A Comparative Study on the Regulatory Framework of Regulatory Agencies: CDSCO (India), FDA (USA), and EMA (Europe)

Vaishnavi S. Zarekar [1],Vaishnavi S. Sanap [1], Vaishnavi S. Kayande [1], Vaishnavi S. Chopade 1,Vaishnavi V. Waghmare [1], Shivshankar M. Nagrik [2], Manisha R. Jawale [3], Prakash Kendre [4], Somnath Vibhute [4], Shirish Jain [5].

[1]B. Pharm, Rajarshi Shahu College of Pharmacy ,Buldhana, Maharashtra, India.

[2] M. Pharm, Department of Pharmaceutics , Rajarshi Shahu College of Pharmacy ,Buldhana, Maharashtra, India.

[3] Assoc Prof. M. Pharm, Department of Pharmacology , Rajarshi Shahu College of Pharmacy ,Buldhana, Maharashtra, India.

[4]Assoc Prof. M.Pharm, Ph.D. Department of Pharmaceutics , Rajarshi Shahu College of Pharmacy ,Buldhana, Maharashtra, India.

[5] Principal, M. Pharm, Ph.D. Department of Pharmacology , Rajarshi Shahu College of Pharmacy ,Buldhana, Maharashtra, India.

Abstract

The regulation of pharmaceuticals is crucial for safeguarding public health, ensuring that drugs are safe, effective, and of high quality. This project aims to conduct a comparative analysis of the regulatory frameworks established by three pivotal agencies: the Central Drugs Standard Control Organization (CDSCO) in India, the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) in the United States, and the European Medicines Agency (EMA) in the European Union. While these agencies share a common goal of protecting public health, their regulatory practices differ significantly due to variations in legal structures, historical contexts, and regional health priorities. This study will explore key areas such as drug approval pathways, clinical trial governance, good manufacturing practices (GMP), and pharmacovigilance systems. By evaluating the efficiency, transparency, and responsiveness of each agency, the project seeks to identify best practices and opportunities for regulatory convergence. The growing globalization of pharmaceutical development necessitates harmonization of regulatory standards to reduce delays and costs for multinational companies. Through this comparative analysis, the project will provide valuable insights for policymakers, pharmaceutical stakeholders, and researchers, highlighting the strategic need for a more unified regulatory ecosystem. Ultimately, this study aims to contribute to the ongoing discourse on regulatory science and the evolution of global drug regulation, fostering collaboration and innovation in the pharmaceutical industry.

Key words: Regulatory Agencies, Pharmaceuticals, Pharmacovigilance, Regulatory Framework, Market Authorization

1. Introduction

The development, approval, and monitoring of pharmaceuticals are fundamental to public health systems worldwide. Drug regulation refers to a series of processes and mechanisms that govern the safety, efficacy, quality, and availability of drugs for human use. These regulations, implemented through national and regional regulatory agencies, are vital for ensuring that medicines entering the market are rigorously evaluated and monitored throughout their lifecycle. The presence of well-structured regulatory authorities is especially critical in preventing the circulation of substandard, counterfeit, or harmful pharmaceutical products that could pose significant risks to population health [1]. In this context, regulatory agencies such as the Central Drugs Standard Control Organization (CDSCO) in India, the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) in the United States, and the European Medicines Agency (EMA) in the European Union play pivotal roles. These bodies oversee comprehensive frameworks covering drug research and development, clinical trials, marketing authorization, post-market surveillance, and pharmacovigilance. While their core mandates align in purpose—to protect public health by ensuring drug safety, efficacy, and quality—each agency adopts unique regulatory practices shaped by its legal structure, scientific policies, historical evolution, and regional health priorities [2]. For instance, while the FDA operates as a centralized federal agency under the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, the EMA functions within a decentralized model across EU member states. The CDSCO, in turn, collaborates with state regulatory authorities in a federated setup, making India's regulatory landscape especially complex [3].The growing globalization of pharmaceutical development and supply chains has intensified the need for harmonization of drug regulatory standards. Multinational pharmaceutical companies must navigate multiple regulatory environments, which can result in delays, increased costs, and regulatory redundancies. Harmonization—through initiatives like the International Council for Harmonisation of Technical Requirements for Pharmaceuticals for Human Use (ICH)—promotes common standards and mutual recognition of approvals, thereby improving access to medicines and reducing barriers to innovation [4]. It also fosters collaborative approaches to pharmacovigilance, clinical trial data interpretation, and crisis response mechanisms, as seen during the COVID-19 pandemic when agencies had to rapidly coordinate for vaccine approvals.

This project aims to undertake a comparative study of the regulatory frameworks of CDSCO, FDA, and EMA. The primary objective is to understand the similarities and differences in their approaches to drug regulation, particularly in areas like drug approval pathways, clinical trial

governance, good manufacturing practices (GMP), and pharmacovigilance systems. The scope of this study extends to evaluating the regulatory efficiency, transparency, and responsiveness of each agency, with the goal of identifying best practices and opportunities for convergence. This comparative analysis can serve as a valuable reference for regulatory policy makers, pharmaceutical stakeholders, and academic researchers by providing insights into evolving global regulatory paradigms and the strategic need for a more harmonized regulatory ecosystem [5].

2. Basics of Regulatory Affairs

It is a field that deals with legislative and regulations matters on drug products in the course of development, approval, distribution and marketing of the products. The development was more defined during the middle of the Twentieth century, mainly because of several major calamities in the field of human health mainly Thalidomide disaster of 1960's which showed the crucial, nature of regulatory checks in case of drug approval and safety [6]. It used to occupy merely the aspects of legislation and guidelines, but now it includes scientific advice, submissions handling, and regulatory strategy, and help in opening up the world markets. Currently, regulatory affairs act as middlemen between regulatory agencies, research, and development, manufacturing, and quality assurance departments for the given research data to be accurate, reliable, and useful in support of the benefit-risk balance of the product. It also involves the shift from paper-based submission to electronic common technical document (eCTD) format and now there is increased efforts directed towards harmonization through body like International Council for Harmonisation of Technical Requirement for Pharmaceuticals Human Use (ICH) [7].

Role of Regulatory Affairs Professionals

It is the professionals in the regulatory affairs who have the responsibility and role of ensuring that all new products that are to be developed meet with the regulatory requirements and get the required approval in the pharmaceutical industry. It ranges from the involvement in the defining of the strategic development plans of a drug at the concept stage all the way through to preparation and submission of regulatory dossiers, interactions with the health authorities, post approval activities such as pharmacovigilance and handling of variations. These people make sure that each aspect in the production cycle of the end product, by way of clinical tests and printing of labels, complies with the law. They also understand diverse and dynamic legal

environments in different states and countries and integrate them to functional approaches to these in pharmaceutical businesses. Technologically as internationalization and globalization intensify, regulatory advocates should need to have wider knowledge in finding out many existing regulating systems for instance the FDA in the USA, EMA in Europe, and CDSCO in India to help facilitate the product into other markets as well. It plays a major role on the output resulting to swift approval of products, costs, and propagation of patient safety and medicine availability [8].

Importance in the Pharmaceutical Industry

The role of regulatory affairs in the pharmaceutical sector can be described as crucial. As the claim the face of regulatory authorities, regulatory affairs play a critical role in maintaining legal and scientific validity of products to be submitted to the authorities. Effective regulations enable the quick availability of new therapeutic products in the market which ultimately influences the population's health. In addition, its planning and development is increasingly aligned with the business plan on strategic issues, such as trial and expansion and lifecycle. As the already existing and rising focus to drug safety, efficacy, and regulatory disclosure provide companies with the incentive to develop sound regulatory capabilities that would help them achieve quicker assessment, better risk management, and improved market image. Another important area is regulatory affairs that deal with issues of recalls, safety reporting and GRP, managing the regulations concerning a company long after getting to the market. The changes in the breadth and scope of regulatory science due to the development in the field of biotechnology, concepts associated with personalized medicine, and the recent introduction of Artificial Intelligence has shifted the position of the function into the focus of innovation and the health technology review [9].

Key Terminologies in Regulatory Affairs

It is necessary to provide a clear definition of the idea of the drug development and approval process to define urgent immediate and long-term goals as well as to identify ways to address the existing challenges. IND is filed with the regulatory authorities to get approval for conducting clinical trial not on animals but on human beings. It supports the transition to human trials through presentation of some data and outlines the approach of the trial itself. When sufficient data has been gathered, an NDA is filed with agencies such as the Food and Drug Administration to allow the marketer to bring in the new drug into the market. The ANDA

relates to generic drugs which brought about the bioequivalence data but not clinical trial and hence shortening the approval periods.In the European context, a Marketing Authorization (MA) is required for the commercial sale of a drug and can be obtained via centralized, decentralized, mutual recognition, or national procedures. Across all jurisdictions, compliance with manufacturing standards like Good Manufacturing Practices (GMP) is mandatory. Similarly, Good Laboratory Practices (GLP) and Good Clinical Practices (GCP) ensure the quality and integrity of preclinical and clinical data, respectively. Good Distribution Practices (GDP) safeguard product integrity throughout the supply chain. Mastery of these terminologies and the underlying concepts is vital for professionals working within or aspiring to enter the regulatory affairs domain [10].

