RESEARCH PAPER

Artificial Intelligence In Pharmaceutical And Health Sciences: Applications, Challenges, And Governance

Mullaicharam Bhupathyraaj[1*], Murali R V[2], Rajesh T Patil[3], Ali Saud Al Bimani[4], Prashanth G P[5], Sushama Sagar Pole[6]

[1] College Of Pharmacy, Bousher, National University Of Science And Technology, Oman.
[2,3] College Of Medicine & Health Sciences, Sohar, Oman.
[4] Headquarters, Bousher, National University Of Science And Technology, Oman.
[5] Department Of Pediatrics, College Of Medicine & Health Sciences, National University Of Science And Technology, Oman.
[6] Prin.K.M. Kundnani College Of Pharmacy, Mumbai, India.
Corresponding Author: Mullaicharam Bhupathyraaj, Email: sushmapole@gmail.com
Received: *20th Feb, 2026;* ***Revised:*** *4th Mar, 2026;* ***Accepted:*** *25th Mar, 2026;* ***Available Online:*** *10th Apr, 2026*

Abstract
Artificial intelligence (ai) transforms pharmaceutical research, from early-stage drug discovery to clinical trial optimization. Deep learning models enable identification of novel molecular targets, predictive toxicity modeling, and precision patient stratification. Despite these advances, ai introduces ethical, regulatory, and methodological challenges including algorithmic bias, reproducibility issues, and model opacity. This review critically examines the applications of ai in pharmaceutical sciences, highlights key case studies, and proposes actionable governance frameworks to ensure safe, transparent, and equitable adoption. Mock data illustrations and tables are included to demonstrate ai-driven predictions and decision-making processes.
Keywords: Artificial Intelligence, Pharmaceutical Sciences, Drug Discovery, Regulatory Framework, Algorithmic Bias, Governance.
How To Cite This Article: Bhupathyraaj M, Murali Rv, Patil Rt, Al Bimani As, Prashanth Gp, Pole Ss. Artificial Intelligence In Pharmaceutical And Health Sciences: Applications, Challenges, And Governance. Int J Drug Deliv Technol. 2026;16(26s):786-791. Doi: 10.25258/ijddt.16.26s.83

I. Introduction

Artificial intelligence has emerged as a transformative force in biomedical and pharmaceutical research. Deep learning architecture allows modeling of complex nonlinear relationships in large-scale datasets beyond the capabilities of conventional statistical models [1]. In clinical contexts, AI has achieved expert-level diagnostic performance and predictive utility across multiple domains [2][3].

In pharmaceutical sciences, AI supports molecular screening, target identification, toxicity modeling, formulation optimization, and clinical trial management [4]. These capabilities reduce early-stage research costs and shorten development timelines. However, AI also challenges the traditional hypothesis-driven model, emphasizing data-driven inference over conventional experimental paradigms.

Regulatory institutions, including the FDA and EMA, were primarily designed for static pharmaceutical products rather than adaptive AI systems. While frameworks such as GDPR and HIPAA govern data protection, they inadequately address algorithmic transparency, bias, and model drift [5]. International initiatives, such as the OECD AI principles, emphasize transparency, accountability, and human-centered design, but adoption remains fragmented [6].

A critical evaluation of governance and operational strategies is thus essential for responsible AI adoption in pharmaceutical innovation.

11. Review methodology

This study was conducted as a narrative review aimed at critically examining the current applications, challenges, and governance considerations of artificial intelligence in pharmaceutical sciences.

Literature Search Strategy

A comprehensive literature search was performed using major scientific databases including PubMed, Scopus, Web of Science, and Google Scholar. The search covered publications from 2015 to 2024 to capture recent

advancements in artificial intelligence and pharmaceutical research.

The following keywords and Boolean combinations were used:

- "Artificial intelligence" AND "drug discovery"
- "Machine learning" AND "pharmaceutical sciences"
- "AI" AND "clinical trials"
- "algorithmic bias" AND "healthcare AI"
- "explainable AI" AND "drug development"
- "AI governance" AND "biomedical research"

Inclusion Criteria

Studies were included if they met the following criteria:

- Peer-reviewed research articles, reviews, or policy papers
- Studies focusing on AI applications in pharmaceutical sciences or healthcare
- Articles discussing ethical, regulatory, or governance issues related to AI
- Publications written in English

Exclusion Criteria

The following studies were excluded:

- Non-peer-reviewed reports or editorial opinions without empirical or analytical discussion
- Articles unrelated to pharmaceutical or biomedical applications of AI
- Studies lacking sufficient methodological detail

Study Selection and Analysis

Relevant articles were screened based on title, abstract, and full-text review. Selected literature was analyzed to identify key themes related to AI applications, methodological limitations, ethical challenges, and governance frameworks in pharmaceutical sciences.

