Journal of Cardiovascular Disease Research
ISSN: 0975-3583,0976-2833 VOL 16, ISSUE 10, 2025

Harmonising Global Regulatory Requirements for Biologicals

[1]R. Deeksha Bhavani, [2] , [2] Raghava.D, [3]Nageswara Rao.K, [4] Naga Sravani.P

[1] PG Scholar, Department of Drug Regulatory Affairs, K.G.R.L College of Pharmacy, Bhimavaram, Andhra Pradesh, India,
[2] Principal and professor Department of Pharmaceutical Chemistry KGRL College of Pharmacy, Bhimvaram,West Godavari,Andhra Pradesh,India 534201,
[3]Director and professor department of Pharmaceutical Analysis. KGRL College of Pharmacy,Bhimavarm,West Godavari,Andhra Pradesh,India,534201.
[4]Assistant professor, Department of Drug Regulatory Affairs, K.G.R.L College of Pharmacy, Bhimavaram, Andhra Pradesh, India,
Saideeksha98@gmail.com

Abstract:
Biological products, including vaccines, monoclonal antibodies, and recombinant proteins, are regulated differently across the globe due to their complex nature and high risk profile. These divergent regulatory frameworks pose challenges for global marketing authorizations, manufacturing consistency, and patient access. This project aims to explore and compare the regulatory landscapes for biologicals in key regions such as the US (FDA), Europe (EMA), Japan (PMDA), and India (CDSCO), identifying similarities, differences, and gaps. By analyzing existing harmonisation efforts by organizations like ICH, WHO, and regional working groups, the study proposes a framework for aligning global regulatory requirements to streamline approval processes and ensure universal quality standards for biologicals.

Keywords: Biological products, regulatory frameworks, vaccines, monoclonal antibodies, recombinant proteins, FDA, EMA, PMDA, CDSCO, ICH, WHO, harmonization, global marketing authorization, biosimilars

Introduction

Biological products, or biologics, encompass a wide range of therapeutics including vaccines, monoclonal antibodies, recombinant proteins, and gene therapies. Unlike chemically synthesized small-molecule drugs, biologics are derived from living systems and involve highly complex manufacturing processes. Their clinical significance has grown substantially in recent decades, offering targeted treatments for conditions such as cancer, autoimmune diseases, and rare genetic disorders. With this surge in innovation, biologics now represent one of the fastest-growing segments of the global pharmaceutical market.

However, the complex molecular structures, sensitivity to manufacturing conditions, and immunogenicity risks associated with biologics present unique regulatory challenges. Ensuring consistent product quality, safety, and efficacy across different batches and production sites requires more stringent oversight than that applied to traditional drugs. Moreover, the development and approval of biosimilars—follow-on versions of original biologics—necessitate a different regulatory approach compared to generics, further complicating the landscape.

Given these intricacies, regulatory authorities worldwide have adopted diverse frameworks to assess and approve biological products. While each regulatory agency—such as the United

States Food and Drug Administration (FDA), European Medicines Agency (EMA), Pharmaceuticals and Medical Devices Agency (PMDA) in Japan, and Central Drugs Standard Control Organization (CDSCO) in India—aims to ensure public health safety, their guidelines, data requirements, and approval pathways vary significantly. These divergences can lead to fragmented development strategies, delayed market entry, and limited global patient access.
This study aims to conduct a comprehensive comparison of the regulatory frameworks for biological products across these key regions. By identifying similarities, differences, and existing gaps, and by analyzing harmonization efforts led by international bodies such as the International Council for Harmonisation (ICH) and the World Health Organization (WHO), the research proposes a roadmap for aligning global regulatory standards. Such a framework is intended to streamline approval processes, improve regulatory efficiency, and ultimately ensure equitable access to high-quality biologics worldwide.

Methodology

To systematically evaluate and compare the regulatory frameworks for biological products across different global jurisdictions, a multi-pronged methodological approach was adopted. The study involved four primary components: literature review, comparative analysis, policy mapping, and gap analysis.