3. Overview of Major Global Regulatory Agencies

3.1 Role and Purpose of Regulatory Agencies

Regulatory agencies such as the Central Drugs Standard Control Organization (CDSCO) in India, the United States Food and Drug Administration (FDA), and the European Medicines Agency (EMA) serve as the guardians of public health by overseeing the safety, efficacy, and quality of pharmaceuticals, biologics, and medical devices. Their fundamental role is to regulate the development, manufacturing, distribution, and marketing of these products to ensure they meet national and international safety standards. The CDSCO, operating under the Ministry of Health and Family Welfare, governs drug regulation in India through the Drugs and Cosmetics Act, 1940. Among the activities it performs it appraises new drug applications, oversees clinical trials and approves domestic and imported pharmaceutical products. The FDA which was created in 1906 under the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act regulate not only drugs and device but also foods, cosmetics and tobacco products. It expects significantly better clinical data as well as real-world evidence before granting approval and has a post-market regulation system in place. On the other hand, the EMA which was established in 1995 is an agency of the European Union that collaboratively maintains the scientific evaluation of medicines through the committees like the Committee for Medicinal Products for Human Use. Some still are the Single European Authorisation for a medicine which shifts the central drug approval to London, the pharmacovigilance and risk management for all EU member-states. Collectively, these agencies play a significant role of protecting citizens' health and at the same time encourage pharmaceutical development through submission of regulatory science [11].

3.2 Key Differences in Structure and Function

However, these agencies are quite distinct in terms of structure and functions to achieve the stated goals. The CDSCO functions as a hierarchical regulatory body where the Drugs Controller General of India (DCGI) serves as the apex authority. It also operates in cooperation with the state drug controllers, which establishes a dual structure of the federal and state-level regulation.In contrast, the FDA has a more centralized structure and is divided into specialized centers such as the Center for Drug Evaluation and Research (CDER) and the Center for Biologics Evaluation and Research (CBER), which manage specific therapeutic categories . Its statutory autonomy allows for swift regulatory actions, especially under emergency use authorizations (EUAs) as demonstrated during the COVID-19 pandemic. The EMA, although decentralized, operates under the supervision of the European Commission and works collaboratively with national competent authorities (NCAs) of member states. This enables simultaneous input from various national regulatory bodies, making the decision-making process more integrative yet occasionally slower [12]. Functionally, the FDA relies heavily on a risk-based approach and emphasizes post-market surveillance. The EMA uses benefit-risk assessments facilitated by multi-disciplinary expert committees, and the CDSCO, while improving, still faces challenges in clinical trial transparency, pharmacovigilance infrastructure, and digital harmonization. The timelines for regulatory approvals also vary widely; FDA's Priority Review, EMA's Accelerated Assessment, and CDSCO's Fast Track are mechanisms that reflect regional nuances in urgency, data requirements, and review philosophies [13].

3.3 International Collaboration and Harmonization Efforts (ICH, WHO, PIC/S, etc.)

In response to the global nature of pharmaceutical development, regulatory convergence and harmonization have become critical. International bodies like the International Council for Harmonisation of Technical Requirements for Pharmaceuticals for Human Use (ICH), the World Health Organization (WHO), and the Pharmaceutical Inspection Co-operation Scheme (PIC/S) facilitate alignment of regulatory practices across borders. The ICH, originally formed by the regulatory authorities and pharmaceutical industry of Europe, Japan, and the United States, has grown to include India as a full regulatory member through CDSCO, allowing it to adopt ICH guidelines such as ICH E6(R2) for Good Clinical Practice and ICH Q10 for pharmaceutical quality systems [14]. The FDA has been an ICH founding member and plays a leading role in developing global technical documents. The EMA, being a regulatory arm of

the EU, contributes significantly to the ICH and also works with WHO on regulatory system strengthening in low- and middle-income countries. Furthermore, PIC/S, which focuses on Mutual recognition of GMP inspections, Thus, the current members are FDA and EMA and the latter has taken the status of full member. This did not happen, for instance, for some countries, including India which is, however, an observer member of CDSCO. Collaborative structures like the Access Consortium as well as the Project Orbis which has made it possible to conduct the drug review across participating countries. They also help to facilitate patients to get such treatments so quickly and easily.New therapies but also for capacity strengthening, opened-ness and dependence for regulation models. The convergence that has been realized due to these harmonization is a very commendable achievement towards devising a standardized method of regulating, although the fulfillment of this goal is yet to be achieved remains an aspiration for the nations due to legal, cultures and infrastructure difference across the countries. [16].

4. Regulatory Rramework of CDSCO (Central Drugs Standard Control Organization – India)

4.1 History and Establishment

The Central Drugs Standard Control Organization (CDSCO) stands as the apex regulatory body for pharmaceuticals and medical devices in India. It owes its origin to the social necessity of the pre-independent India with formal start up with the Drugs Enquiry Committee popularly known as the Chopra Committee of 1930. This committee pointed to the fact that a centralized drug control structure would ensure that only quality and safe drugs entered the market due to the incidences of substandard and spurious drugs then in circulation.

The prevailing system changed with the passing of the Drugs and Cosmetics Act in 1940, which commenced in ’47. However, enforcement of this legislation was later handed to the CDSCO that was established under the Ministry of Health and Family Welfare. Originally, it had been tasked with the regulation of drugs only but as the years progressed; it broadened its role to regulating cosmetics, diagnosable products, and equipment. The Drugs Controller General of India (DCGI) was authorized to be the head of CDSCO in order to maintain a centralized authority and regulation across the country regarding the provisions for the center [17, 18].

4.2 Governing Laws (Drugs and Cosmetics Act, 1940 and Rules 1945)

The Drugs and Cosmetics Act, 1940, along with the Drugs and Cosmetics Rules, 1945, forms the cornerstone of drug regulation in India. This and the following laws act as the legal regimes in the production, importation, distribution, and selling of drugs and cosmetics. The Act makes it mandatory to make available to the consumers safe, efficacious and quality drugs in the Indian market. It has been reviewed severally to address various issues with regard to clinical trials, new drugs' approval, and pharmacovigilance among other aspects globally. Another major factor was the approval of a 'Schedule Y' that outlines the rules and information regarding clinical trial in India for a new medical device.. The Rules of 1945 provide the detailed information about the operation in regard to licensing, labeling, and packaging. Besides that, Rule 122A to 122E also prescribes the guidelines to be followed by the DCGI in granting permission to manufacture a new drug. The New Drugs and Clinical Trials Amendment Rules 2019 is a recent issue that takes a new direction towards liberalization and gaining more approval for the orphan drugs and other critical therapies [19].

4.3 Structure and Organization (DCGI, Zonal Offices, State Licensing Authorities)

CDSCO is headed by the Drugs Controller General of India (DCGI) who oversees the proper enforcement of the drug laws of India. The DCGI also serves as the national mID that oversees new drugs, investigation new drugs, clinical trial and any other requirement which warrants a central standard within the country. The structure of the organization is so designed as to work in parallel with state regulating authorities which is why it is known as a dual regulated authority. However, through CDSCO level all these general functions are handled whereas the State Licensing Authorities or SLAs are responsible at the state level for routine licensing and enforcement. This way of the decentralization of power brings efficiency and local control and at the same time regards overall national standards.

To reinforce regulatory vigilance, the CDSCO has established:

- 6 Zonal Offices
- 4 Sub-Zonal Offices
- 13 Port Offices
- 7 Central Drug Testing Laboratories (CDTLs) [20]

Key Responsibilities

Procedures such as the regulatory inspections, post-marketing surveillance and contact made to the customs and import offices are done in each zonal and port offices. The zonal offices also provide training and are responsible for the pharmaceutical vigilance and compliance activities in different zones. In addition, technical review committees and specialist committees in the CDSCO make assessments scientific in the new applications.

The Central Drugs Standard Control Organization (CDSCO) is an organization whose functions are under the Ministry of Health and Family Welfare of India. It is the phenomenally significant drug regulatory body for India that is responsible for the safety, performance, and quality of the drugs as well as the medical devices within the country's territory. It was framed under the Drugs and Cosmetics Act of 1940 and the corresponding rules of 1945 in particular Schedule Y deals with clinical trial clearances and drug control mechanisms [21].

