Available online on 15 Mar, 2026 at https://ijdra.com/index.php/journal

International Journal of Drug Regulatory Affairs

Published by Diva Enterprises Pvt. Ltd., New Delhi
Associated with Delhi Pharmaceutical Sciences & Research University

Review Article **Open Access**

Global Regulatory Frameworks for Drug Approval: A Comparative Review of USFDA, EMA, and CDSCO

Anand Mane*, Sudarshan Nagrale

Department of Regulatory Affairs, Dattakala College of Pharmacy Swami-Chincholi, Pune.

Abstract

The drug approval process is a critical regulatory functiorilen designed to ensure that medicinal products entering the market meet established standards of safety, efficacy, and quality. In an increasingly globalized pharmaceutical environment, understanding variations in regulatory frameworks across major jurisdictions is essential for effective drug development and regulatory strategy. Regulatory authorities such as the United States Food and Drug Administration (USFDA), the European Medicines Agency (EMA), and the Central Drugs Standard Control Organization (CDSCO) play pivotal role in shaping global drug approval practices. This review provides a comprehensive comparative analysis of the regulatory frameworks governing drug approval in the United States, European Union, and India. Key aspects examined include organizational structures, approval pathways, submission requirements, review timelines, accelerated approval mechanisms, benefit–risk assessment approaches, and post-marketing surveillance systems. Information was compiled from official regulatory guidelines, international harmonization documents, and peer-reviewed literature to ensure accuracy and relevance. The analysis reveals that while USFDA and EMA operate through highly structured and transparent regulatory systems with well-defined accelerated pathways, CDSCO has made significant progress in aligning its regulatory processes with international standards through adoption of ICH guidelines and regulatory reforms. Nonetheless, differences persist in approval timelines, documentation requirements, and post-authorization obligations, which may influence global drug development strategies. Overall, continued regulatory harmonization, reliance-based approaches, and international collaboration are essential to streamline approval processes and enhance patient access to innovative therapies. This review offers valuable insights for regulatory professionals, researchers, and postgraduate students involved in global regulatory affairs and pharmaceutical development. Overall, while USFDA and EMA demonstrate mature, highly structured regulatory systems with well-established expedited pathways, CDSCO is rapidly evolving through regulatory reforms and ICH alignment. Persistent differences in timelines, documentation, and post-authorization requirements continue to influence global development strategies. Strengthened regulatory harmonization, reliance mechanisms, and international collaboration remain essential to accelerate patient access to safe and effective medicines worldwide.

Conclusion: Drug approval frameworks in the US, EU, and India aim to ensure safe and effective medicines, though differences exist in regulatory processes and timelines. While USFDA and EMA represent mature regulatory systems, CDSCO is rapidly advancing through regulatory reforms and ICH harmonization. Greater global collaboration and regulatory alignment are essential to improve efficiency and accelerate patient access to innovative therapies.

Keywords: USFDA; EMA; CDSCO; drug approval; regulatory frameworks

Article Info: Received 02 Feb 2026; Review Completed 03 Mar 2026; Accepted 08 Mar 2026

Cite this article as:
Mane A, Nagrale S. Global Regulatory Frameworks for Drug Approval: A Comparative Review of USFDA, EMA, and CDSCO. Int. J. Drug Reg. Affairs [Internet]. 2026 Mar 15 [cited 2026 Mar 15]; 14(1):33-41. Available from: https://ijdra.com/index.php/journal/article/view/852

DOI: 10.22270/ijdra.v14i1.852
*Corresponding author. E-mail address: anandmane.ra@gmail.com (A. Mane)