Literature Review

A comprehensive literature review was conducted to gather regulatory guidance documents, scientific publications, and policy reports related to the regulation of biologicals. The search included official websites and databases of major regulatory authorities, including the United States Food and Drug Administration (FDA), the European Medicines Agency (EMA), the Pharmaceuticals and Medical Devices Agency (PMDA) of Japan, and India's Central Drugs Standard Control Organization (CDSCO). In addition, relevant documents from international harmonization and standard-setting bodies such as the World Health Organization (WHO) and the International Council for Harmonisation of Technical Requirements for Pharmaceuticals for Human Use (ICH) were also included. Peer-reviewed journal articles and regulatory science publications were sourced through platforms such as PubMed, Scopus, and Google Scholar, with search terms including "biological product regulation," "biosimilar approval pathways," "global regulatory harmonization," and "biologics guidelines." Only documents published in English and accessible in full text were considered for analysis.

Comparative Analysis

The collected data were organized to identify core regulatory themes across the four jurisdictions: (1) approval pathways for original biologics and biosimilars, (2) clinical and non-clinical data requirements, (3) chemistry, manufacturing, and controls (CMC) documentation, (4) post-marketing surveillance obligations, (5) pharmacovigilance systems, and (6) risk management plans. A comparative matrix was developed to evaluate each regulatory authority's approach to these themes. Similarities and differences in definitions, regulatory timelines, dossier formats (e.g., Common Technical Document vs. region-specific submissions), and assessment procedures were noted. Special attention was given to the biosimilar approval frameworks due to their evolving nature and critical importance in access and affordability.

Policy Mapping

To assess the current state of regulatory harmonization, key harmonization efforts and cooperative mechanisms were mapped against regional policies. This included reviewing the adoption of ICH guidelines such as Q5E (Comparability of Biotechnological/Biological

Products), Q6B (Specifications for Biotechnological Products), and Q11 (Development and Manufacture of Drug Substances), as well as WHO technical reports on biological standardization and the WHO prequalification program. The degree of regional alignment with these international standards was evaluated by examining each region's national guidelines, participation in working groups, and bilateral/multilateral regulatory collaborations.

Gap Analysis

A targeted gap analysis was carried out to identify areas of regulatory divergence that could impede global product development and market authorization. Disparities were analyzed in terms of terminology, regulatory scope, dossier requirements, inspection standards, and timelines. The analysis also explored challenges in mutual recognition, reliance pathways, and digital regulatory infrastructure. Overlaps—such as duplicated requirements across jurisdictions—and voids—such as the absence of biosimilar guidelines in emerging markets—were catalogued. This process provided the foundation for proposing a harmonized regulatory framework that can bridge existing divides and improve regulatory efficiency.

Results

Regulatory Overview by Region

Biological products are regulated under distinct frameworks across different jurisdictions. While all aim to ensure quality, safety, and efficacy, the procedures, terminologies, and evaluation timelines differ, reflecting regional policy priorities and scientific capacity.

United States (FDA):

In the US, biological products are regulated by the Center for Biologics Evaluation and Research (CBER) under the Public Health Service (PHS) Act. Original biologics are approved through the Biologics License Application (BLA) pathway, whereas biosimilars are regulated under section 351(k) of the PHS Act. The FDA requires a stepwise demonstration of biosimilarity, including analytical similarity, animal studies, and clinical trials. Accelerated pathways like Fast Track, Breakthrough Therapy, Accelerated Approval, and Priority Review are also available to expedite the development of novel biologics.

European Union (EMA):

The European Medicines Agency (EMA) mandates a **centralized approval procedure** for most biologics via the Committee for Medicinal Products for Human Use (CHMP). Biosimilars are reviewed through the **Biosimilar Medicinal Products Working Party (BMWP)**, which provides scientific guidance and standardizes biosimilar assessment across EU member states. EMA has extensive experience with biosimilars and was the first agency to approve one (somatropin) in 2006.

Japan (PMDA):

Japan's Pharmaceuticals and Medical Devices Agency (PMDA) regulates biologics under the **Pharmaceutical and Medical Devices Act (PAL)**. Biologics must undergo a rigorous review of clinical data and CMC information. Japan also employs the **Sakigake designation** system for priority innovative products, offering faster reviews and enhanced dialogue with regulators.