Drug Approval Process (Clinical Trials, NDAs)

To wit, one of the important tasks falls on CDSCO is to regulate the New Drug Application or NDA and clinical trials. In order to market and sell any new drug in India, one has to go through a step-by-step procedure known as clinical trial which is laid down under Schedule Y of the Drugs and Cosmetics Rules. This regulation also covers the design and conduct, safety and the ethics of the introduction of human trials, taking GCP into consideration. The approval process for the new drug involves filing an Investigational New Drug (IND) application accompanied by Phase I to Phase III clinical trials and finally submission of the New Drug Application (NDA). Indeed, it is important to note that CDSCO has the power to grant an exemption from local testing under other situations as follows: If such a drug has been cleared for sale in other major markets such as the US or EU [22].

Import and Export Regulations

CDSCO is also responsible for regulating import and export of drugs and cosmetics as per provision of the Drugs Cosmetics Act, 1940 out in the Drugs and Cosmetics Rules. Therefore, in order to import a drug, any manufacturer is expected to have a Registration Certificate (RC) and Import License. The DCGI (Drugs Controller General of In India, this is done through the Central Drugs Standard Control Organization and also the imported products are made halal standards required of domestic products.Export is facilitated through No Objection Certificates

(NOCs), GMP certifications, and licensing documentation that align with international standards [23].

Pharmacovigilance Programs

India's pharmacovigilance system is implemented via the Pharmacovigilance Programme of India (PvPI) under CDSCO. This system acts as a depot for adverse drug reactions (ADRs) and tracking and analyzing their effectiveness in hospitals or any other health facilities. The PvPI continues with monitoring safety of approved products to the general public through the Adverse Drug Reaction Monitoring Centre abbreviated as AMCs. CDSCO requires reporting of ADRs during post-marketing surveillance and results of such critical analysis can trigger recalls, change in labels or in extreme cases, a ban on the product [24].

Medical Device Regulations

The legislation related to medical devices has evolved in India greatly. Medical Devices Rules (MDR) came into existence in Year 2017 under the act of Drugs and cosmetics Act and thus moving medical devices under the strict surveillance of CDSCO. There are official rules that divide the devices according to the level of risk involved (A, B, C, D), and according to them the CDSCO issues licenses. However, it is pertinent to understand that the clinical trails for the medical devices are not same as for a drug and do not come under Schedule Y anymore; CDSCO has made it mandatory to follow a different track of performance studies and safety validation based on risk categorisation [25].

Schedule Y Overview

Schedule Y is the biggest framing rule through which clinical trials can be conducted in India. It was initially implemented in July 1998 but has been further revised in 2005; it deals with the operational procedures of bioavailability and bioequivalence study and ethics review of clinical investigations and use of informed and informed consent, SAE (Serious Adverse Events) reporting, and submission procedure. It complies with the guidelines of ICH-GCP and offers a proper context to manage clinical research. The international and national company regulation of Schedule Y helps to maintain ethical standards and also protect the safety of the patients taking part in the trailing in India [26].

Regulatory Submission Process

India's regulatory submission is done under the Laws of Drugs and Cosmetics Act, 1940 and the rules related to it. Applicants seeking new drug approvals, biologicals and medical devices have no other choice than to present their applications to DCGI who leads CDSCO.The submission of dossiers typically follows Form 44 (for new drug applications), which requires comprehensive documentation covering clinical trial data, manufacturing processes, safety reports, and pharmacovigilance strategies. Each submission is subject to rigorous review by expert committees including the Subject Expert Committees (SECs) and the Technical Committee before any authorization is granted. Moreover, India follows a tiered system of review, where different levels of review and compliance are ensured at the zonal and sub-zonal offices of CDSCO across India. The evaluation process is largely harmonized with international standards, especially following India's participation in the International Council for Harmonisation (ICH). However, national-specific requirements also persist, which sometimes necessitate local clinical trials or bridging studies, especially for imported drugs [27].

Online Portals: SUGAM and INMAS

The digital transformation of CDSCO's regulatory interface is primarily facilitated through online portals such as SUGAM and INMAS, which aim to streamline the drug approval and licensing processes. SUGAM, launched in 2015, is an online portal designed to allow stakeholders—including pharmaceutical companies, importers, and manufacturers—to submit applications for drug approvals, clinical trials, registration certificates, and licenses. The SUGAM portal has significantly reduced paperwork, improved application tracking, and enhanced transparency and efficiency in the regulatory approval timeline.

Through SUGAM, entities can submit documentation related to:

- Form 44 for new drugs
- Form CT-04 for clinical trials
- Form MD-7 and MD-14 for medical devices
- Import licenses and manufacturing approvals

Another critical portal, **INMAS** (Inventory Management and Monitoring System), is utilized by CDSCO to oversee the movement and stock status of drugs and medical supplies. This portal is especially relevant during public health emergencies or national programs where drug

distribution must be closely monitored. It ensures inventory control and aids in the traceability of regulated products throughout the supply chain, aligning with pharmacovigilance and risk minimization protocols.

Both SUGAM and INMAS reflect CDSCO's push toward a digital regulatory environment that mirrors best practices adopted by global counterparts like the FDA and EMA. These platforms help bridge gaps in documentation, reduce human error, and expedite the entire regulatory process. Yet, ongoing challenges such as intermittent technical glitches, the digital literacy of stakeholders, and harmonization with state-level authorities still pose hurdles.

Together, the structured regulatory submission process and digital platforms like SUGAM and INMAS contribute significantly to enhancing regulatory efficiency, thereby reinforcing the credibility and robustness of India's pharmaceutical regulatory framework on the global stage [28].

5. Regulatory Framework of the FDA (Food and Drug Administration – USA)

Historical Background

The origins of the U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) trace back to the late 19th century when the need for public health oversight grew in response to unsafe practices in food and drug production. Initially part of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, the FDA formally began its regulatory role under the 1906 Pure Food and Drug Act, which was spurred by public outcry following revelations like those in Upton Sinclair's *The Jungle* and the advocacy of chemist Harvey Wiley. The 1938 Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (FDCA) marked a pivotal evolution, granting the FDA authority to demand safety evidence for new drugs before marketing. Over time, the FDA's mandate expanded to include efficacy (post-1962 Kefauver-Harris Amendments), good manufacturing practices, post-market surveillance, and oversight of biologics and medical devices [29]. This evolution reflects the FDA's proactive response to public health crises and scientific innovation, making it a globally influential regulatory body in the life sciences.

Organizational Structure

FDA is sub-divided in to several centers from where it deals in different products. These are the three main ones among them and these include the Center for Drug Evaluation and Research (CDER), Center for Biologics Evaluation and Research (CBER) and the Center for Devices and Radiological Health (CDRH). These centres interface with each other, while keeping the

entrust jurisdictional constitute to be able to focus and adequately cover their areas of jurisdiction [30].

Center for Drug Evaluation and Research (CDER)

As for CDER, it can be stated that it performs a crucial function with regard to making sure that safe and effective drugs get to the American people. It also reviews prescription and OTC medical drugs for human and guides through the stages of drug development from IND to NDA and post-marketing approval [31]. CDER has well developed review capacity for new drugs through its OND, OSE and OPQ. Also, CDER makes an assessment of the therapeutic biologics in its purview due to the reorganization that occurred in 2003 transferring many in the CBER to CDER for harmonization purposes [32]. The center has broadened its functions even more to patient engagement in drug development, real-world evidence, and fast-track as well as break through designations [33].

Center for Biologics Evaluation and Research (CBER)

CBER is responsible for the overseeing of biologics such as vaccines, blood, and blood products and products which infused with cells or genes and allergenic products. Chemically synthesized drug is different from Biologic drug because the later, can be obtained from natural sources and thus a different regulatory structure to handle the complexity of the drug is generally required. CBER is in charge of analysis, safety, potency, and quality of biologics through preclinical and clinical assessments in accordance with CGMPs and post-marketing safety monitoring [34]. CBER's composition is supported by offices including the Office of Blood Research and Review (OBRR) and Office of Vaccines Research and Review (OVRR), whose responsibility is to review biological products and oversee adverse reactions through an approach like the VAERS (Vaccine Adverse Event Reporting System). Since biologics have increased in therapeutic significance over the years, CBER has led the way in advanced therapies and regenerative medicine[35].

Center for Devices and Radiological Health (CDRH)

FDA oversees the medical device and radiation-emitting products through pre-market clearance or approval as well as post-market surveillance. They have categorized the devices into three classes (I to III) based on risk and are reviewed through the 510(k) premarket notification, Premarket Approval (PMA), and De Novo classifications. CDRH is also assigned with the regulation of diagostic devices and technologies as well as digital health technologies

such as software as a medical device (SaMD). It cooperates with CDER and CBER in assessing the effects of combination products that are based on merged drug/biological product and a device element. In addition, through notices, collaboration with industry is used by CDRH in providing guidance, proposal of public workshops and the sponsorship of pilot programs that enhance on the delivery of the regulatory procedures while ensuring safety and effectiveness of the products [36].

