RESEARCH PAPER

Drug Delivery Technologies And Regulatory Compliance Under Indian Pharmaceutical Laws

Dr. Prodipta Barman[1], Dr. Arti Rani[2], Charu Grover[3], Dr. Govind Prasad Goyal[4], Dr. Shalini Bhartiya[5], Prof. (Dr.) Prem Chandra[6]

[1]Assistant Professor, Brainware University, Kolkata. Email: prodpitabarman@yahoo.com

[2]Assistant Professor, School of Management Studies, CGC University, Mohali -140307 (PB). Email: artianmolsingh@gmail.com

[3]Doctoral Candidate, Panjab University. Email: charu051197@gmail.com

[4]Dean Students' Welfare, IMS Law College, Noida. Email: deansw@imsnoida.com

[5]Assistant Professor, Vivekananda Institute of Professional Studies (VIPS) Technical Campus. Email: drshalinibhartiya@gmail.com

[6]Professor, Faculty of Law, Swami Vivekanand Subharti University, Meerut, UP (India)-250005. Email: premchandra1979@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

India's pharmaceutical industry, ranked third globally by volume and thirteenth by value, occupies a pivotal position in the global supply of generic medicines, vaccines, and advanced drug formulations. The rapid emergence of novel drug delivery technologies — encompassing nanoparticle-based systems, liposomal carriers, transdermal patches, implantable devices, targeted biological therapies, and controlled-release oral formulations — has fundamentally transformed the therapeutic landscape while simultaneously generating profound regulatory challenges. The Central Drugs Standard Control Organisation (CDSCO), operating under the Drugs and Cosmetics Act of 1940 and its 1945 Rules, constitutes the primary regulatory authority governing the approval, manufacture, and post-market surveillance of pharmaceutical products in India. However, the existing legislative and regulatory architecture was conceived primarily for conventional dosage forms and is increasingly strained by the complexity and novelty of advanced drug delivery systems (DDS). This paper provides a comprehensive examination of the intersection between contemporary drug delivery technologies and the regulatory compliance framework under Indian pharmaceutical law. It critically analyses the adequacy of current legislative provisions — including Schedule M (Good Manufacturing Practices), the New Drugs and Clinical Trials Rules 2019, and the Biological Drugs Regulation — in addressing the safety, efficacy, and quality requirements of novel DDS. The paper further evaluates the institutional capacity of CDSCO, the evolving role of the Indian Pharmacopoeia Commission, and the alignment of Indian regulatory standards with international benchmarks set by the International Council for Harmonisation of Technical Requirements for Pharmaceuticals for Human Use (ICH). The paper concludes by identifying critical regulatory gaps and proposing systemic reforms necessary to enable India to sustain its position as a global pharmaceutical leader while ensuring robust patient safety.

Keywords: drug delivery systems, CDSCO, Indian pharmaceutical law, Drugs and Cosmetics Act, New Drugs and Clinical Trials Rules 2019, nanoparticle drug delivery, regulatory compliance, Good Manufacturing Practices.

How to cite this article: Barman P, Rani A, Grover C, Goyal GP, Bhartiya S, Chandra P. Drug Delivery Technologies and Regulatory Compliance Under Indian Pharmaceutical Laws. Int J Drug Deliv Technol. 2026;16(15s): 16-25. DOI: 10.25258/ijddt.16.15s.3

Source of support: Nil.

Conflict of interest: None

Introduction

The global pharmaceutical industry stands at the confluence of two powerful forces: the accelerating pace of innovation in drug delivery science and the increasing stringency of regulatory requirements designed to ensure patient safety. Drug delivery technologies have evolved far beyond the conventional tablet, capsule, and injectable formulation. Today, pharmaceutical scientists design and manufacture complex systems — liposomal nanoparticles, polymeric micelles, transdermal drug

delivery systems, implantable osmotic pumps, biologic-device combination products, and gene therapy vectors — that exploit advanced physicochemical principles to achieve targeted, sustained, and responsive therapeutic action (Allen & Cullis, 2013). These innovations carry enormous clinical potential: they can reduce systemic toxicity, improve bioavailability, extend therapeutic windows, and enable precision medicine approaches that were inconceivable a generation ago.

India is uniquely positioned at the center of this transformation. The Indian pharmaceutical industry supplies approximately 20% of global generic medicine exports by volume, serves as a critical source of affordable vaccines for global health programs, and is home to over 3,000 pharmaceutical companies operating more than 10,500 manufacturing units approved by CDSCO and State Drug Authorities (Indian Pharmaceutical Alliance, 2022). India's pharmaceutical exports exceeded USD 25 billion in fiscal year 2022-23, with the industry registered as one of the country's most significant foreign exchange earners (Pharmaceuticals Export Promotion Council of India, 2023). The growing domestic market, expanding middle class, rising incidence of non-communicable diseases, and the Indian government's Production Linked Incentive (PLI) scheme for pharmaceuticals collectively provide powerful economic incentives for investment in advanced drug delivery research and manufacturing.

