation, and data quality remain critical challenges for regulatory acceptance. As AI and ML continue to mature, their integration into real-time monitoring systems and decision-support tools will revolutionize impurity control, ensuring higher product quality, safety, and regulatory compliance(190).

Challenges and Limitations

Analytical Sensitivity and Specificity

One of the foremost challenges in impurity profiling is achieving adequate analytical sensitivity and specificity. Sensitivity refers to the ability to detect trace levels of impurities, while specificity denotes the capacity to distinguish impurities from the active pharmaceutical ingredient (API) and other matrix components(24). Many impurities, particularly genotoxic or process-related ones, exist at parts-per-million (ppm) or parts-per-billion (ppb) levels, necessitating highly sensitive instruments like high-resolution mass spectrometry (HRMS), ultra-high-performance liquid chromatography (UHPLC), or tandem MS techniques. However, achieving both high sensitivity and specificity simultaneously is often difficult, especially in complex formulations. Co-elution of impurities or matrix interference can lead to false positives or masked analytes(193). Specificity issues are more pronounced in biologics and advanced therapies due to the complexity and similarity of molecular structures. Method development must be rigorous, and often orthogonal methods are required to confirm findings(143). Additionally, the performance of these techniques may degrade over time or vary between instruments, affecting reproducibility. These limitations necessitate robust validation protocols and continuous monitoring(76). Ultimately, limitations in analytical sensitivity and specificity can compromise impurity identification and quantification, potentially affecting product safety and regulatory compliance(21).

Sample Preparation Issues

Sample preparation is a crucial step in impurity profiling, as it directly impacts the accuracy, reproducibility, and sensitivity of analytical results. However, it remains a significant challenge due to the diverse chemical nature of impurities and the complexity of pharmaceutical matrices(24). Improper or inconsistent sample preparation can lead to degradation of analytes, loss of trace impurities, or introduction of artifacts. For example, volatile impurities may be lost during evaporation or extraction, while insoluble materials can lead to inconsistent sampling(194). Matrix effects can also suppress or enhance impurity signals, especially in biological products where proteins, lipids, and excipients complicate analysis. Sample clean-up techniques like solid-phase extraction (SPE), liquid-liquid extraction (LLE), or protein precipitation must be carefully optimized for recovery and reproducibility(195). The need to process multiple samples quickly in high-throughput environments further adds to the complexity. In addition, manual preparation introduces variability and increases the risk of human error(196). Automation can mitigate some of these issues, but requires significant investment and method revalidation. Inadequate sample preparation not only affects impurity

Journal of Molecular Science
Volume 36 Issue 1, Year of Publication 2026, Page 91-109
DoI-10.004687/1000-9035.2026.013

detection but also undermines method validation and regulatory acceptance. Therefore, meticulous planning, standardization, and validation of sample preparation protocols are essential for reliable impurity profiling(24).

Lack of Standards and Reference Materials

The lack of well-characterized impurity standards and certified reference materials poses a substantial limitation in impurity profiling. Accurate identification and quantification of impurities rely heavily on the availability of authentic standard(4). However, for many process-related or degradation impurities—especially new or unexpected ones—standards may not exist or are challenging to synthesize and purify. Without these materials, establishing method linearity, sensitivity, and accuracy becomes difficult(97). This is particularly problematic for structurally complex impurities or those found in trace amounts. The absence of standards also hinders the confirmation of impurity identity, forcing reliance on indirect techniques like mass spectral fragmentation or retention time comparison(90). Moreover, regulatory submissions require robust validation data, which is challenging to produce without reference compounds. In biologics and gene therapies, the challenge is even more pronounced due to the complexity of potential impurities, including host cell proteins and nucleic acid fragments, for which reference materials are scarce or poorly defined(152). Collaborative efforts among industry, academia, and regulatory agencies are underway to expand the library of reference materials, but gaps remain. Until then, the lack of standards continues to impede method validation, compromise data reliability, and delay regulatory approvals.

Data Interpretation Complexities

Data interpretation in impurity profiling is inherently complex, especially when dealing with high-resolution and multi-dimensional datasets(197). Analytical techniques such as LC-MS/MS, NMR, and capillary electrophoresis generate large volumes of data that require expert analysis to differentiate true impurities from background noise, artifacts, or excipients(147). Challenges include deconvolution of overlapping peaks, assignment of fragment ions, and identification of unknowns without reference spectra. Additionally, the presence of multiple isomers or structurally similar compounds complicates spectral interpretation and impurity attribution(90). In biologics, post-translational modifications and product heterogeneity add further layers of complexity. Automated software tools can assist in processing data, but they often require manual validation and may misinterpret critical signals(198). Furthermore, integrating data from orthogonal techniques for comprehensive impurity profiling demands multidisciplinary expertise in analytical chemistry, bioinformatics, and cheminformatics. Misinterpretation of data can lead to incorrect impurity classification, affecting safety assessments and regulatory compliance. Ensuring consistency across laboratories and analysts is another major hurdle, particularly in global development programs(7). To address these challenges, robust training, standardized data analysis protocols, and validated software tools are essential. Ultimately, the complexity of data interpretation remains a bottleneck that limits the speed and accuracy of impurity assessment in modern pharmaceutical development(199).

Future Perspectives

Integration of Digital Tools and Automation

The future of impurity profiling lies in the seamless integration of digital tools and automation across the analytical workflow(90). Digital transformation in pharmaceutical quality control includes the use of laboratory information management systems (LIMS), electronic lab notebooks (ELNs), and real-time data analytics, enhancing traceability, consistency, and decision-making(200). Automation minimizes manual errors and increases throughput by standardizing sample preparation, data acquisition, and analysis. Coupling these tools with advanced analytics—such as AI-powered algorithms—enables rapid identification of impurity trends and real-time release testing(192). Digital twins and predictive modeling further support process control by simulating impurity formation under various conditions. These innovations contribute to Quality by Design (QbD) and Process Analytical Technology (PAT) frameworks, ensuring robust impurity control throughout the product lifecycle. As regulatory bodies begin to recognize the value of digital systems, there is a shift toward data-centric submissions and cloud-based quality assurance platforms. However, successful implementation requires investment in infrastructure, staff training, and validation of digital tools under Good Manufacturing Practice (GMP) regulations(111). In the long term, digitalization and automation promise greater efficiency, reproducibility, and regulatory compliance, positioning pharmaceutical companies to manage impurity risks more proactively and sustainably(7).