Governing laws: FD&C Act, PDUFA, Hatch-Waxman Act

Currently, FDA works under one of the most complex and well-developed regulatory systems in the world due to a number of legal acts that are based upon the number of basic laws and legislative acts. FDA's core legislative basis stems from the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act of 1938 which was passed because of the worsening condition of the drug safety in the early part of the 20th century. Under the FD&C Act, the FDA is able to regulate various aspects of a product, namely the safety, effectiveness and quality of drugs, biologics, and medical devices consumed within the United States. As a result of this act,FDA assess the data in predicate reports from the preclinical studies and clinical trial and then approve the New Drug Application (NDA). It also controls labeling and makes certain that pharmaceutical firms conform to the current good manufacturing practice, otherwise referred to as cGMP The other important Act that has influenced the FDA functioning is the Prescription Drug User Fee Act (PDUFA) enacted in 1992 and renewed every five fiscal years. The legislation called PDUFA permits the FDA to charge fees from manufacturers submitting New Drug Applications so as to facilitate the quick review of their products without compromising on the quality of the evaluation. This act played a significant role in cutting down the drug review time and, in turn, expediting access to the better therapies to the patients. The collected fees are spent to recruit new members to the review staff, introduce newly facilities to speed up drug review process. Subsequently, over the five successive PDUFA reauthorizations (PDUFA I–VII), the act has added goals for communicating more, post-market risk evaluation, and broadening transparency.The second major legislation in the FDA specific jurisdiction is the Hatch-Waxman Act of 1984, otherwise called the Drug Price Competition and Patent Term Restoration.This act was aimed at trying to promote pharmaceutical research and development while at the same time trying to ensure that the general public was able to access affordable generic medicines. Hatch-Waxman for the first time set out the Abbreviated New Drug Application (ANDA) that enabled generic makers to demonstrate bioequivalency rather than repeating expensive and arduous clinical trials like the brand drugs. In addition, it included

recruitments like patent term extensions for drugs that is an innovator or status and market exclusivity periods, as it encourages drug development and at the same time promote competition [37].The FDA is internally structured by centers that are charged with different product types: CDER is charged with the evaluation of drugs while CBER is for the evaluation of biologics, including vaccines or gene therapies among others. These centers ensure that all the data provided complies with the set requirements by law and that they go through scientific scrutiny. Interestingly , there is still practices like Breakthrough Therapy Designation, Fast Track, the Accelerated Approval and Priority Review which are facilitated by PDUFA and aimed at increasing availability of drugs for diseases with unmet needs. From the aspect of Postmarketing safety monitoring, the FDA also assumes an active role through use of MedWatch, Risk Evaluation and Mitigation Strategies (REMS) as well as Pharmacovigilance. Thus, the FDA is a many layered system originating from statutes, for-e.g., FD&C Act, PDUFA and the Hatch-Waxman Act on the legislation level. These laws have given the agency the balance to enable the innovation within the developing of products, securing public safety involved in the use of such products, and promoting competition within the markets. The FDA Regulations is still set as a model for debating other nations, and it always changes its regulations in accordance with the new scientific progress and the demands of the population [38].

Drug Approval Process: IND, NDA, ANDA

The FDA has a linear pathway system of drugs, and the first step is the Investigational New Drug (IND) application, which is a necessity prior to the commencement of the clinical investigations involving human subjects. The IND includes specific information about the pharmacology of the proposed drug, its toxicity and the method of synthesis and manufacturing, as well as plan of clinical trial. In human trials, after the IND is filed, the FDA has the authority to review it for safety within 30 days to permit the testing on human subjects. This phase puts into check the safety of the investigational drugs to qualify for phase I clinical trials.After the three phases of clinical trials that allow a drug to be tested in human patients, the pharmaceutical company creating the drug must present the drug’s safety information, mechanism of action, suggested usage and consecutive use, as well as information about the company’s manufacturing processes in an NDA. The NDA is the last filing of the folds that precursed market approval and consist of all preclinical and clinical data, proposed labeling for the drug, and safety contingency plans.For the copy version also pharmaceutical companies submit an Abbreviated New Drug Application or ANDA. As opposed to the NDA process, there

is no provision for preclinical and clinical trial data for the safety and efficacy of the proposed product as in the ANDA process. It only states that equivalence to a reference-listed drug has to be proven, meaning that the drug cannot be approved on the basis of the results of a test. This saves a lot of time and money on approval and increases market competition and availability of medications [39].

Expedited Review Programs: Fast Track, Breakthrough Therapy, Accelerated Approval, and Priority Review

In order to provide the patients with some of the life-saving therapies for certain diseases at an even faster rate, the FDA has developed several fast-track regimes that can fasten the process of approval of certain drugs without compromising much on the safety of the patients. The individual programs are being addressed at unmet medical needs or priorities in public health needs or treatments.The FDA fast track allows for development and fast track review of treatments for serious diseases when there is a demonstrated unmet medical need. The potential of drugs under this designation is to be able to have more communication with the FDA and rolling review, which can accept completed portions of the NDA at a time.Treatment indication for Breakthrough Therapy Designation is when there is preliminary evidence of a significant improvement compared with standard treatments available for the disease. This pathway provides the FDA with more intensive recommendations on how to significantly reduce both the drug development and review time frames.The fast Track Development offers early approval of the drugs based on surrogate markers that are likely to show clinical benefit in the furture. However, post-marketing confirmatory trials can rarely be initiated to establish the expected benefit. This is specifically the case in phases where clinical outcomes could take time such as in oncology and in the field of rare diseases.The Priority Review designation reduces the FDA’s review time from the standard 10 months to 6 months for applications that, if approved, would significantly improve the safety or effectiveness of the treatment, diagnosis, or prevention of serious conditions. While this program does not change the evidentiary standard for approval, it prioritizes the application in the review queue.Together, these mechanisms reflect the FDA's adaptability and commitment to public health, especially when timely access to medications is critical. These pathways are particularly significant in responding to public health emergencies, such as the COVID-19 pandemic, where accelerated regulatory responses were necessary to ensure timely access to vaccines and therapeutics [40].

Regulatory Enforcement and Inspections

The FDA being the leading regulatory authority over the pharmaceutical products in the United States exercises a vigorous enforcement and inspection in an effort to promote and ensure that the products meet required safety, efficacy, and quality standards. The Office of Regulatory Affairs (ORA) performs the operational, investigative, enforcement functions of the FDA with regard to the regulated products within the FDA's purview. These inspections are both routine and for-cause, and they span domestic and international manufacturing sites. The frequency and depth of these inspections depend on the risk classification of the facility and the product category. The FDA applies the Current Good Manufacturing Practices (cGMPs) as the benchmark for quality compliance and evaluates adherence to these standards during inspections. If deviations are detected, regulatory actions such as Warning Letters, Import Alerts, product recalls, or even legal prosecution may follow.The agency also participates in international collaborations and inspections, especially in countries that manufacture active pharmaceutical ingredients (APIs) and finished drugs exported to the U.S. Notably, foreign inspections have increased over the past two decades, indicating the FDA's shift towards a globally harmonized surveillance model. Furthermore, the FDA's inspection data are transparently reported on its website, reflecting its commitment to public accountability. The FDA leverages risk-based selection for inspection prioritization, ensuring that high-risk manufacturing facilities receive closer scrutiny [41].

FDA Orange Book and Purple Book

The FDA maintains comprehensive databases known as the Orange Book and the Purple Book, which are pivotal for regulatory decision-making concerning drug approval and substitution. The Orange Book (officially titled *Approved Drug Products with Therapeutic Equivalence Evaluations*) lists all drugs approved on the basis of safety and effectiveness under the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act. It includes critical information such as patent data, exclusivity periods, and therapeutic equivalence codes that are vital for generic drug manufacturers when seeking Abbreviated New Drug Application (ANDA) approvals.

In contrast, the Purple Book catalogs biologics licensed under the Public Health Service Act and provides details regarding their biosimilarity or interchangeability to FDA-licensed reference biological products. This guide aids healthcare providers and pharmacists in understanding whether a biosimilar can be safely substituted for its reference product without the prescriber's intervention. As biologics represent a complex and growing segment of

therapeutics, the Purple Book plays a crucial role in regulatory transparency and market access strategies for biosimilar developers [42].

Post-Marketing Surveillance (FAERS)

One of the most critical elements of the FDA's regulatory framework is its post-marketing surveillance system, formally known as the FDA Adverse Event Reporting System (FAERS). This database supports the FDA's mission to monitor the safety of drugs once they are on the market. It collects voluntary adverse event and medication error reports from healthcare professionals, consumers, and manufacturers. FAERS is instrumental in identifying potential safety concerns, generating signals, and informing regulatory decisions such as updating product labeling, issuing warnings, or withdrawing products.