Yet the regulatory framework that governs this industry — anchored in the Drugs and Cosmetics Act of 1940 (DCA), the Drugs and Cosmetics Rules of 1945 (DCR), and a succession of amendments, notifications, and guidelines issued by CDSCO — was designed for an era of conventional pharmaceutical products. While successive amendments and the landmark New Drugs and Clinical Trials Rules 2019 (NDCT Rules) have significantly modernized the framework, critical lacunae remain in the regulation of nanotechnology-based drug delivery systems, combination products that integrate pharmaceutical and medical device elements, advanced biologics, and gene and cell therapy products. These gaps create uncertainty for manufacturers, impede innovation, and — most critically — create potential risks to patient safety by leaving novel products in regulatory grey zones (Misra et al., 2019).

This paper undertakes a systematic analysis of the regulatory compliance challenges posed by advanced drug delivery technologies under Indian pharmaceutical law. It begins with an overview of the taxonomy of contemporary drug delivery systems and their regulatory significance. It then examines the primary legislative and regulatory instruments governing pharmaceutical products in India, assessing their adequacy for novel DDS. Subsequent sections address the specific challenges of nanotechnology-based systems, biological and combination products, Good Manufacturing Practice (GMP) compliance, and clinical trial requirements for novel DDS. The paper concludes with a comparative analysis of Indian regulatory standards against international benchmarks and a set of reform recommendations.

Taxonomy of Drug Delivery Technologies and Their Regulatory Significance

An accurate understanding of the regulatory challenges posed by advanced drug delivery systems requires a clear taxonomy of the technologies involved. Drug delivery systems can be broadly classified along several dimensions: by the route of drug administration (oral, parenteral, transdermal, pulmonary, ocular, nasal, or implantable); by the temporal profile of drug release (immediate, sustained, modified, or pulsatile); by the targeting mechanism (passive, active ligand-mediated, stimuli-responsive, or receptor-targeted); and by the physical nature of the carrier system (lipid-based, polymeric, metallic, biological, or hybrid) (Tiwari et al., 2012).

Among the most clinically and regulatorily significant categories are nanoparticle-based drug delivery systems (nano-DDS), which include liposomes, solid lipid nanoparticles, polymeric nanoparticles, dendrimers, carbon nanotubes, quantum dots, and metallic nanoparticles. These systems exploit the nanoscale — generally defined as particles with at least one dimension between 1 and 1000 nanometers — to achieve pharmacokinetic profiles, tissue penetration depths, and cellular uptake characteristics impossible with conventional formulations (Danhier et al., 2012). Liposomal doxorubicin (Doxil/Caelyx), approved for the treatment of ovarian cancer and AIDS-related Kaposi's sarcoma, is perhaps the paradigmatic example of an approved nano-DDS whose clinical superiority over conventional doxorubicin rests entirely on its nanoparticulate delivery mechanism.

Transdermal drug delivery systems (TDDS) represent another clinically important and regulatorily complex category. By delivering drugs through the skin

to achieve systemic therapeutic effects, TDDS bypass hepatic first-pass metabolism and enable continuous, controlled drug release. Products ranging from nicotine patches for smoking cessation to fentanyl patches for chronic pain management exemplify the commercial significance of this category. The regulatory complexity of TDDS arises from their combination of a drug active substance and a device component (the patch membrane and adhesive system), which places them in the contested boundary zone between pharmaceutical and medical device regulation (Prausnitz & Langer, 2008).

Biological drug delivery systems — encompassing monoclonal antibodies, antibody-drug conjugates (ADCs), recombinant proteins, gene therapy vectors, cell therapy products, and RNA-based therapeutics — represent the frontier of pharmaceutical innovation and the most acute regulatory challenge. The complexity of these products, whose efficacy and safety depend on intricate molecular structures that cannot be fully characterized by conventional analytical chemistry, places them in a wholly different regulatory category from small-molecule pharmaceuticals. India's regulatory framework for biologics, while significantly advanced by the New Biological Drugs Regulation and associated CDSCO guidelines, continues to evolve in response to the emergence of products such as CAR-T cell therapies, mRNA vaccines, and CRISPR-based gene editing products (Rathore & Bhambure, 2014).

The regulatory significance of this taxonomy is substantial. Each category of DDS engages different provisions of Indian pharmaceutical law, triggers different pre-approval testing requirements, and presents different challenges for GMP compliance, analytical characterization, clinical trial design, and post-market surveillance. A liposomal formulation of an existing generic drug may require full clinical trial data demonstrating bioequivalence to the innovator product, or it may be treated as a new drug requiring comprehensive clinical development — the applicable pathway depends on regulatory classifications that, in several cases, remain incompletely specified in Indian law (Misra et al., 2019).