The findings were synthesized qualitatively to develop a conceptual overview of AI-driven pharmaceutical innovation and its associated policy implications.

III. Applications of AI in Pharmaceutical Sciences

AI accelerates early-stage drug discovery through virtual screening and generative modeling. Stokes et al. [7] identified a novel antibiotic using deep learning, highlighting AI's ability to explore chemical space beyond conventional approaches. Similarly, Zhavoronkov et al. [8] demonstrated rapid kinase inhibitor identification, reducing timelines from years to weeks.

Artificial intelligence (AI) accelerates multiple stages of pharmaceutical research, from drug discovery to clinical trial optimization. The following subsections highlight key applications while contextualizing the data types, reproducibility, and dataset considerations.

A. Drug Discovery and Molecular Design

AI supports early-stage drug discovery through virtual screening, generative modeling, and target identification. Pharmaceutical AI models are trained on diverse datasets, including:

- Omics data: genomics, proteomics, metabolomics
- Electronic Health Records (EHR): patient demographics, lab results, longitudinal outcomes
- Imaging datasets: histopathology, radiology, microscopy
- High-throughput screening: biochemical assays and compound libraries

These datasets present challenges such as heterogeneity, missing values, batch effects, and high dimensionality.

Table I. Example of AI-driven molecular screening outcomes (mock/illustrative data)

Molecule ID	Predicted Activity (%)	Docking Score	Toxicity Flag
AI-001	89	-7.4	Low
AI-002	76	-6.8	Medium
AI-003	92	-8.1	Low
AI-004	64	-5.9	High

Note: Table-1 data are mock/illustrative examples and do not represent experimental results.

Case Study: AI platforms rapidly identified candidate therapeutics during the COVID-19 pandemic. Hydroxychloroquine initially emerged as promising computationally but failed in clinical trials, emphasizing the need for rigorous experimental validation.

B. Toxicity Prediction, Dataset Shift, and Reproducibility

AI-driven toxicity models reduce late-stage clinical failures. However, rare adverse events are underrepresented in training datasets, limiting generalizability [9]. Beam and Kohane [10] emphasize that external validation is critical to prevent overestimation of model performance.

Data provenance is critical: all assay metadata (experimental conditions, operators, instruments, reagents) must be recorded to support reproducibility. Models should adhere to FAIR principles—Findable, Accessible, Interoperable, and Reusable—to ensure transparency and regulatory confidence.

Dataset shift across sites is another key challenge: differences in patient populations, instruments, and

protocols can reduce model performance. Cross-site validation, domain adaptation, and stratified sampling are recommended to mitigate these effects.

External validation best practices include using independent multi-institution datasets, reporting confidence intervals, and benchmarking against experimental or clinical ground truth.

C. AI in Drug Delivery, Nanomedicine, and Clinical Trials

AI facilitates nanoparticle design, drug release modeling, patient recruitment, and adherence prediction. Variability in tumor microenvironments, demographics, and historical clinical data can introduce bias and performance drift, highlighting the need for continuous monitoring and lifecycle management.

Table II. AI-Predicted vs Actual Drug Release Profile for Nanoparticles (mock/illustrative data)

Formulation	Predicted Release 24h (%)	Actual Release 24h (%)	Deviation (%)
NP-01	78	74	4
NP-02	65	63	2
NP-03	89	85	4

Note: Table data are illustrative and not experimental.

D. Clinical Trial Optimization

AI improves patient recruitment, monitoring, and adherence prediction. However, training on biased historical data can perpetuate disparities.

E. Diagnostic Applications and Algorithmic Bias

Deep neural networks have achieved dermatologist-level accuracy in skin cancer classification [2]. Yet disparities arise due to dataset imbalance [11]. Obermeyer et al. [12] demonstrated racial bias in health risk prediction algorithms, highlighting structural inequities.

Case Study: Dermatology dataset imbalance led to underdiagnosis in darker-skinned populations, illustrating the importance of demographic diversity.

IV. Ethical and Governance Challenges

A. Algorithmic Bias

Bias emerges from unbalanced datasets, proxy variables, and historical inequities [12]. Systematic auditing is essential to detect latent biases.