In addition to FAERS, the FDA has established the Sentinel Initiative, which provides active surveillance capabilities by accessing electronic healthcare data from various sources. This proactive strategy complements FAERS' passive data collection and enhances the FDA's ability to detect and investigate drug safety signals more rapidly. The integration of FAERS data with data mining tools and AI-based analytics is enabling the FDA to identify patterns of adverse events across demographics, therapeutic classes, and drug-drug interactions. The combination of transparency, technological advancement, and rigorous follow-up makes post-market surveillance in the U.S. one of the most robust systems globally [43].

6. Regulatory Framework of EMA (European Medicines Agency – EU)

Establishment and Legal Foundation

The European Medicines Agency (EMA) was established in 1995 as part of the European Union's initiative to create a centralized and harmonized approach to the regulation of medicinal products for human and veterinary use. It functions as a decentralized body of the European Union, funded through a combination of the EU budget and fees paid by the pharmaceutical industry. The legal foundation of the EMA was first laid under Council Regulation (EEC) No 2309/93, which was subsequently replaced by Regulation (EC) No 726/2004, the current primary legislative act establishing its mandate, powers, and procedural framework . The overarching objective of EMA is to facilitate scientific evaluation, supervision, and safety monitoring of medicines, thereby ensuring high standards of public health and consumer safety within the EU internal market [44].

Structure and Committees

The EMA operates through a well-defined structure composed of several specialized scientific committees that play a pivotal role in the evaluation and supervision of medicines. The Committee for Medicinal Products for Human Use (CHMP) is central to the benefit-risk assessment of medicines for human use. The Pharmacovigilance Risk Assessment Committee (PRAC) oversees the safety monitoring of medicines and the management of risks associated with their use. The Committee for Orphan Medicinal Products (COMP) is responsible for evaluating applications for orphan drug designation, intended for rare diseases. The Committee for Advanced Therapies (CAT) handles cell therapy, gene therapy, and tissue-engineered medicines. Lastly, the Scientific Advice Working Party (SAWP) provides guidance to pharmaceutical companies during drug development to ensure that their applications meet regulatory requirements and scientific standards [45].

Legal Basis: Regulation (EC) No. 726/2004 and Directive 2001/83/EC

Two central legislative acts underpin the EMA's authority: Regulation (EC) No. 726/2004 and Directive 2001/83/EC. The former outlines the centralized marketing authorization procedure and defines the role of the EMA and its committees. It establishes the legal framework under which the CHMP operates and how it issues opinions on marketing authorization applications. Directive 2001/83/EC, on the other hand, is a comprehensive codification of EU laws relating to medicinal products for human use. It governs aspects such as clinical trials, manufacturing, labeling, pharmacovigilance, and distribution. Together, these legal instruments form the backbone of the EMA’s regulatory function [46].

Marketing Authorization Procedures

The EMA supports several marketing authorization routes, each designed to suit specific types of products and market needs. The Centralized Procedure is mandatory for products developed using biotechnology, orphan medicines, and advanced therapy medicinal products (ATMPs). It allows for a single marketing authorization valid across all EU member states. In contrast, the Decentralized Procedure (DCP) and the Mutual Recognition Procedure (MRP) allow companies to apply for authorization simultaneously in multiple countries without going through the centralized route. The National Procedure is reserved for products that will be marketed in only one EU country. The selection of the appropriate route depends on the nature of the product, therapeutic area, and regulatory strategy [47].

Role in Orphan Drugs and Pediatric Regulations

The EMA plays a significant role in facilitating the development and availability of medicines for rare diseases and pediatric populations. Through the COMP, it grants orphan designation based on criteria such as disease prevalence and lack of satisfactory existing treatments. This designation offers incentives including market exclusivity, protocol assistance, and fee reductions. For pediatric medicines, EMA's Pediatric Committee (PDCO) enforces the Pediatric Regulation (EC) No. 1901/2006, which requires companies to submit pediatric investigation plans (PIPs) early in drug development. These regulatory mechanisms aim to close the treatment gap for underserved populations [48].

Pharmacovigilance and EudraVigilance

EMA has a robust pharmacovigilance framework governed by Regulation (EU) No. 1235/2010 and Directive 2010/84/EU. Central to this system is EudraVigilance, a comprehensive database for managing and analyzing information on suspected adverse reactions to medicines. Healthcare professionals and patients can report adverse events, which are then monitored by the PRAC for safety signals. EudraVigilance also facilitates data sharing with national competent authorities and the World Health Organization (WHO), supporting international cooperation in drug safety surveillance [49].

EMA's Online Submission System: IRIS and CTIS

The EMA has introduced digital systems to streamline regulatory interactions. IRIS (Intelligent Regulatory Information System) is used for scientific procedures, including orphan designation, scientific advice, and pediatric investigation plans. It enhances transparency, consistency, and efficiency in document handling. Meanwhile, CTIS (Clinical Trials Information System) supports the implementation of the EU Clinical Trials Regulation (EU CTR 536/2014). It enables the centralized submission and assessment of clinical trial applications across EU member states, promoting a unified, transparent clinical trial process. These systems are part of EMA's digital transformation strategy to modernize regulatory workflows [50].

7. Comparative Analysis: CDSCO vs. FDA vs. EMA

Structure and Functions

To counter such a scenario, medications and drugs which are manufactured and sold in India are regulated by the Central Drugs Standard Control Organization or CDSCO that comes under the Directorate.Director General of Health Services of Ministry of Health and Family Welfare in India is as follows: drug approval, clinical trials oversight, and post-market surveillance under the Drugs and Cosmetics Act, 1940. While OTC is headed by the Drugs Controller General of India, on the other hand, the United States Food and Drug Administration abbreviated as FDA is authorized to work. Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic (FD&C) Act. It is an agency that is located at the centre as a result of the decentralisation policy. HCCS of Department of Health and Human Services and a wider application in its expertise within foods and drugs biological products, and medical devices. It is subdivided to centers such as the Center for Drug. Evaluation and Research (CDER) and Center for Biologics Evaluation and Research (CBER).EMA is an organisation established by the European Commission regulations and its primary functions are Whenever the term is used in the legislation or in the documentation, EMA refers to: serves also as a decentralized body of the European Union. It coordinates the scientific quality assessment of drugs that are produced by the drug manufacturing firms for use in the EU.EMA works through seven scientific committees and cooperates with 27 member states, ensuring unified regulatory actions across the region [51].

Regulatory Pathways and Timelines

Each agency has developed its unique regulatory approval pathway based on its jurisdictional needs.CDSCO follows Schedule Y under the Drugs and Cosmetics Rules for approving new drugs. The process includes submission of a New Drug Application (NDA), followed by reviews and potential clinical trials. The typical review period ranges from 12–18 months, subject to administrative efficiency and completeness of data.The FDA adopts a robust and highly structured pathway: the drug development process begins with an Investigational New Drug (IND) application, proceeding through clinical phases, and culminating in a New Drug Application (NDA) or Abbreviated NDA (ANDA). The Prescription Drug User Fee Act (PDUFA) sets the review time at around 10 months.

EMA offers three pathways: the Centralized Procedure (mandatory for biotech products), Decentralized Procedure (DCP), and Mutual Recognition Procedure (MRP). These ensure

flexibility based on the nature of product and market need. EMA's standard review duration is 210 days, excluding clock stops [52].

Clinical Trial Approval Processes

India mandates the registration of all clinical trials in the Clinical Trials Registry - India (CTRI). Ethics Committee approval is mandatory before any study. CDSCO has guidelines aligned with GCP but lacks a harmonized approach in implementation across different states. FDA requires the submission of an IND before initiating clinical trials in the U.S. These are divided into Phase I to Phase IV, with oversight provided by the Institutional Review Boards (IRBs) and FDA audit teams. The regulatory framework in the U.S. is mature and globally recognized for its strict adherence to safety. EMA complies with the EU Clinical Trials Regulation (EU CTR 536/2014). The process begins with ethics committee and competent authority reviews. Harmonized processes have enhanced transparency and trial quality across the EU [53].

Post-Marketing Surveillance and Pharmacovigilance

Post-marketing surveillance is an essential part of drug regulation to ensure long-term safety. CDSCO operates the Pharmacovigilance Programme of India (PvPI), which collects and assesses Adverse Drug Reactions (ADRs). However, reporting compliance and system robustness are still areas of concern in India .FDA's FAERS (FDA Adverse Event Reporting System) is a highly structured, publicly accessible database that collects adverse event reports from multiple stakeholders. It contributes significantly to drug safety monitoring globally. EMA runs EudraVigilance, an advanced system for managing and analyzing information on suspected adverse reactions. It plays a critical role in risk assessment and regulatory decision-making [54].