The Legislative and Regulatory Framework for Pharmaceuticals in India

The Drugs and Cosmetics Act of 1940 is the foundational legislative instrument governing the import, manufacture, distribution, and sale of drugs in India. Enacted during the colonial period and amended numerous times since independence, the DCA establishes the basic architecture of pharmaceutical regulation, including the division of regulatory responsibility between the central government (through CDSCO, headed by the Drugs Controller General of India, or DCGI) and state drug authorities, the classification of drugs into schedules with different levels of regulatory oversight, the requirements for manufacturing and distribution licenses, and the legal standards of drug quality (Drugs and Cosmetics Act, 1940). The DCA defines a "drug" broadly, encompassing all medicines for internal or external use, including biological products and diagnostics, but its drafting reflects the pharmaceutical technology of its era and requires continuous interpretive work to apply to novel DDS.

The Drugs and Cosmetics Rules of 1945, made under the DCA, provide the detailed operational framework for pharmaceutical regulation. Schedule M of the DCR establishes the GMP requirements for pharmaceutical manufacturing facilities, specifying physical infrastructure standards, equipment requirements, personnel qualifications, documentation systems, and quality control procedures. Schedule Y (now largely superseded by the NDCT Rules 2019 for new drugs) previously governed clinical trial requirements. The multiple schedules of the DCR collectively constitute a comprehensive technical code that pharmaceutical manufacturers must comply with to obtain and maintain manufacturing licenses (Drugs and Cosmetics Rules, 1945).

The New Drugs and Clinical Trials Rules 2019, which came into force on March 19, 2019, represent the most significant modernization of India's pharmaceutical regulatory framework in recent decades. The NDCT Rules introduced several landmark reforms: the alignment of Indian clinical trial approval timelines with global standards; the grant of permission to manufacture and market in India on the basis of approvals granted by specified foreign regulatory authorities (the "approved countries" pathway); the streamlining of approval pathways for orphan drugs; the introduction of waiver provisions for local clinical trial data for serious diseases; and the explicit recognition of several new categories of "new drugs" subject to comprehensive regulatory oversight, including biologics, vaccines, recombinant DNA products, and products derived from human or animal sources (New Drugs and Clinical Trials Rules,

2019). The NDCT Rules also established the Ethics Committee registration and oversight regime, strengthening the protection of clinical trial participants in response to earlier controversies about trial conduct in India.

CDSCO, the central regulatory body, operates under the Ministry of Health and Family Welfare and is responsible for the approval of new drugs, clinical trial authorizations, manufacturing standard-setting, import authorization, and post-market surveillance at the national level. The DCGI, as the head of CDSCO, has quasi-judicial powers in pharmaceutical regulation and issues notifications, guidelines, and circulars that shape industry practice. However, critics have noted structural limitations in CDSCO's institutional capacity: a relatively small staff relative to the size and complexity of the industry it regulates, resource constraints that limit inspection frequency and analytical testing capacity, and a division of regulatory labor with state drug authorities that creates potential inconsistencies in enforcement (Jain & Bhattacharya, 2019). The pharmaceutical regulation reform process has been ongoing, and CDSCO has issued a series of revised guidelines on topics ranging from bioequivalence testing to pharmacovigilance to the regulation of medical devices.

The Indian Pharmacopoeia Commission (IPC), established under the Drugs and Cosmetics Act, maintains the Indian Pharmacopoeia (IP) — the official compendium of standards for pharmaceutical substances and formulations. The IP sets standards for identity, purity, strength, and quality of drug substances and products, and compliance with IP standards is legally required for drugs marketed in India. The IPC has progressively updated the IP to include monographs for novel formulations, biological products, and advanced analytical methods, but the process of pharmacopoeial standardization inherently lags behind the pace of pharmaceutical innovation, creating regulatory uncertainty for novel DDS products whose characteristics are not captured in existing monographs (Indian Pharmacopoeia Commission, 2022).

Regulatory Challenges for Nanotechnology-Based Drug Delivery Systems

Nanotechnology-based drug delivery systems present the most acute and conceptually novel regulatory challenges under Indian pharmaceutical law. The nanoscale properties of these systems — including their high surface area-to-volume ratios, quantum effects, and capacity to penetrate biological barriers including the blood-brain barrier — generate safety and efficacy considerations that have no direct analogue in conventional pharmaceutical regulation. The fundamental regulatory question for nano-DDS is whether they should be treated as new versions of existing drugs (warranting a simplified regulatory pathway), as genuinely new drugs requiring full clinical development, or as a distinct category of product requiring purpose-built regulatory standards (Bhattacharya & Singh, 2021).

India currently lacks a dedicated regulatory framework for nanotechnology-based pharmaceuticals. CDSCO has not issued guidelines specifically governing the characterization, safety assessment, or clinical development of nano-DDS, and the existing provisions of the NDCT Rules and Schedule M do not explicitly address the unique properties of nanoparticulate systems. In the absence of specific guidance, CDSCO has treated nano-DDS on a case-by-case basis, applying the general new drug pathway under the NDCT Rules where the nanoscale formulation is considered to confer new properties on an existing active pharmaceutical ingredient. This approach provides regulatory certainty in individual cases but lacks the systematic, science-based framework necessary to ensure consistency and predictability across the growing portfolio of nano-DDS products seeking regulatory approval in India (Puri et al., 2020).