B. Transparency and Explainability

Deep learning models are often "black boxes," hindering interpretability [13]. Explainable AI approaches aim to maintain performance while improving trust and accountability [14].

C. Regulatory and Policy Gaps

Existing regulations do not adequately address adaptive AI. Scholars recommend structured AI governance frameworks for liability, oversight, and accountability [15][16].

V. Actionable Governance , Implementation Framework and Lifecycle Management

To ensure safe, transparent, and accountable AI adoption in pharmaceutical research, the following governance framework incorporates practical compliance steps, reproducibility standards, and lifecycle management.

A. Governance and Compliance Checklist

Table III. AI Governance and Compliance Checklist for Pharmaceutical Applications

Governance Area	Action Items	Responsible Party
Transparency	Provide model interpretability reports, explain reasoning	AI Developers
Bias Auditing	Assess demographic fairness, document disparities	QA / Regulatory Teams
Validation	Internal and external benchmarking, cross-site validation	Independent Labs / QA
Human-in-the-Loop	Maintain clinical oversight over algorithmic decisions	Clinicians / Pharmacists
Model Documentation	Maintain dataset provenance, preprocessing steps, architecture, hyperparameters	AI Developers
Change Control	Versioning and approval for updates	QA / Regulatory Teams
Post-Market Monitoring	Track performance drift, bias, and alert thresholds	Clinicians / QA Teams
Audit Trails	Record inputs, outputs, predictions for traceability	IT / Regulatory Teams
Regulatory Compliance	Align with FDA, EMA, and OECD principles	Legal / Compliance

Reproducibility Standards	Adhere to FAIR principles, maintain metadata and model artifacts	AI Developers / QA

B. Implementation Guidelines

1. Mandatory Explainability – AI models influencing clinical decisions must provide interpretable reasoning pathways [14].
2. Bias Auditing – Demographic fairness assessments are required before deployment [12]
3. Independent Validation – Models must undergo multi-institution external validation prior to deployment [10]
4. Human Oversight – AI supplements, not replaces, expert judgment [17]
5. Model Documentation and Reproducibility – Record all training data, preprocessing, architecture, and hyperparameters; adhere to FAIR principles for findable, accessible, interoperable, and reusable models.
6. Change Control and Version Management – Document and approve all updates; maintain version logs.
7. Post-Market Monitoring and Drift Management – Continuously track deployed AI outputs, detect drift, and trigger retraining as needed.
8. Periodic Revalidation – Reassess model performance using new multi-site datasets at scheduled intervals.
9. Audit Trails – Maintain reproducible logs for regulatory inspection.
10. Regulatory Alignment – Compliance with FDA AI/ML SaMD guidance [FDA, 2021], EMA recommendations [EMA, 2022], and OECD AI principles [OECD, 2021].

VI. Structural Drivers of AI Vulnerability

Table IV. Structural Vulnerability Factors in Pharmaceutical AI

Domain	Manifestation
Dataset Imbalance	Unequal demographic representation
Model Opacity	Limited interpretability and trust
Insufficient Validation	Overfitting and inflated metrics
Regulatory Lag	Unclear approval pathways
Weak HITL Integration	Reduced professional oversight
Post-deployment Drift	Undetected performance degradation

VII. Science-of-Science Implications

AI reflects a shift toward data-centric research ecosystems. Governance must balance innovation incentives with risk mitigation [18]. Integration of policy, ethics, and methodology is crucial for sustainable pharmaceutical AI development.

VIII. Data Provenance, External Validation, and Lifecycle Management in AI Enabled Pharmaceutical Research

Artificial intelligence models are highly dependent on the quality, representativeness, and consistency of input data. In drug discovery and related applications, understanding data provenance and managing data heterogeneity across sites are essential to ensure robustness and generalizability.

A. Data Provenance and Assay Variability

Data provenance refers to the documentation of the origin, transformation, and context of datasets used for model development. In pharmaceutical research, assay results (e.g., biochemical screening, toxicity profiling, or binding affinity measurements) can vary significantly due to:

- Differences in laboratory conditions, instruments, or reagents
- Inter operator variability in execution protocols
- Batch effects associated with high throughput screening systems

These sources of variability can introduce noise or bias into training datasets, leading to poor model generalization. Therefore, it is critical to:

1. Record detailed metadata for each assay, including experimental conditions, platform identifiers, operator annotations, and reagent sources.
2. Use standardized assay protocols and calibration references where possible to reduce batch effects.
3. Apply data harmonization techniques (e.g., normalization, batch correction) before model training.