Device vs. Drug Regulations

While the CDSCO regulates both drugs and medical devices, medical device regulation is still evolving. It adopted the Medical Device Rules 2017, aiming to bring devices under tighter control akin to drugs.FDA, through CDRH (Center for Devices and Radiological Health), separately regulates medical devices based on their risk category (Class I–III). Its framework is considered one of the most advanced, with clear demarcations between drugs and devices. EMA does not directly regulate medical devices. Instead, this function is governed by the

Medical Device Regulation (EU MDR 2017/745). National competent authorities and notified bodies manage device assessment, unlike EMA's direct role in medicines [55].

Harmonization Efforts and Mutual Recognition

In terms of global regulatory convergence, each agency has contributed differently. CDSCO is a member of the International Council for Harmonisation (ICH) and the Pharmaceutical Inspection Co-operation Scheme (PIC/S). It also has MoUs with other agencies for capacity-building.FDA plays a leading role in ICH and actively participates in harmonization through mutual recognition agreements, notably with EMA and Health Canada. It emphasizes regulatory science and international collaboration. EMA leads several harmonization projects across the EU and has strong MRAs with countries like Japan, the USA, and Australia. It also co-chairs ICH working groups and promotes data sharing [56].

Table 1. Tabular Comparison of Key Parameters.

Parameter	**CDSCO (India)**	**FDA (USA)**	**EMA (EU)**
Legal Framework	Drugs and Cosmetics Act	FD&C Act	EC Regulations
Approval Process	Schedule Y	IND → NDA/ANDA	Centralized / DCP / MRP
Review Timelines	12–18 months	10 months	210 days
Clinical Trials	CTRI, Ethics Committee	IND, Phases I-IV	EU CTR, Ethics approval
Pharmacovigilance	PvPI	FAERS	EudraVigilance

8. Challenges in Regulatory Frameworks

Variability in Global Regulatory Requirements

One of the most prominent challenges in global pharmaceutical regulation is the variability in requirements across jurisdictions. The FDA (USA), EMA (Europe), and CDSCO (India) each have distinct legal, procedural, and scientific frameworks, which complicate the process for multinational pharmaceutical companies aiming for simultaneous drug approvals. The FDA is often seen as rigorous, demanding extensive clinical trial data, while the EMA emphasizes a

balance between scientific data and public health risk, and the CDSCO has historically shown flexibility but suffers from administrative complexity.

Lack of Harmonization

Despite the efforts by organizations such as the International Council for Harmonisation of Technical Requirements for Pharmaceuticals for Human Use (ICH), true harmonization remains elusive. The FDA, EMA, and CDSCO have different stances on clinical data requirements, reference biologic sourcing, pharmacovigilance models, and even terminology. EMA supports “work-sharing” and decentralized procedures within the EU, which contrast starkly with FDA’s independent decision-making or CDSCO’s often discretionary approvals at state and central levels. Additionally, while EMA and FDA have some collaborative procedures for inspection and information exchange, CDSCO’s integration into such frameworks remains limited. Harmonization also faces political and economic resistance, with regulatory sovereignty and local manufacturing priorities often taking precedence. This disharmony delays patient access to essential drugs in low- and middle-income countries and complicates global supply chains [58].

Regulatory Delays and Bureaucracy

Time to approval varies drastically among these agencies. The FDA, while thorough, has predictable timelines due to the Prescription Drug User Fee Act (PDUFA), which funds timely reviews. EMA follows a centralized, committee-based review process that typically spans 210 active days. CDSCO, on the other hand, has faced criticism for bureaucratic delays, inconsistencies in application assessments, and lack of transparency. Frequent changes in leadership and the dual role of the Drug Controller General of India (DCGI) in both policymaking and execution introduce inefficiencies . Moreover, India's regulatory apparatus is often affected by infrastructural constraints, limited reviewer capacity, and overlapping responsibilities between the central and state regulators. These issues significantly impact clinical trial start-up times and new drug registration processes, impeding global trial alignment [59].

Challenges in Biosimilar and Biologics Regulations

Regulating biosimilars and biologics is inherently more complex than small molecules due to their structural intricacy and variability in manufacturing. While the FDA has implemented the Biologics Price Competition and Innovation Act (BPCIA) providing pathways for biosimilar approval, and the EMA has pioneered biosimilar regulation since 2005 with specific guidelines, CDSCO has lagged in providing comprehensive, consistently applied frameworks. Although India introduced its Guidelines on Similar Biologics in 2012 (updated in 2016), issues persist in defining interchangeability, extrapolation of indications, and clinical immunogenicity assessment. Furthermore, differences in reference product sourcing policies — particularly CDSCO's allowance for local comparator products versus EMA/FDA's preference for licensed biologics — cause scientific and legal ambiguities. This regulatory divergence often leads to ethical and safety concerns during multinational clinical development and marketing [60].

Compliance and Inspection Issues

Another considerable hurdle lies in compliance enforcement and regulatory inspections. The FDA is known for its rigorous inspection regime, frequently issuing Form 483 notices and warning letters. EMA also employs joint inspections and has harmonized Good Manufacturing Practices (GMP) guidelines within the EU. CDSCO, however, has historically lacked consistent inspection protocols and suffers from under-resourced inspectorates. Recent attempts at restructuring its GMP compliance under Schedule M (revised in 2023) mark progress, but enforcement remains sporadic and often politically influenced . The discrepancy in inspection intensity leads to quality issues, especially in contract manufacturing and generics, which dominate India's pharmaceutical exports. Moreover, the absence of real-time monitoring and poor pharmacovigilance integration, especially at the regional CDSCO zonal offices, contributes to compliance variability. In contrast, the FDA's Sentinel Initiative and EMA's EudraVigilance offer robust adverse event tracking, which India is still building [61].

9. Recent Updates and Developments

CDSCO (India): New Medical Devices Rules, Online Submission Platforms, e-CTD

In recent years, the Central Drugs Standard Control Organization (CDSCO) of India has made significant advancements in its regulatory landscape, especially in the realm of medical device regulation and digital infrastructure. The introduction of the Medical Devices Rules, 2017,

which came into effect in January 2018, marked a pivotal shift in how medical devices are regulated in India, separating them from drug regulations for a more tailored approach. These

The rules system uses risk classes A to D to classify devices while improving the registration process together with import and manufacturing steps with different regulatory demands for each class.Each distinctive classification has its own set of regulatory specifications which governs manufacturing and processes in the regulatory framework. The initiative the steps made India's framework more standard like the ones applied by the US FDA and EU MDR. The EU MDR systems and the advancement of digitization work together as guiding foundations of current healthcare regulations transformation in India. SUGAM online platform has improved procedure management including the simplified process of drug registration and clinical trial authorization through SUGAM platform and medical device authorization also involves drug licensing and registration tasks which shortens administrative delays bureaucratic delays and enhancing transparency. The shift toward Electronic Common Regulatory submissions now operate with Technical Document (e-CTD) formats to bring India into close alignment with international standards. The adopted international practices through SUGAM enable easier communication while global partners perform reviews and multinational pharma companies . This coordinated attempt by various entities has produced these developments. The regulatory authority CDSCO works to enhance its operation efficiency as part of a strategy to draw in clinical research and innovation the country [62].

FDA (USA): Real-World Evidence (RWE), Project Orbis, and COVID-19 EUA Pathways

As a regulatory leader the U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) maintains its vision of innovation.The FDA actively promotes innovative processes to address both new health dangers and developing scientific discoveries. One of real-World Evidence has emerged as a fundamental development that the agency fully supports.Evidence (RWE) as a tool for regulatory decision-making. RWE represents a growing application for regulatory purposes since its uptake extends far beyond supplements for clinical trial data.Real-World Evidence has established itself as an essential tool both for backing traditional clinical trials and enhancing new drug applications along with updating drug labels expansions, and post-marketing safety surveillance. FDA's Framework for RWE Program,The FDA Framework for RWE Program was released in 2018 then received comprehensive guidance across 2021 to 2023 which established the basis for its wider implementation its wider implementation. Project Orbis represents a major initiative of the FDA's Oncology Center .The Project Orbis of Excellence

functions as an innovative regulatory framework which allows international regulators to examine oncology drugs simultaneously review of oncology drugs among international regulators. Participating countries include these countries including Canada, the UK, Australia, and Singapore together with others use this program to achieve global medicine acceleration innovative cancer treatments. Through its use Project Orbis shortens the duration required for product reviews.The FDA supported unified worldwide treatment choices for cancer medicines through its actions.During the COVID-19 pandemic the regulatory authority demonstrated its capacity to adapt. Through Emergency under EUAs the agency expedited both diagnostic testing and therapeutic treatments and vaccines to the market and vaccines. These regulatory avenues enabled strict oversight of COVID-19 intervention distribution to reach the public.The evidence-based frameworks operated under frequent updates through the submission of real-world data and clinical findings emerged. additional real-time data collection supported the EUA processThe FDA My Studies App together with other digital platforms served as secure platforms for collecting data from research subjects while under lockdown conditions ongoing trials during lockdown conditions [63].