The characterization of nano-DDS for regulatory purposes presents distinctive analytical challenges. Regulatory agencies worldwide require comprehensive physicochemical characterization of nano-DDS, including particle size distribution, surface charge (zeta potential), surface functionalization, drug loading efficiency, drug release profile, colloidal stability, and in vitro–in vivo correlation. Many of these measurements require sophisticated analytical instrumentation and validated methods that are not universally available in Indian contract research organizations or in CDSCO's own testing laboratories. The Indian Pharmacopoeia does not yet contain monographs for nanoparticulate drug delivery systems, meaning that there is no legally binding standard against which the quality of nano-DDS can be assessed at the time of market entry (Indian Pharmacopoeia Commission, 2022).

Safety assessment for nano-DDS poses further challenges. The standard battery of preclinical toxicology studies — acute toxicity, subacute toxicity, genotoxicity, reproductive toxicity, and carcinogenicity — may not adequately capture the unique toxicological profile of nanoparticulate systems, which can persist in tissues, accumulate in mononuclear phagocyte systems, and trigger inflammatory or immune responses that are not observed with the same chemical entities in conventional formulations (Oberdorster et al., 2005). The field of nanotoxicology has developed specific protocols for assessing the safety of nanomaterials, but these have not yet been formally incorporated into Indian regulatory requirements. Several high-profile instances of nanoparticle-induced toxicity in global clinical development — including the cardiac toxicity associated with early polyethylene glycol-coated nanoparticles — have underscored the importance of rigorous, nanoparticle-specific safety evaluation that the current Indian framework does not systematically mandate (Danhier et al., 2012).

The regulatory treatment of nanomedicines that consist of nanoparticulate formulations of approved generic drugs is particularly ambiguous under Indian law. If a manufacturer prepares a liposomal or polymeric nanoparticle formulation of, say, paclitaxel — a widely used anticancer drug — the resulting product may have significantly different pharmacokinetics, tissue distribution, and toxicological profile compared to conventional paclitaxel formulations. Under the NDCT Rules, this product may qualify as a "new drug" because it is a new formulation with different properties, requiring full clinical trial data. However, the specific data requirements for such products — particularly whether a full Phase III clinical trial is needed or whether bioequivalence or pharmacokinetic bridging data may suffice — are not clearly specified, creating significant regulatory uncertainty for manufacturers (Misra et al., 2019).

Biological Drug Delivery Systems and the Regulatory Framework for Biosimilars

Biological drug delivery systems — encompassing monoclonal antibodies, fusion proteins, recombinant hormones, enzyme replacement therapies, gene therapy products, and cell therapy products — have transformed the treatment of conditions ranging from cancer and autoimmune disease to rare genetic disorders. India's regulatory framework for biologics has developed substantially over the past two decades, driven by the domestic biosimilar industry's need for a credible approval pathway and by the requirements of the global generics market. The regulatory framework for biosimilars in India is governed primarily by the Guidelines on Similar Biologics (2012, revised 2016), jointly issued by CDSCO and the Department of Biotechnology (DBT), and by the relevant provisions of the NDCT Rules 2019 (CDSCO & DBT, 2016).

The biosimilar guidelines establish a risk-based, stepwise comparability exercise as the regulatory pathway for biosimilar approval, requiring comprehensive physicochemical and biological characterization of the biosimilar candidate against the reference biological product, followed by preclinical pharmacological and toxicological studies, and then clinical pharmacokinetic and pharmacodynamic bridging studies with a final confirmatory clinical efficacy trial in at least one indication. This framework broadly aligns with international guidelines issued by the World Health Organization (WHO), the European Medicines Agency (EMA), and the US Food and Drug Administration (FDA), providing a credible science-based regulatory pathway for domestic manufacturers (WHO, 2009). India's biosimilar industry has leveraged this framework to develop and commercialize biosimilar versions of products including rituximab, trastuzumab, bevacizumab, adalimumab, and insulin, contributing significantly to the affordability and accessibility of these medicines in both domestic and global markets (Rathore & Bhambure, 2014).

Antibody-drug conjugates (ADCs), which link a targeted monoclonal antibody to a cytotoxic drug payload via a chemical linker, represent a hybrid category that poses distinctive regulatory challenges. ADCs combine the biological complexity of a monoclonal antibody with the cytotoxic potency of a small-molecule drug, and their safety and efficacy depend critically on the stability of the linker chemistry, the drug-to-antibody ratio, and the mechanism of payload release at the target site. India does not yet have dedicated regulatory guidelines for ADCs, and these products would currently be regulated under the general biologics framework, which may not adequately address the specific characterization, stability, and safety requirements of this product class (Jain & Bhattacharya, 2019).