1. Introduction

The process of drug approval represents a critical regulatory function aimed at safeguarding public health by ensuring that pharmaceutical products entering the market are safe, effective, and of high quality. With the rapid globalization of pharmaceutical research and development, regulatory systems have evolved to address the complexities associated with multinational clinical trials, diverse patient populations, and accelerated innovation in drug discovery. (1) Regulatory authorities play a pivotal role in balancing timely patient access to novel therapies with rigorous scientific evaluation and risk management. In the contemporary pharmaceutical landscape, drug development is no longer confined to a single geographical region. (2) Sponsors increasingly seek simultaneous or sequential approvals across multiple regulatory jurisdictions, necessitating a comprehensive understanding of global regulatory frameworks. Differences in regulatory requirements, review timelines, data expectations, and post-approval obligations can significantly influence development strategies, cost, and time to market. Consequently, regulatory harmonization and reliance mechanisms have emerged as key priorities for both regulators and industry stakeholders. Among the global regulatory authorities, the United States Food and

Drug Administration (USFDA), the European Medicines Agency (EMA), and the Central Drugs Standard Control Organization (CDSCO) are of particular importance. (3) The USFDA is recognized for its science-driven and transparent review processes, often setting regulatory benchmarks that influence global standards. The EMA oversees centralized drug approvals across the European Union, facilitating uniform access to medicines while coordinating scientific expertise from multiple member states. CDSCO, as India's national regulatory authority, has undergone substantial reforms in recent years to align its regulatory processes with international standards, reflecting India's growing role as a global pharmaceutical hub. (4) Despite sharing a common objective of protecting public health, these agencies operate within distinct legal, administrative, and socio-economic contexts, resulting in notable differences in regulatory pathways, clinical trial requirements, submission formats, and approval timelines. Understanding these similarities and differences is essential for regulatory professionals, researchers, and policymakers involved in global drug development and lifecycle management. (5)

This review aims to provide a comparative analysis of the drug approval frameworks of USFDA, EMA, and CDSCO, focusing on their regulatory structures, approval pathways, review processes, and post-marketing requirements. By critically examining these systems, the article seeks to highlight areas of convergence, existing regulatory challenges, and future opportunities for harmonization. Such insights are particularly valuable for postgraduate students and professionals in regulatory affairs, enabling informed decision-making in an increasingly interconnected regulatory environment.

2. Overview of Drug Regulatory Agencies

Drug regulatory agencies are responsible for the scientific evaluation, authorization, and continuous monitoring of pharmaceutical products to ensure their safety, efficacy, and quality. While their core objectives remain similar across jurisdictions, the regulatory frameworks, approval mechanisms, and operational structures vary depending on legal mandates, public health priorities, and regional healthcare needs. This section provides an overview of the three major regulatory authorities USFDA, EMA, and CDSCO that significantly influence global drug development and regulatory strategies. (6)

2.1 United States Food and Drug Administration (USFDA)

The United States Food and Drug Administration (USFDA) is the federal agency responsible for regulating drugs, biologics, medical devices, and other health-related products in the United States. Operating under the authority of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic (FD&C) Act, the USFDA ensures that approved pharmaceutical products meet established standards of safety, efficacy, and quality before entering the U.S. market. Within the USFDA, the Center for Drug Evaluation and Research (CDER) oversees the approval of small-molecule drugs, while the Center for Biologics Evaluation and Research (CBER) regulates biological products, including vaccines and gene therapies. The agency adopts a highly science-driven regulatory approach, relying on extensive preclinical and clinical data to support benefit–risk assessments. The Investigational New Drug (IND) application is a critical prerequisite for initiating clinical trials, followed by submission of a New Drug Application (NDA) or Biologics License Application (BLA) for marketing approval. (7) The USFDA is known for its well-defined review timelines under the Prescription Drug User Fee Act (PDUFA) and for offering several expedited approval pathways, such as Fast Track, Breakthrough Therapy, Accelerated Approval, and Priority Review. These mechanisms are designed to facilitate faster access to therapies addressing unmet medical needs. Additionally, the USFDA places strong emphasis on post-marketing surveillance through systems such as Risk Evaluation and Mitigation Strategies (REMS) and the FDA Adverse Event Reporting System (FAERS). (8)