EMA (Europe): Brexit Impact, Regulatory Science Strategy 2025, ePI Initiatives

The case of the EMA has been presented a number of challenges and tasks have been unprecedented opportunities in recent years, not least due to the United Kingdom's departure from the European Union. Brexit caused the EMA's headquarters to be moved from London to Amsterdam and posed regulatory concerns to the approval of the medicines and entry into the market surveillance. As one may infer, EMA was quickly achieved through reshuffling of tasks and upscaling efforts with the other remaining EU member countries in order to keep on with the implementation of regulations activities.One of the most innovative activities that have been planned in the present days has been the EMA Regulatory Science Strategy to 2025 as a vision for the future inspired by the desire to improve and adapt scientific evaluation and regulatory guidance as such technologies as artificial intelligence, advanced therapies and genomics advanced therapies. This strategy highlights stakeholder engagement, patient-centered innovation, and proactive planning for public health crises as critical pillars. In sync with the strategic planning, EMA has also enhanced its electronic Product Information. About this, it can be cited that PQRC, which works on the electronic implementation of the content of the leaflet and labeling of medicines as part of the (ePI) initiative, structured, interoperable format. Thisims to enhance the acquisition of drugs through ensuring that these reach the patient as per the required specifications. information, increase multiculturalism in Europe and

improve the integration of the European Internet with digital health tools and electronic prescribing systems. The push toward digital transformation also serves a purpose of contributing to the Pharmaceutical Strategy for Europe, launched by the European Community prepare for action to 'streamline and enhance' drugs for the EU health system [64].

Conclusion

This comparative study of the regulatory frameworks of the Central Drugs Standard Control Organization (CDSCO) in India, the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) in the United States, and the collaboration with the European Medicines Agency (EMA) in Europe shows that the goals are similar. and the different strategies of these central agencies in the promotion of public health. While all three they should strive at providing safety, efficacy, and quality of the pharmaceutical products and regulation began as nonprofit organizations that had legislative models, a legal framework, historical backgrounds and environments, and health priorities. The FDA has set a highly centralized and formal system in contrast to the decentralized and less strict system as seen in EMA. this type of a decentralized model and CDSCO's federated model of regulatory. complexity and efficiency. This has been revealing that there is a need to harmonize in the global level. drug regulation with the impetus for pharmaceutical development speeding up and becoming more world-wide. The absence of harmonisation of the regulatory requirements can cause lots of problems such as taking of more time, costs more and slowed process for the international business. Measures such as the International Council for Accordions are known initiative s Orienteering the course, instrument and scopes of this group should permits understanding its influence as well as the prospects of further development. Harmonisation (ICH) are essential for adoption of identical and acceptable standard by the member states clearance procedures, which can improve availability of drugs and stimulate development. Thus, in the end, this analysis is beneficial as a reference to the policy makers and to all stakeholders dealing with the pharmaceutical industry. experts on the future scope and trends of researcher agendas, where they provide the specifics on guidelines and possibilities for synergy. By learning The analysis of potentials and threats of each agency, based on their individual and collective summation of the portraits of the global regulatory environment. that it may develop toward such an integrated and efficient system which may well redound to the improvement of public health and patient safety worldwide.

References

1. Kimbrell GA. Cutting Edge Issues in 21st Century Animal Food Product Labeling. Drake J. Agric. L.. 2022;27:179.
2. Abed I, Gonzalez-Quevedo R, Mura M, Dias M, da Rocha Dias S, Burgos JG. Commentary on the European Medicines Agency's extended mandate: Protecting public health in times of crisis and improving availability of medicines and medical devices. British Journal of Clinical Pharmacology. 2022 Nov 7;89(1):5.
3. Agarwal DS, Chairman DT. Central drugs standard control organization. New Delhi. 2017.
4. Gundayao JC, Engkasan JP, Kaur S. Nonscientific Members of Institutional Review Boards. Asian Bioethics Review. 2024 Dec 7:1-6.
5. Fang Y, Wang H, He W. A statistical roadmap for journey from real-world data to real-world evidence. Therapeutic Innovation & Regulatory Science. 2020 Jul;54:749-57.
6. Sharma U, Kumar P, Kumar N, Singh B. Recent advances in the chemistry of phthalimide analogues and their therapeutic potential. Mini reviews in medicinal chemistry. 2010 Jul 1;10(8):678-704.
7. Pisano DJ, Mantus DS, editors. FDA regulatory affairs: a guide for prescription drugs, medical devices, and biologics. CRC Press; 2008 Aug 11.
8. Ratanawijitrasin S, Wondemagegnehu E. Effective drug regulation. A multicountry study. Geneva: World Health Organization. 2002 Sep 20.
9. Linton SL, Leifheit KM, McGinty EE, Barry CL, Pollack CE. Association between housing insecurity, psychological distress, and self-rated health among US adults during the COVID-19 pandemic. JAMA Network Open. 2021 Sep 1;4(9):e2127772-.
10. Shmela M, Habbassi M. Overview in EMA and FDA Approved Novel Drugs in the Years 2020, 2021 and 2022. Libyan Journal of Medical Research. 2024 Jan 1;18(1):178-92.
11. Hampsher-Monk SC, Prieger JE, Patwardhan S. Who Is (Still) Smoking?. InTobacco Regulation, Economics, and Public Health, Volume I: Clearing the Air on E-Cigarettes and Harm Reduction 2024 May 31 (pp. 31-146). Cham: Springer International Publishing.
12. Roldan Munoz S, Postmus D, de Vries ST, Gross-Martirosyan L, Bahri P, Hillege H, Mol PG. What Factors Make EU Regulators Want to Communicate Drug Safety Issues Related to SGLT2 Inhibitors? An Online Survey Study. Drug Safety. 2023 Mar;46(3):243-55.
13. Chauhan DS, Branga AN. *CHIEF PATRON* (Doctoral dissertation, GLA UNIVERSITY, MATHURA).

14. Lomeli-Silva A, Contreras-Salinas H, Barajas-Virgen MY, Romero-Lopez MS, Rodríguez-Herrera LY. Harmonization of individual case safety reports transmission requirements among PAHO reference authorities: a review of their current regulation. Therapeutic Advances in Drug Safety. 2024 Feb;15:20420986241228119.
15. Brunner D. Pharmaceutical Inspection Co-operation Scheme (PIC/S). The Quality Assurance Journal: The Quality Assurance Journal for Pharmaceutical, Health and Environmental Professionals. 2004 Sep;8(3):207-11.
16. Casula M, Toth F. The 2017 Italian reform on mandatory childhood vaccinations: Analysis of the policy process and early implementation. Health Policy. 2021 Jan 1;125(1):7-11.
17. Rao TJ, Kesharwani RK, Keservani RK, Sharma AK, editors. Formulations, regulations, and challenges of nutraceuticals. CRC Press; 2024 Aug 23.
18. Sud S, Sud Khyati S. An overview of laws governing pharmacy in india.
19. Meshram N, Harane S, Kale V, Biyani D, Umekar MJ. Regulatory overview on new drugs and clinical trials rules, 2019. International Journal Of Drug Regulatory Affairs. 2023;11(1):31-42.
20. Chatterjee B, Dash B, Shrestha B, Bhuyan NR. Current Scenarios on Regulatory Landscape of Indian Pharmaceutical Industries. Int. J. Pharm. Sci. Res. 2021;12:5642-51.
21. Thakur D, Reddy P. A report on fixing India's broken drug regulatory framework. URl: https://spicyip. com/wp-content/uploads/2016/06/Report_India-Drug-Regulatory-Framework_June-2016. pdf (visited on 5th Aug. 2020). 2016 Jun 4.
22. Kumar V, Chopra S. Comparative study of the regulatory guidelines for clinical trials in regulated and semi-regulated countries. Nat Con Assoc Pharma. 2016 May.
23. Sharma S, Rabbani SA, Sharma R. Global submissions for drug approvals. InRegulatory Affairs in the Pharmaceutical Industry 2022 Jan 1 (pp. 89-111). Academic Press.
24. Jose J, Rajput A, Nikshitha M. Regulatory affairs: historical overview, authorities, and role in drug approval. InDosage Forms, Formulation Developments and Regulations 2024 Jan 1 (pp. 99-138). Academic Press.
25. Agarwal NB, Karwa M. Pharmaceutical regulations in India. InPharmaceutical Medicine and translational clinical research 2018 Jan 1 (pp. 215-231). Academic Press.
26. Rupnawar M, Wani P. Pharmaceutical Regulatory Affairs: An Overview of Global Regulatory Frameworks and Emerging Trends. Int. J. Sci. R. Tech. 2024;1(12).
27. Bhave A, Batolar LS. Indian regulatory update April–October 2018. Perspectives in Clinical Research. 2019 Jan 1;10(1):31-3.