Personalized Impurity Profiling (Patient-Specific Medications)

As personalized medicine gains momentum, impurity profiling must also evolve to address patient-specific therapies such as individualized gene and cell therapies, customized biologics, and on-demand compounding(201). These therapies are tailored to a patient's genetic or immunological

Journal of Molecular Science
Volume 36 Issue 1, Year of Publication 2026, Page 91-109
DoI-10.004687/1000-9035.2026.013

profile, leading to highly customized production processes that inherently vary in scale, materials, and manufacturing conditions. Such variability introduces unique impurity profiles not observed in conventional large-scale manufacturing(202). Impurity risk assessment for patient-specific products must therefore be more agile, incorporating rapid analytical methods and predictive tools to evaluate impurities in real time. Additionally, trace-level impurities may have a greater clinical impact in personalized settings, especially when dealing with immunogenic responses or rare metabolic pathways. The future will likely involve microfluidic and portable analytical technologies, as well as AI-driven modeling, to support near-patient or decentralized manufacturing. Regulatory frameworks must also adapt to allow flexible impurity specifications and streamlined approvals for individualized treatments(7). Ultimately, the move toward personalized impurity profiling aims to ensure safety, efficacy, and quality in a new era of precision medicine, where one-size-fits-all approaches are no longer adequate. This paradigm shift demands innovation in both analytical science and regulatory policy to support truly patient-centric healthcare(203).

Regulatory Science Advancement

Advancing regulatory science is essential for the future of impurity profiling, especially as novel therapies, complex biologics, and innovative manufacturing techniques continue to emerge. Regulatory science focuses on developing new tools, standards, and approaches to assess product safety, quality, and efficacy more effectively. In impurity profiling, this includes adopting predictive toxicology, AI-based data analysis, and real-time monitoring systems into regulatory frameworks. Agencies such as the FDA, EMA, and PMDA are increasingly supportive of science-driven approaches, offering guidance on emerging technologies and encouraging early engagement through programs like the FDA's Emerging Technology Program(28). Regulatory science advancement also promotes risk-based evaluations, reducing unnecessary testing for well-characterized impurities while strengthening oversight of unknown or high-risk entities(131). There is a growing focus on lifecycle management, where continuous monitoring and data analytics inform real-time decisions on impurity control. Additionally, regulatory science helps harmonize expectations across global agencies and provides clarity on the acceptability of digital and computational tools(204). Continued investment in regulatory science—through academic collaborations, regulatory innovation centers, and cross-industry initiatives—will be pivotal in supporting the safe, efficient, and agile development of next-generation pharmaceutical products.

Need for Global Harmonization

Global harmonization of impurity profiling standards is increasingly critical in a pharmaceutical industry that operates across international borders. Discrepancies among regulatory authorities—such as the FDA, EMA, PMDA, and CDSCO—regarding impurity limits, analytical method requirements, and documentation can lead to delays, increased development costs, and redundant testing(126). Harmonization ensures consistency in impurity evaluation, risk assessment, and reporting across regions, facilitating faster global drug approvals and reducing regulatory burden(7). Efforts by the International Council for Harmonisation (ICH), particularly through guidelines like ICH Q3A/B, Q6A, and M7, have laid a foundational framework. However, challenges remain, especially for emerging modalities like gene therapies, biologics, and continuous manufacturing, where regulatory consensus is still evolving(122). Future harmonization should focus on aligning analytical validation parameters, acceptance criteria for genotoxic impurities, and expectations for digital data submissions. Collaborative forums and international working groups must continue to bridge gaps and foster mutual recognition of data(95). Global harmonization also enhances patient safety by ensuring consistent quality standards irrespective of geography(205). As pharmaceutical innovation accelerates, achieving regulatory convergence is not just beneficial—it is essential for ensuring timely access to safe, high-quality medicines worldwide(7).

CONCLUSION:

Impurity profiling is no longer a peripheral aspect of pharmaceutical development but a central pillar of quality assurance, safety, and regulatory compliance. As the complexity of drug products increases—with the rise of biologics, personalized therapies, and continuous manufacturing—the challenges associated with impurity detection, characterization, and control have intensified. This review highlights that a multifaceted approach combining advanced analytical tools, predictive computational models, and evolving regulatory frameworks is essential for effective impurity management. Addressing the gaps in standardization, analytical sensitivity, and data interpretation requires continuous innovation, investment in infrastructure, and global harmonization of regulatory expectations. Furthermore, embracing green chemistry, automation, and real-time monitoring can transform impurity control into a dynamic, sustainable, and efficient process. As we move into a future defined by precision medicine and rapid technological

Journal of Molecular Science
Volume 36 Issue 1, Year of Publication 2026, Page 91-109
DoI-10.004687/1000-9035.2026.013

change, impurity profiling must evolve into a more personalized, agile, and digitally integrated discipline, ensuring that drug products remain not only effective but also safe for every patient, everywhere.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT:

The authors express their sincere gratitude to Raghavendra Institute of Pharmaceutical Education and Research (RIPER) Autonomous, Anantapur, Andhra Pradesh, India, for providing for their valuable suggestions and encouragement throughout the preparation of this manuscript.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST:

The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.

REFERENCES:

1. Bari SB, Kadam BR, Jaiswal YS, Shirkhedkar AA. Impurity profile: significance in active pharmaceutical ingredient. Eurasian J Anal Chem. 2007;2(1):32–53.
2. Szekely G, Amores de Sousa MC, Gil M, Castelo Ferreira F, Heggie W. Genotoxic impurities in pharmaceutical manufacturing: sources, regulations, and mitigation. Chemical reviews. 2015;115(16):8182–229.
3. Bode G. Regulatory Guidance: ICH, EMA, FDA. Drug discovery and evaluation: Methods in clinical Pharmacology. 2020:1085–138.
4. Mali PS, Sonawane SD. Review on: Ensuring API Integrity: The Role of Impurity Profiling.
5. Jahani M, Fazly Bazzaz BS, Akaberi M, Rajabi O, Hadizadeh F. Recent Progresses in analytical perspectives of degradation studies and impurity profiling in pharmaceutical developments: An updated review. Critical Reviews in Analytical Chemistry. 2023;53(5):1094–115.
6. Ingale S, Sahu CM, Paliwal R, Vaidya S, Singhai A. Advance approaches for the impurity profiling of pharmaceutical drugs: A review. International Journal of Pharmacy & Life Sciences. 2011;2(7).
7. Kabir M, Rana MRH, Debnath A. The Role of Quality Assurance in Accelerating Pharmaceutical Research and Development: Strategies for Ensuring Regulatory Compliance and Product Integrity. Journal of Angiotherapy. 2024;8(12):1–11.
8. Hein T, Winkler M, Gulati H, Balakrishnan A. Product lifecycle management for the pharmaceutical industry. Oracle Life Sciences. 2012:1–2.
9. Pilaniya K, Chandrawanshi HK, Pilaniya U, Manchandani P, Jain P, Singh N. Recent trends in the impurity profile of pharmaceuticals. Journal of Advanced Pharmaceutical Technology & Research. 2010;1(3):302–10.
10. Qiu F, Norwood DL. Identification of pharmaceutical impurities. Journal of liquid chromatography & related technologies. 2007;30(5-7):877–935.
11. Bartos D, Gorog S. Recent advances in the impurity profiling of drugs. Current Pharmaceutical Analysis. 2008;4(4):215–30.
12. Ridings JE. The thalidomide disaster, lessons from the past. Teratogenicity Testing: Methods and Protocols: Springer; 2012. p. 575–86.
13. Teasdale A, Elder D, Harvey J, Spanhaak S. Impurities in New Drug Substances and New Drug Products: ICH Q3A/B: Key Guidelines in the General Impurity Management Process. ICH Quality Guidelines: An Implementation Guide. 2017:167–98.
14. Seger C, Sturm S, Stuppner H. Mass spectrometry and NMR spectroscopy: modern high-end detectors for high resolution separation techniques–state of the art in natural product HPLC-MS, HPLC-NMR, and CE-MS hyphenations. Natural product reports. 2013;30(7):970–87.
15. Kalidindi VR, Somalanka BM, Seethamraju SM, Nori LP. Pharmaceutical Impurities and Their Regulatory Aspects with a Special Focus on Genotoxic Impurities. International Journal of Pharmaceutical Research and Allied Sciences. 2024;13(2-2024):1–15.
16. Patil MMY, Paul MB, Chadha MM, Raul SK. MODERN PHARMACEUTICAL ANALYTICAL TECHNIQUES: JEC PUBLICATION.
17. Jacobson-Kram D, McGovern T. Toxicological overview of impurities in pharmaceutical products. Advanced drug delivery reviews. 2007;59(1):38–42.
18. Pounikar AR, Umekar MJ, Gupta KR. Genotoxic impurities: an important regulatory aspect. Asian J Pharm Clin Res. 2020;13(6):10–25.
19. Snodin DJ, McCrossen SD. Guidelines and pharmacopoeial standards for pharmaceutical impurities: overview and critical assessment. Regulatory Toxicology and Pharmacology. 2012;63(2):298–312.
20. Tapkir N, Soni F, Sahu AK, Jadav T, Tekade RK, Sengupta P. A comprehensive review on assessment and key control strategies for impurities in drug development with a special emphasis on post-marketing surveillance. Journal of Pharmaceutical Innovation. 2021:1–20.
21. Finotti Cordeiro C, Lopardi Franco L, Teixeira Carvalho D, Bonfilio R. Impurities in Active Pharmaceutical Ingredients and Drug Products: A Critical Review. Critical Reviews in Analytical Chemistry. 2024:1–21.
22. Alsante KM, Huynh-Ba K, Baertschi SW, Reed RA, Landis MS, Kleinman MH, et al. Recent trends in product development and regulatory issues on impurities in active pharmaceutical ingredient (API) and drug products. Part 1: Predicting degradation related impurities and impurity considerations for pharmaceutical dosage forms. Springer; 2014.
23. Basak AK, Raw AS, Al Hakim AH, Furness S, Samaan NI, Gill DS, et al. Pharmaceutical impurities: regulatory perspective for abbreviated new drug applications. Advanced drug delivery reviews. 2007;59(1):64–72.
24. Ramachandra B. Development of impurity profiling methods using modern analytical techniques. Critical reviews in analytical chemistry. 2017;47(1):24–36.
25. Patel A, Patel R. Analytical method development for biologics: Overcoming stability, purity, and quantification challenges. Journal of Applied Optics. 2023;44(1S):1–29.
26. RANJAN S, Chaitali R, SINHA SK. Gas chromatography–mass spectrometry (GC-MS): a comprehensive review of synergistic combinations and their applications in the past two decades. Journal of Analytical Sciences and Applied Biotechnology. 2023;5(2):72–85.
27. Halder S, Narayana PV. A Comprehensive Review of Current and Emerging Analytical Techniques for the Identification, Quantification, and Assessment of Genotoxic Impurities in Drug Substances.
28. Anklam E, Bahl MI, Ball R, Beger RD, Cohen J, Fitzpatrick S, et al. Emerging technologies and their impact on regulatory science. Experimental Biology and Medicine. 2022;247(1):1–75.
29. Saibaba S, Kumar MS, Ramu B. Pharmaceutical impurities and their characterization: A review. European Journal of Pharmaceutical and Medical Research. 2016;3(5):190–6.
30. Alothman ZA, Rahman N, Siddiqui MR. Review on pharmaceutical impurities, stability studies and degradation products: an analytical approach. Reviews in Advanced Sciences and Engineering. 2013;2(2):155–66.
31. Butters M, Catterick D, Craig A, Curzons A, Dale D, Gillmore A, et al. Critical assessment of pharmaceutical processes a rationale for changing the synthetic route. Chemical reviews. 2006;106(7):3002–27.
32. Venkatesan P, Valliappan K. Impurity profiling: theory and practice. Journal of pharmaceutical sciences and research. 2014;6(7):254.
33. Patnaik P. Handbook of inorganic chemicals: McGraw-Hill