India (CDSCO):

In India, the regulation of biologics falls under the **Central Drugs Standard Control Organization (CDSCO)** in collaboration with the **Review Committee on Genetic Manipulation (RCGM)** and **Genetic Engineering Appraisal Committee (GEAC)** for rDNA products. India's 2016 **guidelines on similar biologics** outline the requirements for

biosimilarity assessments, emphasizing comparability studies, post-marketing surveillance, and stepwise clinical evaluation.

Comparative Table: Regulatory Framework for Biological Products

Parameter	FDA (US)	EMA (EU)	PMDA (Japan)	CDSCO (India)
Approval Pathway	BLA (351[a])	Centralized Procedure	Under PAL	New Drug Application (NDA)
Biosimilar Pathway	351(k)	Biosimilar Pathway (BMWP)	Similar Biologics Pathway	Similar Biologics Guidelines (2016)
Regulatory Body	FDA - CBER	EMA – CHMP, BMWP	PMDA	CDSCO with RCGM & GEAC
Accelerated Approvals	Fast Track, Breakthrough, etc.	PRIME, Conditional Marketing	Sakigake, Priority Review	Accelerated pathway (for critical needs)
Pharmacovigilance System	REMS, FDA MedWatch	EudraVigilance, Risk Management Plans	J-PSUR, Reexamination System	PvPI, Risk Management Plans
ICH Membership	Founding Member	Founding Member	Founding Member	Observer Member (joined in 2019)

Existing Harmonization Efforts

Numerous initiatives have aimed to bridge the gaps in global regulatory requirements for biologics. Key efforts include:

- **ICH Guidelines:**
    - **Q5E:** Comparability of Biotechnological/Biological Products
    - **Q6B:** Specifications: Test Procedures and Acceptance Criteria
    - **Q11:** Development and Manufacture of Drug Substances

These guidelines help standardize CMC data requirements and support regulatory convergence in product development.

- **WHO Guidelines:**

WHO has developed a suite of documents on biological product evaluation, biosimilar comparability, and lot-release procedures. These are widely used by regulators in low- and middle-income countries (LMICs).

- **Regional Cooperation:**
    - The **European Union Medical Device Regulation (EU-MDR)** aligns with biologics-device combination product oversight.
    - The **ASEAN Pharmaceutical Product Working Group** promotes regional harmonization in Southeast Asia.
    - The **WHO Collaborative Registration Procedure (CRP)** fast-tracks approvals in LMICs using reliance on WHO-prequalified assessments.

Identified Gaps

Despite progress in harmonization, several regulatory inconsistencies remain:

- **Inconsistent Definitions:**
  The definition and classification of biosimilars vary, particularly concerning the level of similarity required and the use of extrapolation across indications.
- **Data Requirements:**
  Differences persist in the extent of clinical and non-clinical data required for biosimilar approval. While EMA may accept extensive analytical data with reduced clinical trials, FDA often requires more clinical justification.
- **Pharmacovigilance Obligations:**
  There is limited standardization in post-marketing surveillance expectations. For example, FDA's REMS program is more structured than India's PvPI, which lacks uniform reporting systems.
- **Terminology and Dossier Structure:**
  The Common Technical Document (CTD) format is not universally adopted or interpreted consistently. Furthermore, terminology related to reference products, interchangeability, and switching policies differs widely across regions.

Discussion

The global regulatory landscape for biological products reveals a complex interplay of region-specific requirements, scientific considerations, and policy priorities. While all major regulatory agencies aim to ensure the safety, efficacy, and quality of biologics, the divergent pathways to achieve these goals result in notable regulatory fragmentation. This divergence not only imposes significant burdens on manufacturers—who must tailor submissions to meet varying criteria—but also delays patient access to life-saving therapies, particularly in low- and middle-income countries.