28. Bhave A, Batolar LS. Indian regulatory update April–October 2018. Perspectives in Clinical Research. 2019 Jan 1;10(1):31-3.
29. Labson MS, Carver KH, Boyd MC. FDA Regulation of Biological Products. InThe Pharmaceutical Regulatory Process 2008 Dec 2 (pp. 123-150). CRC Press.
30. Margolies ME. The Regulation of Biological Products and the CBER-CDER Intercenter Agreements. Drug Information Journal. 1993 Jul;27(3):925-31.
31. Hamrell MR. An overview of the US regulatory environment for drug-device and biologic-device combination products. Drug information journal: DIJ/Drug Information Association. 2006 Jan;40:23-32.
32. Walsh G. Drug Approval in the European Union and United States. Pharmaceutical Biotechnology: Drug Discovery and Clinical Applications. 2012 Apr 18:257-67.
33. Cácananta OV. FDA and Regulation of Biologics. InNavigating the FDA Regulatory Processes 2025 Jan 31 (pp. 88-100). CRC Press.
34. Sensabaugh SM. A primer on CBER's regulatory review structure and process. Drug information journal: DIJ/Drug Information Association. 1998 Oct;32:1011-30.
35. Wu L, Smith H, Zheng H, Yu LX. Drug product approval in the United States and international harmonization. InDeveloping Solid Oral Dosage Forms 2017 Jan 1 (pp. 1049-1077). Academic Press.
36. Greenbaum J. Regulation of drug–device combination products in the USA. InDrug-Device Combination Products 2010 Jan 1 (pp. 496-529). Woodhead Publishing.
37. Zhu X, Zhang J. Regulatory efforts to address the access gap for foreign new drugs in China: the priority review program and related policies. Global Health Research and Policy. 2025 Feb 25;10(1):7.
38. Winter JD, Kerns JW, Brandt N, Wastila L, Qato D, Sabo RT, Petterson S, Chung Y, Reves S, Winter C, Winter KM. Prescribing Trends and Associated Outcomes of Antiepileptic Drugs and Other Psychotropic Medications in US Nursing Homes: Proposal for a Mixed Methods Investigation. JMIR Research Protocols. 2024 Sep 19;13(1):e64446.
39. Morgan MR, Richard G. From Patents To Regulatory Exclusivities In Drug Development: A Comparative Transaction Cost Analysis. McGill SGI Research Papers in Business, Finance, Law and Society Research Paper Forthcoming. 2024 Mar 1.
40. GOV O. How FDA Used Its Accelerated Approval Pathway Raised Concerns in 3 of 24 Drugs Reviewed.

41. Woteki CE, Buckley GJ, National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine. Global Efforts to Strengthen Regulatory Systems. InStronger Food and Drug Regulatory Systems Abroad 2020 Jan 15. National Academies Press (US).
42. Wen H. *A Comparative Analysis of Chinese and US Government Approaches to Managing Generic Drug Quality* (Doctoral dissertation, The Ohio State University).
43. Kind C. Exit through the app store?. Patterns. 2020 Jun 12;1(3).
44. Tissot M, Valnet-Rabier MB, Stalder T, Limat S, Davani S, Nerich V. Epidemiology and economic burden of "serious" adverse drug reactions: Real-world evidence research based on pharmacovigilance data. Therapies. 2022 May 1;77(3):291-300.
45. Saesen R, Machado M, Crifo B, Liu L, de Vries C, Herold R, Llinares Garcia J, Huys I. Involvement of the European Medicines Agency in multi-stakeholder regulatory science research projects: experiences of staff members and project coordinators. Frontiers in Medicine. 2023 May 30;10:1181702.
46. Koski SM, Hietikko A, Airaksinen M, Laitinen-Parkkonen P. Implementation of safety-related statutory information for herbal products under the pharmaceutical legislation between 1965 and 2021 in Finland: a content analysis of product information. Archives of Public Health. 2025 Mar 5;83(1):60.
47. Jakubowski S, Malinowski KP, Kawalec P. The clinical assessment of studies on orphan drugs in relation to the EMA's authorization marketing decisions in Europe. Frontiers in Pharmacology. 2025 Mar 31;16:1558987.
48. Jakubowski S, Malinowski KP, Kawalec P. The clinical assessment of studies on orphan drugs in relation to the EMA's authorization marketing decisions in Europe. Frontiers in Pharmacology. 2025 Mar 31;16:1558987.
49. Bloem LT, van der Elst ME, Klungel OH. Principles of Pharmacovigilance and Drug Regulation. InPrinciples and Practice of Pharmacovigilance and Drug Safety 2024 Aug 6 (pp. 135-161). Cham: Springer International Publishing.
50. Fuhrmann C, Reineke C, Lang B, Grählert X. Erste Erfahrungen bei der Umsetzung der EU-Verordnung 536/2014 (CTR) aus Sicht der nichtkommerziellen akademischen Forschung. Bundesgesundheitsblatt-Gesundheitsforschung-Gesundheitsschutz. 2023 Jan;66(1):38-44.
51. Shmela M, Habbassi M. Overview in EMA and FDA Approved Novel Drugs in the Years 2020, 2021 and 2022. Libyan Journal of Medical Research. 2024 Jan 1;18(1):178-92.

52. Manellari S, Musazzi UM, Rocco P, Minghetti P. Marketing authorisations for unmet medical needs: A critical appraisal of regulatory pathways in the European Union. International Journal of Pharmaceutics. 2023 Jul 25;642:123193.
53. Salminen E. Implementation of Clinical Trials Regulation EU no 536/2014 to Clinical Operations-organisation's working procedures.
54. Bloem LT, van der Elst ME, Klungel OH. Principles of Pharmacovigilance and Drug Regulation. InPrinciples and Practice of Pharmacovigilance and Drug Safety 2024 Aug 6 (pp. 135-161). Cham: Springer International Publishing.
55. Zhu S, Gilbert M, Chetty I, Siddiqui F. The 2021 landscape of FDA-approved artificial intelligence/machine learning-enabled medical devices: an analysis of the characteristics and intended use. International journal of medical informatics. 2022 Sep 1;165:104828.
56. Tallon MJ, Kalman DS. The regulatory challenges of placing dietary ingredients on the European and US market. Journal of Dietary Supplements. 2025 Jan 2;22(1):9-24.
57. Patil N, Ranjan A, Gaurav, Mukherjee D, Panda BK, Diksha, Komal, Narang RK, Singh A. Navigating Biosimilar Regulatory Pathways in Emerging Markets: Insights from Brics Nations. Applied Drug Research, Clinical Trials and Regulatory Affairs. 2024 Nov 6.
58. Upadhyay A, Manzoor A, Bhushan B, Tewari S. Indian industries and biologicals. InQuality Control and Regulatory Aspects for Biologicals 2024 Apr 22 (pp. 61-81). CRC Press.
59. Upadhyay A, Manzoor A, Bhushan B, Tewari S. Indian industries and biologicals. InQuality Control and Regulatory Aspects for Biologicals 2024 Apr 22 (pp. 61-81). CRC Press.
60. Musti K, Yarra SP, Munukutla KS, Kavala NR. Possible Guidelines and Regulatory Issues on Biosimilars in INDIA, USA, EU. World Journal of Pharmacy and Biotechnology. 2023 Oct 2;10(1):51-6.
61. Gandhi S, Patankar D, Kashiramka S, Rathore AS. The economics of translating a biosimilar from lab to market in India. Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences. 2024 Nov;1541(1):219-29.
62. Pal C, Rengan AK, Moodahadu L, Swaminathan J, Nagalla B. Assessment of knowledge and awareness among the stakeholders of clinical research at the site: a collaborative, electronic-survey approach to identify the indicators of quality. Reviews on Recent Clinical Trials. 2023 Feb 1;18(1):56-68.
63. Thakkar J, Patel A, Desai J, Patel M, Shah U, Patel A, Patel K, Patel S. Pharmaceutical Market Access in Latin America: Analyzing Approval Requirements in Three Key Nations:

Ecuador, Dominican Republic and Nicaragua. Applied Drug Research, Clinical Trials and Regulatory Affairs. 2024;10(1):E230524230257.

64. Barton C. Overhauling the Human Medicines Directive and Regulation.