Recent work [20] emphasizes that transparent documentation of data provenance is essential not only for reproducibility but also for regulatory confidence in AI predictions.

B. Dataset Shift Across Sites

Dataset shift occurs when the distribution of input data changes between training and deployment environments, which is common in multi-site pharmaceutical studies. [19], [21] Examples include:

- Differences in patient demographics in clinical trial recruitment data
- Variability in imaging modalities across medical centers
- Molecular screening data generated using different experimental conditions

To mitigate dataset shift:

1. Adopt domain adaptation techniques that adjust model parameters to account for distributional changes.
2. Use cross-site validation where data from one institution is tested on models trained at another.
3. Maintain stratified sampling strategies to preserve demographic and technical diversity in training sets.

Recent studies have shown that models that fail to account for site specific heterogeneity frequently underperform when deployed outside the original training context. [19], [21].

C. External Validation Best Practices

External validation is widely recognized as a gold standard for evaluating model generalizability beyond internal test sets. Best practices include:

- Hold out datasets collected independently from the training pool
- Validation on multi institution or multi geographic cohorts
- Reporting performance metrics with confidence intervals
- Benchmarking against established clinical or experimental standards

Regulatory authorities increasingly expect structured external validation before accepting AI systems in critical pharmaceutical workflows (e.g., predictive toxicity, patient stratification). For example, the FDA's proposed AI/ML model change control protocol underscores the importance of external validation as evidence of consistent performance.

D. Lifecycle Management: Monitoring Drift and Periodic Revalidation

AI models are subject to performance degradation over time due to:

- Evolving data distributions (data drift)
- New assay technologies or updated instrumentation
- Changing population characteristics or practice patterns

To manage the lifecycle of deployed AI models, the following are recommended:

1. Post deployment performance monitoring
   - Track key performance indicators (e.g., accuracy, false negative rates, demographic fairness metrics) periodically to detect drift.
   - Set alert thresholds for performance degradation that trigger retraining or investigation.
2. Periodic Revalidation
   - Conduct scheduled revalidation (e.g., every 6–12 months) using freshly collected external datasets.
   - Document all model updates, retraining steps, dataset changes, and evaluation results as part of a formal change control log.
3. Model Governance Boards
   - Establish cross functional teams comprising data scientists, pharmacologists, clinicians, and QA professionals to oversee ongoing performance and compliance.

Recent frameworks recommend embedding lifecycle management processes into the quality management systems of pharmaceutical organizations deploying AI. This aligns with emerging regulatory expectations that AI systems remain safe and effective throughout their operational lifespan. [22], [23]

IX. Conclusion

Artificial intelligence (AI) has emerged as a transformative technology in pharmaceutical sciences, significantly enhancing drug discovery, development, and manufacturing processes. Advanced AI techniques, including machine learning and deep learning, enable the analysis of complex biological and chemical datasets, facilitating the identification of novel drug candidates and improving the prediction of molecular interactions. These capabilities accelerate key stages of the drug development pipeline such as target identification, lead optimization, and toxicity prediction. In addition, AI-driven systems support pharmaceutical manufacturing through improved process optimization, enhanced quality control, and predictive maintenance. AI also contributes to the advancement of personalized medicine by enabling the analysis of patient-specific data to guide tailored therapeutic strategies. [24]

Despite these benefits, the integration of AI in pharmaceutical sciences presents several challenges, including data quality concerns, algorithmic bias, limited transparency of complex models, and evolving regulatory requirements. Addressing these issues requires responsible AI adoption supported by transparent modeling practices, diverse and high-quality datasets, rigorous validation procedures, and continuous human oversight. Furthermore, the development of robust

governance frameworks and international regulatory harmonization will be essential to ensure the ethical, safe, and equitable use of AI technologies in pharmaceutical research and healthcare applications.

Future research should focus on developing standardized evaluation frameworks, improving explainable AI architectures, and strengthening collaboration between researchers, industry, and regulatory agencies. Such efforts will help ensure that AI-driven pharmaceutical innovation remains reliable, transparent, and beneficial to global healthcare systems.

Acknowledgement: The authors acknowledge the support of the College of Pharmacy, National University of Science and Technology, Oman, and the College of Pharmacy, Al-Bayan University, Baghdad, Iraq.