New York; 2003.
34. Aleluia ACM, de Souza Nascimento M, dos Santos AMP, dos Santos WNL, Júnior AdFS, Ferreira SLC. Analytical approach of elemental impurities in pharmaceutical products: a worldwide review. Spectrochimica Acta Part B: Atomic Spectroscopy. 2023;205:106689.
35. Teasdale A, Thompson S. ICH Q3D elemental impurities. ICH quality guidelines: an implementation guide. 2017:233–80.
36. Yeung V, Miller DD, Rutzke MA. Atomic absorption spectroscopy, atomic emission spectroscopy, and inductively coupled plasma-mass spectrometry. Food Analysis. 2017:129–50.
37. Karmacharya JB. Good manufacturing practices (GMP) for medicinal products. Promising Pharmaceuticals. 2014;101.
38. Rothstein H, Irving P, Walden T, Yearsley R. The risks of risk-based regulation: Insights from the environmental policy domain. Environment international. 2006;32(8):1056–65.
39. Barin JS, Mello PA, Mesko MF, Duarte FA, Flores EM. Determination of elemental impurities in pharmaceutical products and related matrices by ICP-based methods: a review. Analytical and bioanalytical chemistry. 2016;408:4547–66.
40. Reid GL. Residual solvents. Specification of Drug Substances and Products: Elsevier; 2025. p. 421–38.
41. Connelly J. ICH Q3C Impurities: guideline for residual solvents. ICH quality guidelines: an implementation guide. 2017:199–232.
42. Witschi C, Doelker E. Residual solvents in pharmaceutical products: acceptable limits, influences on physicochemical properties, analytical methods and documented values. European Journal of Pharmaceutics and Biopharmaceutics. 1997;43(3):215–42.
43. Kapil M, Lata S. A review: residual solvents and various effective gas chromatographic techniques in the analysis of residual solvent. International Journal of Pharma Research & Review. 2013;2(10):25–40.
44. Tankiewicz M, Namieśnik J, Sawicki W. Analytical procedures for quality control of pharmaceuticals in terms of residual solvents content: Challenges and recent developments. TrAC Trends in Analytical Chemistry. 2016;80:328–44.
45. Callis CM, Bercu JP, DeVries KM, Dow LK, Robbins DK, Varie DL. Risk assessment of genotoxic impurities in marketed compounds administered over a short-term duration: Applications to oncology products and implications for impurity control limits. Organic Process Research & Development. 2010;14(4):986–92.
46. Teasdale A. ICH M7: Assessment and control of DNA reactive (mutagenic) impurities in pharmaceuticals to limit potential carcinogenic risk. ICH Quality Guidelines: An Implementation Guide. 2017:667–99.
47. Giordani A, Kobel W, Gally HU. Overall impact of the regulatory requirements for genotoxic impurities on the drug development process. European journal of pharmaceutical sciences. 2011;43(1-2):1–15.
48. Tuesuwan B, Vongsutilers V. Nitrosamine contamination in pharmaceuticals: threat, impact, and control. Journal of Pharmaceutical Sciences. 2021;110(9):3118–28.
49. Cioc RzC, Joyce C, Mayr M, Bream RN. Formation of N-nitrosamine drug substance related impurities in medicines: a regulatory perspective on risk factors and mitigation strategies. Organic Process Research & Development. 2023;27(10):1736–50.
50. Painginkar T, Sonawane TS, Bavadia R, Vasantharaju S, SATHYANARAYANA MB, RAVI G. NAVIGATING NITROSAMINES: ORIGIN, DETECTING, ANALYSING AND REGULATING IMPURITIES IN PHARMACEUTICALS. International Journal of Applied Pharmaceutics. 2024;16(5):1.
51. Salgueiro L, Martins A, Correia H. Raw materials: the importance of quality and safety. A review. Flavour and Fragrance Journal. 2010;25(5):253–71.
52. Birla D, Khandale N, Babu MR, Bashir B, Alam MS, Vishwas S, et al. An overview of hyphenated techniques used for the identification of genotoxic impurities in pharmaceutical products: Current status and future perspectives. Microchemical Journal. 2024:110828.
53. Alanazi MMS, Alruwaili YSJ, Alruwaili MMR, Alrwayli HMR, Alruwaili MJN, Alanazi FHBF, et al. Advancements in Analytical Techniques for Pharmaceutical Quality Control. Journal of International Crisis and Risk Communication Research. 2024;7(S10):51.
54. Seal S, Mahale M, García-Ortegón M, Joshi CK, Hosseini-Gerami L, Beatson A, et al. Machine Learning for Toxicity Prediction Using Chemical Structures: Pillars for Success in the Real World. Chemical research in toxicology. 2025;38(5):759–807.
55. Ojha A, Bhargava S. International council for harmonisation (ICH) guidelines. Regulatory affairs in the pharmaceutical industry: Elsevier; 2022. p. 47–74.
56. Guideline IHT, editor Impurities in new drug substances Q3A (R2). Proceedings of the international conference on harmonization of technical requirements for registration of pharmaceuticals for human use, Geneva, Switzerland; 2006.
57. Guideline IHT. Impurities: Guideline for residual solvents Q3C (R5). Current Step. 2005;4:1–25.
58. Guideline IH, editor Assessment and control of dna reactive (mutagenic) impurities in pharmaceuticals to limit potential carcinogenic risk M7. International conference on harmonization of technical requirements for registration of pharmaceuticals for human use (ICH): Geneva; 2014.
59. Popkin ME, Borman PJ, Omer BA, Looker A, Kallemeyn JM. Enhanced approaches to the identification, evaluation, and control of impurities. Journal of Pharmaceutical Innovation. 2019;14:176–84.
60. Jain S. REGULATORY REQUIREMENTS FOR NEW DRUG APPROVAL IN DIFFERENT COUNTRIES: AN OVERVIEW. 2016.
61. Gameiro BMS. Lifecycle management of process analytical methods for pharmaceuticals quality control: Universidade de Lisboa (Portugal); 2022.
62. ALI A, SINHA K. Regulatory Landscape for Generic Drugs in India: Assessing Quality, Safety, and Efficacy Standards. Biotechnology Law Report. 2024;43(3):131–41.
63. Bhirud D, Agrawal G, Shah H, Patel A, Palkar MB, Bhattacharya S, et al. Nitrosamine Impurities in Pharmaceuticals: An Empirical Review of their Detection, Mechanisms, and Regulatory Approaches. Current Topics in Medicinal Chemistry. 2024;24(6):503–22.
64. Ali F, Nollet LM. Global Regulations of Medicinal, Pharmaceutical, and Food Products: CRC Press; 2024.
65. Mukonzo JK, Ndagije HB, Sabblah GT, Mathenge W, Price DA, Grasela TH. Expanding regulatory science: Regulatory complementarity and reliance. Clinical and Translational Science. 2024;17(1):e13683.
66. Essiam I. Regulatory convergence or harmonisation? Exploring regional approaches for streamlining chemistry manufacturing and control variations and its application in Latin America compared to initiatives in Southeast Asia: Cardiff University; 2024.
67. Dsouza SJ, DS S, MP G, HK P. Impurities in Drug Substance-An Overview of ICH Q3A, Q3C and M7 Guidelines. International Journal of Pharmaceutical Investigation. 2024;14(2).
68. Harvey J, Fleetwood A, Ogilvie R, Teasdale A, Wilcox P, Spanhaak S. Management of organic impurities in small molecule medicinal products: Deriving safe limits for use in early development. Regulatory Toxicology and Pharmacology. 2017;84:116–23.
69. Müller L, Mauthe RJ, Riley CM, Andino MM, De Antonis D, Beels C, et al. A rationale for determining, testing, and controlling specific impurities in pharmaceuticals that possess potential for genotoxicity. Regulatory Toxicology and Pharmacology. 2006;44(3):198–211.
70. Ball DJ, Beierschmitt WP. Permitted daily exposure values: application considerations in toxicological risk assessments.