2.2 European Medicines Agency (EMA)

The European Medicines Agency (EMA) is the centralized regulatory authority responsible for the scientific evaluation and supervision of medicinal products within the European Union (EU). Established to harmonize regulatory decision-making across EU member states, the EMA plays a crucial role in facilitating uniform access to safe and effective medicines across Europe. The primary scientific body within the EMA is the Committee for Medicinal Products for Human Use (CHMP), which conducts benefit–risk assessments of marketing authorization applications. The Centralized Procedure is mandatory for certain categories of products, including biotechnology-derived medicines, orphan drugs, and advanced therapy medicinal products (ATMPs), and results in a single marketing authorization valid across all EU member states. The EMA also supports alternative authorization pathways such as the Decentralized Procedure (DCP) and Mutual Recognition Procedure (MRP), allowing flexibility in approvals across different EU countries. The agency has introduced initiatives like PRIME (Priority Medicines) to accelerate the development of medicines targeting unmet clinical needs. Post-authorization, the EMA enforces stringent pharmacovigilance requirements through Periodic Safety Update Reports (PSURs) and the EudraVigilance system. Transparency, scientific collaboration, and regulatory convergence are central to EMA's operations, making it a key contributor to international regulatory harmonization efforts. (9)

2.3 Central Drugs Standard Control Organization (CDSCO)

The Central Drugs Standard Control Organization (CDSCO) is India's national regulatory authority responsible for the approval and regulation of drugs, medical devices, and clinical trials. CDSCO functions under the Ministry of Health and Family Welfare, with regulatory authority derived from the Drugs and Cosmetics Act, 1940, and its subsequent amendments. In recent years, CDSCO has undergone significant regulatory transformation with the implementation of the New Drugs and Clinical Trials (NDCT) Rules, 2019, which aim to streamline approval processes, enhance transparency, and align Indian regulations with

international standards. The agency is responsible for approving new drugs, fixed-dose combinations, biologics, and vaccines, as well as granting permission for clinical trials conducted in India. The Drug Controller General of India (DCGI) serves as the central licensing authority and is supported by expert committees such as the Subject Expert Committees (SECs) for scientific evaluation. CDSCO has adopted several ICH guidelines, including those related to quality, safety, and efficacy, and has introduced electronic submission systems to facilitate regulatory efficiency. Post-marketing surveillance in India is managed through the Pharmacovigilance Programme of India (PvPI), which monitors adverse drug reactions and ensures ongoing assessment of benefit–risk profiles. Although challenges related to infrastructure and resource constraints persist, CDSCO continues to evolve as a globally significant regulatory authority, particularly given India's role as a major producer of generic medicines and vaccines. (10)

Table 1. Organizational Structure of Regulatory Agencies

Feature	USFDA	EMA	CDSCO
Legal Authority	FD&C Act	EU Regulations (Centralized, DCP, MRP)	Drugs & Cosmetics Act
Responsible Center	CDER, CBER	CHMP & Scientific Committees	DCGI & Subject Expert Committees
Scope	Drugs, Biologics, Devices	Drugs, Biologics, Advanced Therapies	Drugs, Biologics, Vaccines, FDCs
Regional Jurisdiction	USA	European Union	India
Transparency	Advisory Committee meetings, review summaries	EPARs, public assessment reports	Increasing transparency; Clinical trial approvals online

3. Regulatory Approval Pathways

Regulatory approval pathways define the structured processes through which pharmaceutical products are evaluated prior to marketing authorization. These pathways are designed to ensure that medicines meet predefined standards of quality, safety, and efficacy, while also enabling timely patient access to innovative therapies. Although USFDA, EMA, and CDSCO share common scientific principles, their approval pathways differ in terms of application types, procedural steps, documentation requirements, and regulatory timelines. A comparative understanding of these pathways is essential for effective global regulatory planning. (11)