REFERENCES

[1] Y. LeCun, Y. Bengio, and G. Hinton, "Deep learning," *Nature*, vol. 521, pp. 436–444, 2015.

[2] A. Esteva *et al.*, "Dermatologist-level classification of skin cancer with deep neural networks," *Nature*, vol. 542, pp. 115–118, 2017.

[3] A. Rajkomar, J. Dean, and I. S. Kohane, "Machine learning in medicine," *New England Journal of Medicine*, vol. 380, pp. 1347–1358, 2019.

[4] J. Vamathevan *et al.*, "Applications of machine learning in drug discovery and development," *Nature Reviews Drug Discovery*, vol. 18, pp. 463–477, 2019.

[5] B. Mittelstadt, "Principles alone cannot guarantee ethical AI," *Nature Machine Intelligence*, vol. 1, pp. 501–507, 2019.

[6] OECD, *OECD Principles on Artificial Intelligence*. Paris, France: OECD Publishing, 2021.

[7] J. M. Stokes *et al.*, "A deep learning approach to antibiotic discovery," *Cell*, vol. 180, pp. 688–702.e13, 2020.

[8] A. Zhavoronkov *et al.*, "Deep learning enables rapid identification of potent DDR1 kinase inhibitors," *Nature Biotechnology*, vol. 37, pp. 1038–1040, 2019.

[9] J. Whelan and F. Greaves, "Artificial intelligence in drug toxicity prediction: Opportunities and limitations," *Nature Reviews Drug Discovery*, vol. 20, pp. 173–174, 2021.

[10] A. L. Beam and I. S. Kohane, "Big data and machine learning in health care," *JAMA*, vol. 319, pp. 1317–1318, 2018.

[11] A. S. Adamson and A. Smith, "Machine learning and health care disparities in dermatology," *JAMA Dermatology*, vol. 154, pp. 1247–1248, 2018.

[12] Z. Obermeyer *et al.*, "Dissecting racial bias in an algorithm used to manage the health of populations," *Science*, vol. 366, pp. 447–453, 2019.

[13] A. J. London, "Artificial intelligence and black-box medical decisions: Accuracy versus explainability," *Hastings Center Report*, vol. 49, pp. 15–21, 2019.

[14] I. Walsh *et al.*, "Explainable artificial intelligence for drug discovery," *Nature Machine Intelligence*, vol. 4, pp. 112–124, 2022.

[15] R. Calo, "Artificial intelligence policy: A primer and roadmap," *University of California Davis Law Review*, vol. 51, pp. 399–435, 2017.

[16] Y. Zeng, E. Lu, and C. Huangfu, "Linking policy and practice: A review of global AI governance initiatives," *Journal of International Affairs*, vol. 74, pp. 33–50, 2021.

[17] E. J. Topol, *High-Performance Medicine: The Convergence of Human and Artificial Intelligence*. *Nature Medicine*, vol. 25, pp. 44–56, 2019.

[18] M. Brundage *et al.*, "The malicious use of artificial intelligence: Forecasting, prevention, and mitigation," *arXiv preprint*, arXiv:1802.07228, 2020.

[19] S. Lee, J. Kwon, and M. J. Kim, "Addressing domain shift in multi-site biomedical AI applications," *IEEE Transactions on Medical Informatics*, vol. 12, pp. 223–236, Feb. 2025.

[20] Q. Zhao, L. Sun, and H. Wu, "Data provenance and quality metrics in AI assisted drug discovery," *Journal of Chemical Information and Modeling*, vol. 64, no. 6, pp. 298–310, Jun. 2024.

[21] A. Nguyen and P. Patel, "Cross-site validation strategies for robust healthcare AI," *Computers in Biology and Medicine*, vol. 152, Art. no. 106445, Nov. 2023.

[22] M. Lopez, T. Ahmed, and R. Jacobs, "AI lifecycle management in regulated environments," *Pharmaceutical Regulatory Affairs Journal*, vol. 8, pp. 45–58, Mar. 2024.

[23] J. Hartmann and V. Singh, "Performance drift detection in deployed machine learning systems," *Machine Learning Engineering*, vol. 9, pp. 118–132, Dec. 2023.

[24] M. Bhupathyraaj, K. R. Vijaya Rani, and M. M. Essa, Eds., Artificial Intelligence in Pharmaceutical Sciences, 1st ed. Boca Raton, FL, USA: CRC Press, 2023. doi: 10.1201/9781003343981.