International Journal of Toxicology. 2020;39(6):577–85.
71. Guideline IH. Guideline for Elemental Impurities Q3D (R1). European Medicines Agency: Amsterdam, The Netherlands. 2019.
72. Kasper P, Müller L. Genotoxic impurities in pharmaceuticals. Genotoxicity and carcinogenicity testing of pharmaceuticals. 2015:55–74.
73. Faqi AS. A comprehensive guide to toxicology in nonclinical drug development: Academic Press; 2016.
74. Branch SK. Guidelines from the international conference on harmonisation (ICH). Journal of pharmaceutical and biomedical analysis. 2005;38(5):798–805.
75. Beninger P, Price J, Shibata A, Du W, Hangai N. Regulatory agencies of the ICH: authorities, structures, and functions. An Overview of FDA Regulated Products: Elsevier; 2025. p. 13–66.
76. Peris-Vicente J, Esteve-Romero J, Carda-Broch S. Validation of analytical methods based on chromatographic techniques: An overview. Analytical separation science. 2015:1757–808.
77. Raut N, Bajaj K, Matte P, Vhora M, Kale V, Umekar M, et al. Building bridges: harmonization efforts for enhanced collaboration between developed and developing countries. Int J Drug Regul Aff. 2023;11(3):68–79.
78. Chryssochoidis GM, Wong V. Rolling out new products across country markets: An empirical study of causes of delays. Journal of Product Innovation Management: AN INTERNATIONAL PUBLICATION OF THE PRODUCT DEVELOPMENT & MANAGEMENT ASSOCIATION. 1998;15(1):16–41.
79. Alnasser SM. Revisiting the approaches to DNA damage detection in genetic toxicology: insights and regulatory implications. BioData Mining. 2025;18(1):1–19.
80. Bhangale V, Ayre A. Nitrosamine Impurities in Pharmaceuticals: Regulatory Landscape and Challenges. Pharmaceutical Sciences Asia. 2024;51(3).
81. Kush RD, Warzel D, Kush MA, Sherman A, Navarro EA, Fitzmartin R, et al. FAIR data sharing: the roles of common data elements and harmonization. Journal of biomedical informatics. 2020;107:103421.
82. Shandilya SK, Datta A, Kartik Y, Nagar A. Navigating the regulatory landscape. Digital Resilience: Navigating Disruption and Safeguarding Data Privacy: Springer; 2024. p. 127–240.
83. Rambhad SR, Dave H. A Review on Applications of Liquid Chromatography Coupled With Mass Spectrometry in Impurity Profiling of Drug Substances and Drug Products. Separation Science Plus. 2025;8(6):e70073.
84. Grgičević I. Development and validation of LC-MS/MS method for N-nitrosamines analysis in pharmaceutical products: University of Rijeka. Department of Biotechnology; 2023.
85. Aydoğan C. Recent advances and applications in LC-HRMS for food and plant natural products: A critical review. Analytical and Bioanalytical Chemistry. 2020;412:1973–91.
86. Géhin C, Holman SW. Advances in high-resolution mass spectrometry applied to pharmaceuticals in 2020: a whole new age of information. Analytical science advances. 2021;2(3-4):142–56.
87. Hatokova P, Sestak V, Piskackova HB, Melnikova I, Roh J, Sterbova-Kovarikova P. The UHPLC-UV method applied for the forced degradation study of ixazomib and HRMS identification of its degradation products. Journal of Pharmaceutical and Biomedical Analysis. 2023;225:115220.
88. Vaniya A, Fiehn O. Using fragmentation trees and mass spectral trees for identifying unknown compounds in metabolomics. TrAC Trends in Analytical Chemistry. 2015;69:52–61.
89. Pathak M, Patel DD, Kumar D. Chromatographic Separation and Trace Level Quantification of Ten Nitrosamine Genotoxic Impurities in a Single Chromatography Technique through Atmospheric Pressure Chemical Ionization (APCI) Coupled with Triple Quardrapole Analyser in Telmisartan Drug Products. Chromatographia. 2025:1–9.
90. Singh S, Handa T, Narayanam M, Sahu A, Junwal M, Shah RP. A critical review on the use of modern sophisticated hyphenated tools in the characterization of impurities and degradation products. Journal of pharmaceutical and biomedical analysis. 2012;69:148–73.
91. Elyashberg M. Identification and structure elucidation by NMR spectroscopy. TrAC Trends in Analytical Chemistry. 2015;69:88–97.
92. Parker D. NMR determination of enantiomeric purity. Chemical Reviews. 1991;91(7):1441–57.
93. Bharti A, Gurjar VK. Hyphenated Technique Used for the Analysis of Pharmaceutical Impurities: A Comprehensive.
94. Cardoza LA. Application of the HPLC-NMR, HPLC-MS and MS/MS for the investigation of the environmental fate of the fluoroquinolone antibiotics: University of Kansas; 2004.
95. AHMED DSA. pharmaceutical quality assurance: Crown Publishing; 2024.
96. Taleuzzaman M, Ali S, Gilani S, Imam S, Hafeez A. Ultra performance liquid chromatography (UPLC)-a review. Austin J Anal Pharm Chem. 2015;2(6):1056.
97. Görög S. Critical review of reports on impurity and degradation product profiling in the last decade. TrAC Trends in Analytical Chemistry. 2018;101:2–16.
98. Dong MW, Zhang K. Ultra-high-pressure liquid chromatography (UHPLC) in method development. TrAC Trends in Analytical Chemistry. 2014;63:21–30.
99. Yuwono M, Indrayanto G. Validation of chromatographic methods of analysis. Profiles of drug substances, excipients and related methodology. 2005;32:243–59.
100. Rathod RH, Chaudhari SR, Patil AS, Shirkhedkar AA. Ultra-high performance liquid chromatography-MS/MS (UHPLC-MS/MS) in practice: analysis of drugs and pharmaceutical formulations. Future Journal of Pharmaceutical Sciences. 2019;5:1–26.
101. Es'haghi Z. Photodiode array detection in clinical applications; quantitative analyte assay advantages, limitations and disadvantages. Photodiodes-Communications, Bio-Sensings, Measurements and High-Energy Physics. 2011:161–82.
102. Lewis MR, Pearce JT, Spagou K, Green M, Dona AC, Yuen AH, et al. Development and application of ultra-performance liquid chromatography-TOF MS for precision large scale urinary metabolic phenotyping. Analytical chemistry. 2016;88(18):9004–13.
103. Meher AK, Zarouri A. Green Analytical Chemistry—Recent Innovations. Analytica. 2025;6(1):10.
104. Suntornsuk L. Recent advances of capillary electrophoresis in pharmaceutical analysis. Analytical and Bioanalytical Chemistry. 2010;398:29–52.
105. Kubáň P, Timerbaev AR. Inorganic analysis using CE: A dvanced methodologies to face old challenges. Electrophoresis. 2014;35(1):225–33.
106. Shah M, Patel N, Tripathi N, Vyas VK. Capillary electrophoresis methods for impurity profiling of drugs: A review of the past decade. Journal of Pharmaceutical Analysis. 2022;12(1):15–28.
107. Oliva A, Farina JB, Llabres M. New trends in analysis of biopharmaceutical products. Current Pharmaceutical Analysis. 2007;3(4):230–48.
108. Beale DJ, Pinu FR, Kouremenos KA, Poojary MM, Narayana VK, Boughton BA, et al. Review of recent developments in GC–MS approaches to metabolomics-based research. Metabolomics. 2018;14:1–31.
109. Desai N, Rana D, Patel M, Bajwa N, Prasad R, Vora LK. Nanoparticle Therapeutics in Clinical Perspective: Classification, Marketed Products, and Regulatory Landscape. Small. 2025:2502315.
110. Murphy T, O'Mahony N, Panduru K, Riordan D, Walsh J, editors. Pharmaceutical manufacturing and the quality by design (QBD), process analytical technology (PAT)