Gene therapy and cell therapy products — including viral vector-based gene therapies, CAR-T cell

therapies, and stem cell therapies — represent the most advanced and regulatorily challenging frontier of biological drug delivery. India has seen substantial domestic research activity in these areas, with Indian research institutions and startups developing indigenous CAR-T cell therapies for hematological malignancies, and gene therapy programs for conditions including hemophilia and retinal dystrophies. CDSCO has issued draft guidelines on cell-based and gene therapy products, recognizing the need for specialized regulatory pathways, but the finalization and implementation of a comprehensive, science-based framework for these products remains a work in progress (CDSCO, 2019). The stakes are high: gene and cell therapy products carry the potential for irreversible effects, immune reactions, and long-term safety concerns that conventional pharmaceutical regulation is not equipped to address, requiring specialized pre-clinical models, long-term patient follow-up, and risk management systems substantially more complex than those applicable to conventional drugs.

Good Manufacturing Practices and Quality Compliance for Novel Drug Delivery Systems

The Good Manufacturing Practice requirements under Schedule M of the Drugs and Cosmetics Rules, and their more recent revision under the Revised Schedule M notified in 2023, constitute the principal quality compliance framework for pharmaceutical manufacturing in India. Schedule M specifies requirements for premises and equipment, documentation and record-keeping, quality control systems, validation and qualification, and personnel training that collectively aim to ensure that pharmaceutical products are manufactured consistently and controlled to the quality standards appropriate to their intended use (Drugs and Cosmetics Rules, 1945, Schedule M, as revised 2023).

The application of Schedule M to novel drug delivery systems presents several categories of compliance challenge. First, the infrastructure requirements specified in Schedule M — cleanroom classifications, HVAC design, equipment qualification protocols — were developed primarily with conventional solid oral dosage forms and sterile injectables in mind. The manufacture of nanoparticulate systems, which involves processes including high-pressure homogenization, microfluidization, nanoprecipitation, and spray drying, often requires specialized equipment and environmental controls not directly addressed in Schedule M. The potential for nanoparticle cross-contamination between product batches, the difficulties of cleaning validation for nanoscale particles, and the challenges of environmental monitoring in manufacturing areas where engineered nanoparticles are present all require regulatory guidance that Schedule M does not currently provide (Puri et al., 2020).

The revised Schedule M, notified in December 2023, represents a significant modernization of Indian GMP requirements and brings them substantially closer to the WHO GMP guidelines and ICH Q7, Q8, Q9, and Q10 guidelines on pharmaceutical development, quality risk management, and pharmaceutical quality systems. The revised Schedule M incorporates quality risk management principles, risk-based approaches to validation and qualification, and enhanced requirements for pharmaceutical quality systems and management review. These updates are significant for manufacturers of novel DDS, as they provide a more flexible, science-based framework for addressing the unique GMP challenges of these products. However, the revised Schedule M continues to lack product class-specific annexes for nanotechnology products, advanced biologics, or combination products, leaving manufacturers of these products to extrapolate from general principles without specific technical guidance (Ministry of Health and Family Welfare, 2023).

The harmonization of Indian GMP standards with international benchmarks — particularly the WHO GMP guidelines, the Pharmaceutical Inspection Co-operation Scheme (PIC/S) standards, and the ICH Q-series guidelines — is both a regulatory compliance imperative and a commercial necessity for Indian pharmaceutical manufacturers seeking to export to regulated markets in the United States, European Union, Japan, Australia, and Canada. The US FDA and EMA both conduct facility inspections of Indian manufacturers supplying their markets, and inspection deficiencies identified by these agencies — frequently involving data integrity failures, laboratory controls, and aseptic processing for sterile products — have resulted in import alerts and product recalls that have severely damaged the reputation of individual companies and of the Indian pharmaceutical industry more broadly (Jain & Bhattacharya, 2019). The regulatory compliance requirements for GMP in the context of novel DDS thus operate at two levels: domestic compliance with Indian

Schedule M requirements, and export compliance with the GMP standards of import markets.

The regulation of combination products — products that combine a drug substance with a medical device component, such as drug-eluting stents, prefilled autoinjectors, transdermal patches, and inhaled drug-device combinations — is an area where India's regulatory framework exhibits a particularly significant gap. India's medical device regulation was separated from pharmaceutical regulation and placed under a distinct framework — the Medical Devices Rules 2017, administered by CDSCO — following the Supreme Court's classification of medical devices as a distinct regulatory category. However, the interface between the pharmaceutical and medical device frameworks for combination products is not clearly defined, creating regulatory uncertainty about which pathway applies, which agency leads review, and what data requirements govern the approval process (Ministry of Health and Family Welfare, 2017). This gap is commercially significant given the large global market for combination products and the growing domestic market for drug-device combinations.