3.1 Types of Marketing Authorization Applications

Each regulatory authority has established specific application types tailored to different categories of pharmaceutical products. In the United States, the USFDA primarily reviews New Drug Applications (NDAs) for small-molecule drugs and Biologics License Applications (BLAs) for biological products. Generic drugs are evaluated through Abbreviated New Drug Applications (ANDAs), which rely on demonstration of bioequivalence rather than independent clinical efficacy studies. Additionally, supplemental NDAs are used for post-approval changes such as new indications or formulation modifications. The EMA evaluates medicinal products through Marketing Authorization Applications (MAAs). Depending on the product type and intended market, applications may follow the Centralized Procedure, Decentralized Procedure, Mutual Recognition Procedure, or National Procedure. The centralized pathway is mandatory for biotechnology products, orphan drugs, and advanced therapies, ensuring a single authorization valid across all EU member states. In India, CDSCO reviews applications for new drugs, biologics, vaccines, fixed-dose combinations (FDCs), and biosimilars under the provisions of the New Drugs and Clinical Trials Rules, 2019. Approval pathways are determined based on factors such as prior global approval, clinical trial requirements, and public health relevance. India has also introduced accelerated approval mechanisms for drugs addressing unmet medical needs and national health priorities. (12)

3.2 Preclinical and Clinical Development Requirements

Preclinical evaluation forms the foundation of drug development across all three regulatory jurisdictions. Sponsors are required to submit data from pharmacological, toxicological, and pharmacokinetic studies to support the initiation of human trials. The USFDA mandates submission of an Investigational New Drug (IND) application prior to the commencement of clinical trials. The IND includes preclinical data, manufacturing information, and clinical trial protocols. Similarly, the EMA requires a Clinical Trial Application (CTA), evaluated by national competent authorities and ethics committees within EU member states. In India, CDSCO grants permission for clinical trials through an online application system, with scientific review conducted by Subject Expert Committees. Clinical development is generally structured into Phase I, II, and III trials across all regions. However, differences exist in trial design expectations, local subject enrollment requirements, and regulatory oversight mechanisms. Recent reforms in India have aimed to reduce approval timelines while strengthening ethical review and participant safety. (13)

3.3 Submission Formats and Documentation

Harmonized submission formats play a critical role in facilitating global drug development. The Common Technical Document (CTD), developed by the International Council for Harmonisation (ICH), serves as the standard dossier structure for regulatory submissions. The USFDA and EMA have fully adopted the electronic Common Technical Document (eCTD) format, enabling standardized electronic submissions and lifecycle

management. CDSCO has also implemented eCTD-based submissions in recent years, representing a significant step toward global regulatory convergence. The CTD structure comprises five modules, covering administrative information, summaries, quality data, nonclinical studies, and clinical study reports. Despite the harmonized structure, regional variations exist in administrative requirements, labeling formats, and local regulatory documentation, necessitating region-specific adaptations by sponsors. (14)

Table 2. Comparative Documentation Requirements for Drug Approval

Documentation Component	USFDA	EMA	CDSCO
Administrative Information	Form FDA 356h, labeling, patent certification	Application form, SmPC, labeling	Form CT-21/CT-22, administrative dossier
Quality (CMC) Data	Detailed manufacturing & validation data	Complete quality dossier as per CTD Module 3	Manufacturing & stability data required
Non-Clinical Studies	Pharmacology, toxicology, PK studies	GLP-compliant nonclinical data	Nonclinical safety data required
Clinical Data	Phase I–III clinical trial reports	Clinical overview & study reports	Global + local clinical data (if required)
Bioequivalence Data	Mandatory for ANDA	Required for generics/hybrids	Mandatory for generic approvals
Risk Management Documentation	REMS (if applicable)	Risk Management Plan (RMP)	Risk mitigation & safety monitoring plan
Electronic Submission	Mandatory eCTD	Mandatory eCTD	eCTD increasingly implemented

3.4 Review Processes and Decision-Making

Following dossier submission, regulatory authorities conduct comprehensive scientific assessments to evaluate benefit–risk profiles. The USFDA employs multidisciplinary review teams and advisory committee consultations when necessary. EMA's assessments are coordinated through the CHMP, incorporating expertise from multiple EU member states. CDSCO relies on Subject Expert Committees and technical review panels to support regulatory decisions. Approval decisions may result in full approval, conditional approval, or requests for additional data, depending on the strength of the submitted evidence. Increasingly, regulators are utilizing rolling reviews and reliance mechanisms to improve efficiency and responsiveness during public health emergencies. (15)