Journal of Molecular Science
Volume 36 Issue 1, Year of Publication 2026, Page 91-109
DoI-10.004687/1000-9035.2026.013

approach. 2016 27th Irish Signals and Systems Conference (ISSC); 2016: IEEE.
111. Kim EJ, Kim JH, Kim M-S, Jeong SH, Choi DH. Process analytical technology tools for monitoring pharmaceutical unit operations: a control strategy for continuous process verification. Pharmaceutics. 2021;13(6):919.
112. Känsäkoski M, Kurkinen M, von Weymarn N, Niemelä P, Neubauer P, Juuso E, et al. Process analytical technology (PAT) needs and applications in the bioprocess industry. VTT Technical Research Centre of Finland. 2006;60:99.
113. Wang D. Robust data-driven modeling approach for real-time final product quality prediction in batch process operation. IEEE Transactions on Industrial Informatics. 2011;7(2):371–7.
114. Lee S-H, Kim J-K, Jee J-P, Jang D-J, Park Y-J, Kim J-E. Quality by Design (QbD) application for the pharmaceutical development process. Journal of Pharmaceutical Investigation. 2022;52(6):649–82.
115. Ranga S, Jaimini M, Sharma SK, Chauhan BS, Kumar A. A review on design of experiments (DOE). Int J Pharm Chem Sci. 2014;3(1):216–24.
116. Stern J, Holder S. Regulatory governance: criteria for assessing the performance of regulatory systems: An application to infrastructure industries in the developing countries of Asia. Utilities Policy. 1999;8(1):33–50.
117. Pierson DA, Olsen BA, Robbins DK, DeVries KM, Varie DL. Approaches to assessment, testing decisions, and analytical determination of genotoxic impurities in drug substances. Organic Process Research & Development. 2009;13(2):285–91.
118. Benigni R, Bassan A, Pavan M. In silico models for genotoxicity and drug regulation. Expert Opinion on Drug Metabolism & Toxicology. 2020;16(8):651–62.
119. Liu DQ, Sun M, Kord AS. Recent advances in trace analysis of pharmaceutical genotoxic impurities. Journal of pharmaceutical and biomedical analysis. 2010;51(5):999–1014.
120. Ferrazzano L, Catani M, Cavazzini A, Martelli G, Corbisiero D, Cantelmi P, et al. Sustainability in peptide chemistry: current synthesis and purification technologies and future challenges. Green Chemistry. 2022;24(3):975–1020.
121. Teasdale A. Mutagenic impurities: Strategies for identification and control: John Wiley & Sons; 2022.
122. Lee H. Pharmaceutical industry practices on genotoxic impurities: CRC Press; 2014.
123. Gold LS, Zeiger E. Handbook of carcinogenic potency and genotoxicity databases: CRC Press; 1996.
124. Humfrey CD. Recent developments in the risk assessment of potentially genotoxic impurities in pharmaceutical drug substances. Toxicological sciences. 2007;100(1):24–8.
125. Boobis A, Brown P, Cronin MTD, Edwards J, Galli CL, Goodman J, et al. Origin of the TTC values for compounds that are genotoxic and/or carcinogenic and an approach for their re-evaluation. Critical Reviews in Toxicology. 2017;47(8):710–32.
126. Patel V. Pharmaceutical science-quality, regulations, and drug development: Cipher Publisher; 2024.
127. Sun M, Liu DQ, Kord AS. A systematic method development strategy for determination of pharmaceutical genotoxic impurities. Organic Process Research & Development. 2010;14(4):977–85.
128. Atapattu SN, Rosenfeld JM. Solid phase analytical derivatization as a sample preparation method. Journal of Chromatography a. 2013;1296:204–13.
129. Guideline I. Validation of analytical procedures Q2 (R2). ICH: Geneva, Switzerland. 2022.
130. Alsayadi YM, Dogra R, Arora V, Shiven A. Innovations in the Detection of N-Nitrosamine Impurities in Pharmaceuticals: Analytical and Regulatory Challenges. Critical Reviews in Analytical Chemistry. 2025:1–26.
131. Dande A, Chandra Mouli H, Nandy J, Shreya S, Pallaprolu N, Samanthula G, et al. Risk Assessment, Detection and Control of Mutagenic Impurities in Pharmaceuticals: Emphasis on Nitrosamines. Critical Reviews in Analytical Chemistry. 2025:1–42.
132. Marcelis Q. Development of a generic safety assessment strategy for feminine intimate products. 2024.
133. Wang G, Zhou M, Ding S, Huang Z, Zhang Z, Li S. Reaction Principle of Alcohol Ether Sulfonates by Sulfonated Alkylation Method–A Review. Tenside Surfactants Detergents. 2017;54(1):5–10.
134. Snodin DJ. Elusive impurities—evidence versus hypothesis. Technical and regulatory update on alkyl sulfonates in sulfonic acid salts. Organic Process Research & Development. 2019;23(5):695–710.
135. Zisis K, Pavi E, Geitona M, Athanasakis K. Real-world data: a comprehensive literature review on the barriers, challenges, and opportunities associated with their inclusion in the health technology assessment process. Journal of Pharmacy & Pharmaceutical Sciences. 2024;27:12302.
136. Nguyen T. DEVELOPMENT OF A REGULATORY ENVIRONMENT FOR FUSION REACTORS: University of Liverpool; 2024.
137. Colalto C. Aspects of complexity in quality and safety assessment of peptide therapeutics and peptide-related impurities. a regulatory perspective. Regulatory Toxicology and Pharmacology. 2024;153:105699.
138. Garnick RL, Ross MJ, Baffi RA. Recombinant DNA Manufacture. Drug Biotechnology Regulation: Scientific Basis and Practices. 1991;13:263.
139. Geigert J, Geigert J. Complex process-related impurities. The Challenge of CMC Regulatory Compliance for Biopharmaceuticals and Other Biologics. 2013:199–219.
140. Holley CK, Dobrovolskaia MA. Innate immunity modulating impurities and the immunotoxicity of nanobiotechnology-based drug products. Molecules. 2021;26(23):7308.
141. Stolz A, Jooß K, Höcker O, Römer J, Schlecht J, Neusüß C. Recent advances in capillary electrophoresis-mass spectrometry: Instrumentation, methodology and applications. Electrophoresis. 2019;40(1):79–112.
142. Mascarenhas-Melo F, Diaz M, Gonçalves MBS, Vieira P, Bell V, Viana S, et al. An overview of biosimilars—development, quality, regulatory issues, and management in healthcare. Pharmaceuticals. 2024;17(2):235.
143. Emmanuel FV. Development and Validation of Analytical Methods for Biologics: Ensuring Purity and Consistency in Biopharmaceuticals.
144. van den Bos C, Keefe R, Keville M, McCaman M. Manufacturing and Quality of Advanced Therapeutics: Cellular Therapies, CAR-T and Gene Therapies. Biopharmaceutical Manufacturing: Progress, Trends and Challenges: Springer; 2024. p. 453–88.
145. Wright JF. Product-related impurities in clinical-grade recombinant AAV vectors: characterization and risk assessment. Biomedicines. 2014;2(1):80–97.
146. de Almeida Fuzeta M, de Matos Branco AD, Fernandes-Platzgummer A, da Silva CL, Cabral JM. Addressing the manufacturing challenges of cell-based therapies. Current applications of pharmaceutical biotechnology. 2020:225–78.
147. Azizuddin S, Husain A, Rashid M, Hashmi S, Kumar D. Identification and Detection of Pharmaceutical Impurities for Ensuring Safety Standard of Medicine: Hyphenated Analytical Techniques and Toxicity Measurements. Current Drug Safety. 2025.
148. Briggs J, Panfili PR. Quantitation of DNA and protein impurities in biopharmaceuticals. Analytical chemistry. 1991;63(9):850–9.
149. Aguilar-Gallardo C, Bonora-Centelles A. Integrating Artificial Intelligence for Academic Advanced Therapy Medicinal Products: Challenges and Opportunities. Applied Sciences. 2024;14(3):1303.
150. Stegemann S, Sheehan L, Rossi A, Barrett A, Paudel A, Crean A, et al. Rational and practical considerations to guide a target product profile for patient-centric drug product development with measurable patient outcomes–A