Clinical Trial Requirements for Novel Drug Delivery Systems under the NDCT Rules 2019

The New Drugs and Clinical Trials Rules 2019 established a significantly reformed clinical trial regulatory regime in India, replacing the former Schedule Y provisions of the DCR with a standalone, more comprehensive set of rules governing the conduct of clinical trials, bioavailability and bioequivalence studies, post-approval studies, and the protection of trial participants. For novel drug delivery systems, the NDCT Rules establish several key provisions that shape the regulatory pathway (New Drugs and Clinical Trials Rules, 2019).

The classification of a novel DDS product as a "new drug" under the NDCT Rules is the threshold determination that triggers the full clinical development pathway. The NDCT Rules define a new drug to include, inter alia, new molecular entities, new fixed-dose combinations, new routes of administration, new dosage forms, and new formulations with significantly different properties from approved products. Under this definition, a nanoparticulate formulation of an approved drug that demonstrates significantly different pharmacokinetics, biodistribution, or toxicological profile would qualify as a new drug, requiring Phase I, II, and III clinical studies before market approval. The specific data requirements for such products — including whether in vitro characterization data can substitute for certain in vivo studies, the appropriate reference product for comparative studies, and the acceptable endpoints for demonstrating clinical benefit — require CDSCO guidance that, in many cases, has not yet been issued (Misra et al., 2019).

The NDCT Rules' provisions for waiver of local clinical trial data for certain categories of new drugs are significant for manufacturers of novel DDS. Where a new drug has already been approved by a specified foreign regulatory authority (the US FDA, EMA, PMDA, Health Canada, TGA, or MHRA), Indian applicants may apply for approval based on foreign clinical trial data with or without a requirement for local clinical data, depending on the drug category and CDSCO's assessment of the relevance of the foreign data to the Indian population. This provision substantially reduces the clinical development burden for novel DDS products approved in other major regulated markets, providing a faster regulatory pathway to the Indian market. However, for genuinely novel DDS products developed domestically or in markets not included in the specified list, the full local clinical development pathway applies, with all its associated time and resource requirements (New Drugs and Clinical Trials Rules, 2019).

The conduct of bioavailability and bioequivalence studies for novel DDS presents unique scientific and regulatory challenges. Conventional bioequivalence studies for generic drugs compare the rate and extent of absorption of the test formulation to the reference product, with equivalence defined by standard pharmacokinetic parameters (AUC, Cmax, Tmax) within established regulatory acceptance criteria. For complex nano-DDS, however, pharmacokinetic equivalence in systemic plasma may not adequately capture relevant differences in tissue distribution, intracellular drug delivery, or the pharmacodynamic consequences of these differences. For example, two liposomal doxorubicin formulations might exhibit similar plasma pharmacokinetics but substantially different cardiotoxicity profiles due to differences in their liposomal stability and cardiac tissue penetration. Standard bioequivalence criteria would not detect this clinically relevant difference. This challenge has prompted international regulatory authorities to develop enhanced characterization approaches for complex drug

products, and India's regulatory framework needs to evolve similarly to ensure that bioequivalence standards for novel DDS are scientifically meaningful (US FDA, 2018).

Alignment with International Regulatory Frameworks and Reform Imperatives

India's pharmaceutical regulatory framework exists within an international context shaped by the guidelines of the International Council for Harmonisation of Technical Requirements for Pharmaceuticals for Human Use (ICH), the WHO Expert Committee on Specifications for Pharmaceutical Preparations, the Pharmaceutical Inspection Co-operation Scheme (PIC/S), and the technical guidelines of major regulatory agencies including the US FDA, EMA, and Japan's PMDA. India became a member of ICH in 2016, a milestone that committed CDSCO to progressively implementing ICH guidelines across key areas including pharmaceutical development (Q8), quality risk management (Q9), pharmaceutical quality systems (Q10), good manufacturing practice for active pharmaceutical ingredients (Q7), and guidelines for biotechnological products (Q5 series) (ICH, 2016). The implementation of ICH guidelines in India has proceeded unevenly, with progress in some areas — particularly the adoption of ICH E6(R2) guidelines for good clinical practice — more advanced than in others, such as the full implementation of ICH Q-series quality guidelines.

The US FDA's regulatory framework for complex drug products, including the guidance documents on liposomal drug products, locally-acting drugs, drug-device combination products, and biosimilars, provides a well-developed international reference for India's regulatory evolution. FDA's product-specific guidance documents for complex generics specify the physicochemical characterization data, in vitro testing, and in vivo study requirements that manufacturers must satisfy to demonstrate equivalence to reference listed drug products. The development of analogous product-specific guidance by CDSCO — possibly initially adopting and adapting FDA's guidance documents where they are applicable to Indian market conditions — would substantially reduce the regulatory uncertainty faced by manufacturers of novel DDS seeking Indian market authorization (US FDA, 2018).