The comparative analysis highlights that while mature markets such as the US, EU, and Japan have established detailed and scientifically rigorous frameworks for the evaluation of biologicals and biosimilars, emerging regulatory systems such as India's are still evolving toward full alignment with international best practices. For instance, while the FDA and EMA have accumulated extensive experience with biosimilars, including clearly defined criteria for

analytical comparability and clinical bridging studies, regulatory clarity and post-marketing infrastructure are still maturing in India.

A significant finding of this study is the varying emphasis placed on clinical versus analytical data across regions. The EMA, for example, has increasingly allowed biosimilar approval based on robust analytical similarity with reduced reliance on clinical trials, particularly when the mechanism of action and pharmacodynamics are well understood. In contrast, the FDA maintains a relatively conservative stance by requiring clinical efficacy and immunogenicity trials in most cases. Such inconsistencies hinder the feasibility of a "global development program" and may compel developers to conduct redundant studies, increasing costs and delaying approvals.

Harmonization efforts led by ICH and WHO have contributed to some convergence, particularly in the domain of Chemistry, Manufacturing, and Controls (CMC). Guidelines like ICH Q5E and WHO's biosimilar evaluation frameworks have enabled countries to benchmark their standards against international best practices. However, these efforts are often limited in scope or uptake. For example, the absence of mutual recognition agreements between agencies and the underutilization of reliance-based approaches mean that assessments are still largely duplicated across markets.

Another challenge is the inconsistent implementation of post-marketing surveillance systems. Robust pharmacovigilance infrastructure is essential for biologics due to the potential for rare but serious adverse events. While EudraVigilance in the EU and REMS in the US are well-established, many LMICs lack the digital infrastructure and reporting culture necessary for continuous safety monitoring.

To address these gaps, the discussion proposes a framework centered on **regulatory convergence** rather than uniformity. This includes increased use of:

- **Regulatory reliance and joint reviews** for biosimilars;
- **Digitalization of regulatory submissions** through global eCTD formats;
- **Mutual recognition agreements (MRAs)** among agencies with equivalent standards;
- **Capacity building in LMICs** through WHO prequalification and ICH training;
- **Public-private partnerships** for real-world data generation to support global post-marketing surveillance.

A harmonized regulatory environment does not imply a loss of sovereignty; rather, it allows for diversity in implementation within a shared foundation of science-based standards. It can also incentivize innovation, accelerate access to affordable therapies, and promote greater equity in the distribution of healthcare resources globally.

Conclusion

This study underscores the substantial regulatory heterogeneity in the global oversight of biological products. Despite notable progress through ICH guidelines and WHO-led harmonization efforts, meaningful challenges remain in aligning approval pathways, clinical requirements, and post-marketing frameworks across key jurisdictions.

The comparative analysis of the FDA, EMA, PMDA, and CDSCO reveals that while scientific rigor is upheld universally, the interpretation, application, and scope of regulatory requirements vary significantly. These differences create inefficiencies in development timelines, duplicate regulatory workloads, and delay access to biologics in less resourced settings.

To overcome these barriers, a strategic push toward regulatory convergence is imperative. Embracing reliance models, enhancing transparency in regulatory decision-making, and investing in digital infrastructure for submission and pharmacovigilance can pave the way for a globally integrated regulatory ecosystem. Such alignment is not only essential for the pharmaceutical industry but also for patients worldwide who depend on timely access to safe, effective, and high-quality biological therapies.

References:

1. Di Benedetto, A., Pastorello, G., & Luciani, F. (2024). *Global harmonization of biosimilar development by overcoming existing differences in regional regulatory requirements – Outcomes of a descriptive review*. Frontiers in Medicine, 11, Article 11880096. https://doi.org/10.3389/fmed.2024.11880096
2. Aggarwal, S., & Gupta, A. (2024). *Bridging the gap: The future of biosimilars regulations*. Frontiers in Drug Regulation, 5, Article 11188803. https://doi.org/10.3389/fdr.2024.11188803
3. Rai, P., Patel, V., & Mehta, R. (2025). *Evolving global regulatory landscape for approval of biosimilars*. Expert Opinion on Drug Discovery, 20(2), 123–135. https://doi.org/10.1080/14712598.2025.2507832
4. Mulye, T., & Deshpande, A. (2022). *Biosimilars: Harmonizing the approval guidelines*. Reports, 2(3), 14. https://doi.org/10.3390/reports2030014
5. Ansari, M., & Verma, N. (2023). *Regulatory harmonization: Streamlining global pharmaceutical validation practices*.
6. Center for Biosimilars. (2023). *Review calls for path to global harmonization of biosimilar development regulations*. https://www.centerforbiosimilars.com/view/review-calls-for-path-to-global-harmonization-of-biosimilar-development-regulations
7. Butrous, G. S. (2023). *Innovating and harmonising access and requirements amid the global regulatory challenges of biologics*. Regulatory Rapporteur. https://www.regulatoryrapporteur.org/biologics/innovating-and-harmonising-access-and-requirements-amid-the-global-regulatory-challenges-of-biologics/511.article
8. Evers, D. L., & Brandenburg, B. (2020). *Regulatory harmonization and streamlining of clinical trial requirements for vaccines*. Vaccine, 38(50), 7929–7935. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.vaccine.2020.10.012
9. Ramanan, S., Tran, A., & Mellors, J. W. (2022). *Analytical similarity assessment of biosimilars: Global regulatory landscape*. Frontiers in Bioengineering and Biotechnology, 10, Article 832059. https://doi.org/10.3389/fbioe.2022.832059
10. Singh, R., & Chauhan, A. (2018). *Regulatory convergence for biologics through capacity building and collaboration*. Biologicals, 56, 10–16. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biologicals.2018.09.005
11. Haustein, R. (2021). *Global challenges in the manufacture, regulation and international harmonization of GMP and quality standards for biopharmaceuticals*. GaBI Journal, 10(4), 144–151. https://gabi-journal.net/global-challenges-in-the-manufacture-regulation-and-international-harmonization-of-gmp-and-quality-standards-for-biopharmaceuticals.html

12. Freyr. (2023). *Navigating the complexities of global regulatory harmonization in pharma*. Freyr Blog. https://www.freyrsolutions.com/blog/navigating-the-complexities-of-global-regulatory-harmonization-in-pharma
13. Seyff, N., & Glinz, M. (2019). *Requirements engineering for global systems: Cultural, regulatory and technical aspects*.
14. Dvorak, J., & Jin, L. (2024). *Transforming medical regulations into numbers: Vectorizing a decade of medical device regulatory shifts in the USA, EU, and China*.
15. Nielson, M., & Hancher, M. (2020). *A global view of standards for open image data formats and repositories*.
16. Innovative and harmonising access and requirements amid the global regulatory challenges of biologics. Regul Rapporteur. 2023;
17. Kim SC, Sarpatwari A, Gagne JJ. Uptake of Biosimilars in the US: Lessons from Real-World Data. JAMA. 2022;327(14):1335–6.
18. Schneider CK, Vleminckx C. Biosimilars in the EU: Scientific and regulatory challenges. Trends Biotechnol. 2018;36(10):1104-11.
19. Weise M, et al. Biosimilars: What clinicians should know. Blood. 2012;120(26):5111-7.
20. Global Regulatory Landscape: Regional Differences in Strategy Development. Makrocare. 2025;
21. FDA works through ICH to support global drug development. FDA CDER Conversations. 2023;
22. Comparing FDA, EMA, and CDSCO regulatory frameworks. Companys Connects. 2025;
23. Understanding PMDA legislation compared to FDA and EMA. LinkedIn Pulse. 2024;
24. Overview on Pharmaceutical Regulatory Agencies. JETIR. 2024;11(12):166-72.
25. A comparison of US, Europe, Japan and India biosimilar regulation. IJDRA. 2025;
26. Current regulatory requirements for biosimilars in BRICS-TM countries. PMC. 2021;
27. US, EU, and Japanese regulatory guidelines for development of drugs. PMC. 2020;
28. Comparative study of updated clinical trial regulations in India. IJDRA. 2024;
29. International Regulatory Harmonization – FDA. FDA.gov. 2025;
30. ICH official site. ich.org. 2025;