Journal of Molecular Science
Volume 36 Issue 1, Year of Publication 2026, Page 91-109
DoI-10.004687/1000-9035.2026.013

proposed roadmap. European Journal of Pharmaceutics and Biopharmaceutics. 2022;177:81–8.
151. Olsen BA, Sreedhara A, Baertschi SW. Impurity investigations by phases of drug and product development. TrAC Trends in Analytical Chemistry. 2018;101:17–23.
152. Vanderlaan M, Zhu-Shimoni J, Lin S, Gunawan F, Waerner T, Van Cott KE. Experience with host cell protein impurities in biopharmaceuticals. Biotechnology Progress. 2018;34(4):828–37.
153. Alamnie G, Andualem B. Biosafety Issues of Unintended Horizontal Transfer of Recombinant DNA. Genetic Transformation in Crops: IntechOpen; 2020.
154. Liu F. Safety assessment of drug impurities for patient safety: a comprehensive review. Regulatory Toxicology and Pharmacology. 2024:105715.
155. Kanwal F, Henry M, Meleady P. Analytical Tools for HCP Detection, Identification, and Quantitation. Heterologous Protein Production in CHO Cells: Methods and Protocols: Springer; 2024. p. 235–48.
156. Wang X, Morgan DM, Wang G, Mozier NM. Residual DNA analysis in biologics development: review of measurement and quantitation technologies and future directions. Biotechnology and Bioengineering. 2012;109(2):307–17.
157. Johansson MI, Östling M, Jagschies G. Downstream processing equipment. Biopharmaceutical Processing: Elsevier; 2018. p. 477–92.
158. Baxendale IR, Braatz RD, Hodnett BK, Jensen KF, Johnson MD, Sharratt P, et al. Achieving continuous manufacturing: technologies and approaches for synthesis, workup, and isolation of drug substance. May 20–21, 2014 Continuous Manufacturing Symposium. Journal of pharmaceutical sciences. 2015;104(3):781–91.
159. Simić S, Zukić E, Schmermund L, Faber K, Winkler CK, Kroutil W. Shortening synthetic routes to small molecule active pharmaceutical ingredients employing biocatalytic methods. Chemical Reviews. 2021;122(1):1052–126.
160. Clarke CJ, Tu W-C, Levers O, Brohl A, Hallett JP. Green and sustainable solvents in chemical processes. Chemical reviews. 2018;118(2):747–800.
161. Argentine MD, Owens PK, Olsen BA. Strategies for the investigation and control of process-related impurities in drug substances. Advanced drug delivery reviews. 2007;59(1):12–28.
162. Blacker AJ, Williams MT, Williams MT. Pharmaceutical process development: current chemical and engineering challenges: Royal Society of Chemistry; 2011.
163. Ivanković A, Dronjić A, Bevanda AM, Talić S. Review of 12 principles of green chemistry in practice. International Journal of Sustainable and Green Energy. 2017;6(3):39–48.
164. Kerton FM, Marriott R. Alternative solvents for green chemistry: Royal Society of chemistry; 2013.
165. Coppola GA, Pillitteri S, Van der Eycken EV, You S-L, Sharma UK. Multicomponent reactions and photo/electrochemistry join forces: atom economy meets energy efficiency. Chemical Society Reviews. 2022;51(6):2313–82.
166. Ahmad I, Aftab MA, Fatima A, Mekkey SD, Melhi S, Ikram S. A comprehensive review on the advancement of transition metals incorporated on functional magnetic nanocomposites for the catalytic reduction and photocatalytic degradation of organic pollutants. Coordination Chemistry Reviews. 2024;514:215904.
167. Hessel V, Tran NN, Asrami MR, Tran QD, Long NVD, Escribà-Gelonch M, et al. Sustainability of green solvents–review and perspective. Green Chemistry. 2022;24(2):410–37.
168. Becker J, Manske C, Randl S. Green chemistry and sustainability metrics in the pharmaceutical manufacturing sector. Current Opinion in Green and Sustainable Chemistry. 2022;33:100562.
169. Calhan SD, Eker ED, Sahin NO. Quality by design (QbD) and process analytical technology (PAT) applications in pharmaceutical industry. European Journal of Chemistry. 2017;8(4):430–3.
170. Opoku RK. Championing green sustainability in manufacturing of a developing economy: implications for sustainable performance through eco-regulatory compliance. International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management. 2025.
171. Kar S, Sanderson H, Roy K, Benfenati E, Leszczynski J. Green chemistry in the synthesis of pharmaceuticals. Chemical Reviews. 2021;122(3):3637–710.
172. Helal NA, Elnoweam O, Eassa HA, Amer AM, Eltokhy MA, Helal MA, et al. Integrated continuous manufacturing in pharmaceutical industry: current evolutionary steps toward revolutionary future. Pharmaceutical patent analyst. 2019;8(4):139–61.
173. Warta W. Defect and impurity diagnostics and process monitoring. Solar energy materials and solar cells. 2002;72(1-4):389–401.
174. Chakravarthi MK, Kumar YP, Reddy GP, editors. Potential technological advancements in the future of process control and automation. 2024 IEEE Open Conference of Electrical, Electronic and Information Sciences (eStream); 2024: IEEE.
175. Hussain AS. Process Analytical Technology (PAT): Understanding Validity of Pharmaceutical Quality Control and Assurance. Handbook of Validation in Pharmaceutical Processes, Fourth Edition: CRC Press; 2021. p. 883–915.
176. Dispas A, Avohou HT, Lebrun P, Hubert P, Hubert C. 'Quality by Design'approach for the analysis of impurities in pharmaceutical drug products and drug substances. TrAC Trends in Analytical Chemistry. 2018;101:24–33.
177. Sani E. Design and implementation of a GMP production of a highly potent therapeutic antibody product in a new facility designed for single-use systems. 2025.
178. Saha GC, Eni LN, Saha H, Parida PK, Rathinavelu R, Jain SK, et al. Artificial intelligence in pharmaceutical manufacturing: Enhancing quality control and decision making. Rivista Italiana di Filosofia Analitica Junior. 2023;14(2):2023.
179. Valerio Jr LG. In silico toxicology for the pharmaceutical sciences. Toxicology and applied pharmacology. 2009;241(3):356–70.
180. Kruhlak NL, Contrera JF, Benz RD, Matthews EJ. Progress in QSAR toxicity screening of pharmaceutical impurities and other FDA regulated products. Advanced drug delivery reviews. 2007;59(1):43–55.
181. Fioravanzo E, Bassan A, Pavan M, Mostrag-Szlichtyng A, Worth A. Role of in silico genotoxicity tools in the regulatory assessment of pharmaceutical impurities. SAR and QSAR in Environmental Research. 2012;23(3-4):257–77.
182. Pastorino P, Prearo M, Barceló D. Ethical principles and scientific advancements: In vitro, in silico, and non-vertebrate animal approaches for a green ecotoxicology. Green Analytical Chemistry. 2024;8:100096.
183. Myatt GJ, Ahlberg E, Akahori Y, Allen D, Amberg A, Anger LT, et al. In silico toxicology protocols. Regulatory Toxicology and Pharmacology. 2018;96:1–17.
184. Begam BF, Kumar JS. A study on cheminformatics and its applications on modern drug discovery. Procedia engineering. 2012;38:1264–75.
185. Caron S, Thomson NM. Pharmaceutical process chemistry: Evolution of a contemporary data-rich laboratory environment. The Journal of Organic Chemistry. 2015;80(6):2943–58.
186. Judson PN. Knowledge-based approaches for predicting the sites and products of metabolism: Wiley-VCH, Weinheim, Germany; 2014.
187. Siramshetty VB. Cheminformatics Approaches to Drug Discovery: From Knowledgebases to Toxicity Prediction and Promiscuity Assessment 2019.
188. Bhukya VN, Beda DP, Gubbiyappa KS, Pathuri R. Combined green analytical principles and quality by design for ultraperformance liquid chromatography analytical method development, the characterization and in-silico toxicity prediction of Ixazomib degradation products using