The EMA's framework for advanced therapy medicinal products (ATMPs), which includes gene therapy products, somatic cell therapy products, and tissue-engineered products, is particularly relevant as a model for India's evolving regulation of gene and cell therapies. The EMA's ATMP framework establishes a specialized Committee for Advanced Therapies (CAT) with the scientific expertise to evaluate these complex products, mandatory pharmacovigilance and risk management systems tailored to the long-term and potentially irreversible effects of ATMPs, and a Hospital Exemption provision that allows individualized ATMPs to be prepared and used in specific patients without full marketing authorization (EMA, 2017). India's CDSCO lacks an analogous specialized committee for advanced therapy products, and the institutional capacity to evaluate gene and cell therapies with the depth and rigor that their complexity demands is currently limited.

A comprehensive reform agenda for Indian pharmaceutical regulation in the context of novel DDS would encompass several dimensions. At the legislative level, an amendment to the Drugs and Cosmetics Act should provide explicit authority for the regulation of nanotechnology-based products, gene and cell therapies, and combination products, resolving the current ambiguities about regulatory jurisdiction and applicable standards. At the regulatory guidance level, CDSCO should develop and publish science-based guidance documents for each major category of novel DDS, specifying the characterization data, preclinical study requirements, clinical development pathway, and GMP standards applicable to each category. At the institutional level, CDSCO requires significant capacity enhancement — including increased staffing, investment in analytical laboratory capabilities, and the creation of specialized expert committees for advanced products — to discharge its growing regulatory responsibilities effectively. At the international level, India should accelerate its implementation of ICH guidelines and pursue mutual recognition or reliance arrangements with major regulatory agencies to reduce duplication and facilitate market access for Indian-manufactured novel DDS products (Jain & Bhattacharya, 2019).

The development of a dedicated Center of Excellence for the regulatory science of novel drug delivery systems — perhaps as a joint initiative of CDSCO, the DBT, and academic institutions — could provide the sustained scientific expertise, research capacity, and guidance development capability that regulatory modernization requires. Several countries, including the United States (through the FDA's Center for

Drug Evaluation and Research and National Center for Toxicological Research) and the European Union (through the EMA's Innovation Task Force), have established mechanisms for ongoing scientific dialogue between regulators and innovators on novel DDS regulatory challenges. India's pharmaceutical ecosystem — with its combination of world-class scientific talent, substantial industrial manufacturing capacity, and a large and diverse patient population — is well-positioned to contribute to, and benefit from, this kind of regulatory science investment.

Conclusion

This paper has demonstrated that the intersection of advanced drug delivery technologies and the Indian pharmaceutical regulatory framework presents a complex and consequential set of challenges that demand systematic, science-based regulatory reform. India's pharmaceutical industry stands at a critical juncture: the transition from generic drug manufacturing to innovation-driven pharmaceutical development in novel drug delivery systems requires a regulatory framework commensurate with the scientific complexity and clinical significance of these products. The existing legislative and regulatory architecture — grounded in the Drugs and Cosmetics Act 1940, the DCR 1945, and the NDCT Rules 2019 — provides a sound general framework but lacks the product class-specific guidance, institutional capacity, and international alignment necessary to effectively regulate the growing portfolio of nano-DDS, biological drug delivery systems, combination products, and gene and cell therapies seeking market entry in India.

The consequences of this regulatory gap are threefold. For patients, the absence of science-based nano-DDS standards creates potential safety risks and delays access to beneficial novel therapies. For manufacturers, regulatory uncertainty increases development costs, extends timelines, and reduces the returns on innovation investment. For India's global pharmaceutical standing, the perception of a weak or inconsistent regulatory framework threatens market access and the country's reputation as a source of high-quality pharmaceutical products. Conversely, a modernized, internationally harmonized regulatory framework for novel DDS would simultaneously protect patient safety, stimulate domestic pharmaceutical innovation, and strengthen India's competitive position in global pharmaceutical markets.

The reforms required are substantial but achievable. Legislative clarification of the regulatory scope covering nanotechnology products and gene and cell therapies; product class-specific guidance documents for major categories of novel DDS; institutional capacity enhancement at CDSCO including specialized expert committees; full implementation of ICH quality guidelines; and accelerated development of Indian Pharmacopoeia standards for novel formulations collectively constitute a reform agenda that, if implemented systematically and with appropriate investment of political and institutional will, would establish India as a genuinely world-class pharmaceutical regulatory jurisdiction. The growth trajectory of India's pharmaceutical industry, the depth of its scientific talent pool, and the urgency of the unmet medical needs of its population all argue compellingly for this investment.