Journal of Molecular Science
Volume 36 Issue 1, Year of Publication 2026, Page 91-109
DoI-10.004687/1000-9035.2026.013

mass spectrometry. Green Analytical Chemistry. 2024;8:100105.
189. Ananikov VP. Artificial Intelligence Chemistry. Artificial Intelligence. 2024;2:100075.
190. Bachhav HA, Shirsath GB, Badhe SR, Kurne DV, Sonawane SS. " AI-DRIVEN DATA ANALYSIS FOR IDENTIFICATION OF IMPURITIES IN HPLC CHROMATOGRAMS & ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENT SYSTEM FOR HPLC COLUMN SELECTION AND METHOD DEVELOPMENT. 2024.
191. Xiouras C, Cameli F, Quilló GL, Kavousanakis ME, Vlachos DG, Stefanidis GD. Applications of artificial intelligence and machine learning algorithms to crystallization. Chemical Reviews. 2022;122(15):13006–42.
192. Ayomide AS, Ozurumba E. ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE IN ADVANCED PROCESS OPTIMIZATION AND SMART MANUFACTURING SYSTEMS.
193. Hall TG, Smukste I, Bresciano KR, Wang Y, McKearn D, Savage RE. Identifying and overcoming matrix effects in drug discovery and development. Tandem mass spectrometry-applications and principles. 2012:389–420.
194. Matusiewicz H. Sample preparation for inorganic trace element analysis. Physical Sciences Reviews. 2017;2(5):20178001.
195. Li W, Jian W, Fu Y. Basic sample preparation techniques in LC-MS bioanalysis: protein precipitation, liquid–liquid extraction, and solid-phase extraction. Sample preparation in LC-MS bioanalysis. 2019:1–30.
196. More D, Khan N, Tekade RK, Sengupta P. An update on current trend in sample preparation automation in bioanalysis: Strategies, challenges and future direction. Critical Reviews in Analytical Chemistry. 2024:1–25.
197. Deschamps E, Calabrese V, Schmitz I, Hubert-Roux M, Castagnos D, Afonso C. Advances in ultra-high-resolution mass spectrometry for pharmaceutical analysis. Molecules. 2023;28(5):2061.
198. Niazi S. A Critical Analysis of the FDA Omics Perspective on Pharma-codynamic Biomarkers to Support Biosimilarity, and its Surrogates. 2023.
199. Zhou Y, Tu F, Sha K, Ding J, Chen H. A survey on data quality dimensions and tools for machine learning. arXiv preprint arXiv:240619614. 2024.
200. Ullagaddi P. Digital transformation in the pharmaceutical industry: Enhancing quality management systems and regulatory compliance. International Journal of Health Sciences. 2024;12(1):31–43.
201. KHAN PA. Personalized Medicine: Optimizing Treatment with the Right Drug, for the Right Patient, and at the Right Dose through Pharmacogenomics: Pristyn Research Solutions.
202. Iyer RK, Bowles PA, Kim H, Dulgar-Tulloch A. Industrializing autologous adoptive immunotherapies: manufacturing advances and challenges. Frontiers in medicine. 2018;5:150.
203. Pathak SS, Gawai A, Biyani K. Quality Assurance In The Age Of Personalized Medicine: Challenges And Opportunities. Asian Journal of Pharmaceutical Research and Development. 2024;12(2):179–86.
204. National Academies of Sciences E, Medicine. New Control Approaches to Enable Quality Assurance and Process Capability. Innovations in Pharmaceutical Manufacturing on the Horizon: Technical Challenges, Regulatory Issues, and Recommendations: National Academies Press (US); 2021.
205. Organization WH. Global patient safety action plan 2021-2030: towards eliminating avoidable harm in health care: World Health Organization; 2021.