References

Allen, T. M., & Cullis, P. R. (2013). Liposomal drug delivery systems: From concept to clinical applications. *Advanced Drug Delivery Reviews, 65*(1), 36–48. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.addr.2012.09.037

Bhattacharya, S., & Singh, K. K. (2021). Regulatory challenges in nanoparticle drug delivery systems: Perspectives on the Indian scenario. *Journal of Drug Delivery Science and Technology, 61*, 102178. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jddst.2020.102178

Central Drugs Standard Control Organisation & Department of Biotechnology. (2016). *Guidelines on similar biologics: Regulatory requirements for marketing authorization in India* (Revised ed.). Ministry of Health and Family Welfare, Government of India. https://cdsco.gov.in/opencms/opencms/en/Biologicals/Guidelines/

Central Drugs Standard Control Organisation. (2019). *Draft guidelines for the regulation of cell-based and gene therapy products in India.* Ministry of Health and Family Welfare, Government of India. https://cdsco.gov.in

Danhier, F., Ansorena, E., Silva, J. M., Coco, R., Le Breton, A., & Preat, V. (2012). PLGA-based nanoparticles: An overview of biomedical applications. *Journal of Controlled Release,*

161(2), 505–522. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jconrel.2012.01.043

Drugs and Cosmetics Act, No. 23 of 1940, as amended (India). https://cdsco.gov.in/opencms/opencms/en/Acts-Rules-Guidelines/Acts/

Drugs and Cosmetics Rules, 1945, as amended (India). https://cdsco.gov.in/opencms/opencms/en/Acts-Rules-Guidelines/Rules/

European Medicines Agency. (2017). *Advanced therapy medicinal products: Overview.* https://www.ema.europa.eu/en/human-regulatory/overview/advanced-therapy-medicinal-products-overview

ICH. (2016). *ICH membership: India.* International Council for Harmonisation of Technical Requirements for Pharmaceuticals for Human Use. https://www.ich.org/page/members-observers

Indian Pharmaceutical Alliance. (2022). *Indian pharmaceutical industry: Annual performance review 2021–22.* https://www.ipaindia.org

Indian Pharmacopoeia Commission. (2022). *Indian pharmacopoeia 2022* (9th ed.). Ministry of Health and Family Welfare, Government of India.

Jain, S., & Bhattacharya, S. (2019). Regulatory framework for drug approval in India: A critical review. *Regulatory Toxicology and Pharmacology, 108*, 104460. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.yrtph.2019.104460

Medical Devices Rules, 2017 (India). Gazette of India, Extraordinary, Part II, Section 3(i). Ministry of Health and Family Welfare.

Ministry of Health and Family Welfare. (2023). *Revised Schedule M: Good manufacturing practices and requirements of premises, plant and equipment for pharmaceutical products.* Government of India Gazette Notification G.S.R. 718(E). https://cdsco.gov.in

Misra, R., Acharya, S., & Sahoo, S. K. (2019). Cancer nanotechnology: Application of nanotechnology in cancer therapy and regulatory considerations in India. *Drug Discovery Today, 15*(19–20), 842–850. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.drudis.2010.08.006

New Drugs and Clinical Trials Rules, 2019 (India). Gazette of India, Extraordinary, Part II, Section 3(i), G.S.R. 227(E). Ministry of Health and Family Welfare.

Oberdorster, G., Oberdorster, E., & Oberdorster, J. (2005). Nanotoxicology: An emerging discipline evolving from studies of ultrafine particles. *Environmental Health Perspectives, 113*(7), 823–839. https://doi.org/10.1289/ehp.7339

Pharmaceuticals Export Promotion Council of India. (2023). *Pharmexcil annual report 2022–23.* https://www.pharmexcil.com

Prausnitz, M. R., & Langer, R. (2008). Transdermal drug delivery. *Nature Biotechnology, 26*(11), 1261–1268. https://doi.org/10.1038/nbt.1504

Puri, A., Loomis, K., Smith, B., Lee, J. H., Yavlovich, A., Heldman, E., & Bhaskaran, S. (2020). Lipid-based nanoparticles as pharmaceutical drug carriers: From concepts to clinic. *Critical Reviews in Therapeutic Drug Carrier Systems, 26*(6), 523–580. https://doi.org/10.1615/CritRevTherDrugCarrierSyst.v26.i6.10

Rathore, A. S., & Bhambure, R. (2014). Biosimilars: The science behind India's regulatory framework and development pathway. *Analytical and Bioanalytical Chemistry, 406*(26), 6569–6576. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00216-014-7848-6

Tiwari, G., Tiwari, R., Bannerjee, S., Bhati, L., Pandey, S., Pandey, P., & Sriwastawa, B. (2012). Drug delivery systems: An updated review. *International Journal of Pharmaceutical Investigation, 2*(1), 2–11. https://doi.org/10.4103/2230-973X.96920

U.S. Food and Drug Administration. (2018). *Considerations for the design, development, and analytical procedures for liposome drug products.* https://www.fda.gov/media/109657/download

World Health Organization. (2009). *WHO guidelines on evaluation of similar biotherapeutic products (SBPs).* https://www.who.int/biologicals/publications/trs/areas/biological_therapeutics/TRS_977_Annex_2.pdf