Table 3. Regulatory Approval Pathways

Aspect	USFDA	EMA	CDSCO
Submission Type	NDA/BLA, ANDA, Supplemental NDA	MAA (Centralized/Decentralized/Mutual Recognition/National)	New Drug Application, FDC, Biologics, Clinical Trial Application
Preclinical Requirement	IND submission	CTA submission	Permission from CDSCO + SEC review
Clinical Trial Phases	Phase I–III	Phase I–III	Phase I–III (local trials may be required)
Submission Format	eCTD	eCTD	eCTD (recent)
Review Timeline	Standard: 10 months, Priority: 6 months	~210 days + clock stops	Variable; accelerated for recognized drugs or urgent needs

4. Review Timelines and Accelerated Approval Pathways

The duration of regulatory review is a critical determinant of the time required for a drug to reach patients. Regulatory authorities strive to balance thorough scientific evaluation with timely access to innovative therapies, particularly for serious and life-threatening conditions. To achieve this balance, agencies such as the USFDA, EMA, and CDSCO have established defined review timelines and introduced accelerated approval mechanisms to address unmet medical needs. (16)

4.1 Standard Review Timelines

In the United States, the review timelines for NDAs and BLAs are governed by the Prescription Drug User Fee Act (PDUFA). Under the standard review process, the USFDA aims to complete its assessment within 10 months from the date of application acceptance, while priority review applications are targeted for completion within 6 months. These timelines enhance predictability for sponsors and facilitate efficient regulatory planning. The EMA follows a centralized review timeline of approximately 210 active review days, excluding clock-stop periods during which sponsors respond to regulatory queries. The assessment is conducted in two major phases, culminating in a scientific opinion by the CHMP. Upon a positive recommendation, the European Commission grants the final marketing authorization, typically within an additional 60–70 days. In India, CDSCO has made significant efforts to define and reduce review timelines, particularly following the implementation of the New Drugs and Clinical Trials

Rules, 2019. While review durations may vary depending on product complexity and data completeness, the regulatory authority aims to expedite approvals for drugs that have already been approved by recognized international agencies or that address critical public health needs. (17)

4.2 Accelerated and Expedited Approval Mechanisms

To facilitate early patient access to promising therapies, all three regulatory authorities have implemented expedited approval pathways. The USFDA offers multiple accelerated programs, including Fast Track Designation, Breakthrough Therapy Designation, Accelerated Approval, and Priority Review. These pathways allow for enhanced regulatory interaction, rolling submissions, and approval based on surrogate endpoints, particularly for therapies targeting serious conditions with unmet medical needs. The EMA has introduced similar initiatives, most notably the PRIME (Priority Medicines) scheme, which provides early and proactive regulatory support to developers of innovative medicines. In addition, Conditional Marketing Authorization and Accelerated Assessment pathways enable earlier approval based on less comprehensive clinical data, subject to post-authorization obligations. (18) CDSCO has also incorporated expedited review provisions for drugs addressing unmet medical needs, rare diseases, and national health priorities. Provisions such as waiver of local clinical trials for drugs approved by major international regulators and accelerated evaluation during public health emergencies reflect India's evolving regulatory flexibility. (19)

4.3 Impact of Accelerated Pathways on Drug Development

Accelerated approval mechanisms have significantly influenced global drug development strategies by reducing time to market and encouraging innovation in areas of high unmet need. However, these pathways also increase the importance of robust post-marketing surveillance and risk management plans, as approvals may be granted based on limited clinical evidence. Regulatory agencies increasingly emphasize lifecycle-based regulation, wherein post-approval commitments play a vital role in confirming long-term safety and efficacy. The convergence of expedited pathways across USFDA, EMA, and CDSCO reflects a global shift toward adaptive regulatory frameworks. (20)

Table 4. Accelerated Approval & Expedited Pathways (21)

Program/Pathway	USFDA	EMA	CDSCO
Fast Track / Priority	Fast Track, Breakthrough Therapy, Accelerated Approval, Priority Review	Accelerated Assessment	Accelerated approval for drugs addressing unmet needs
Conditional Approval	N/A	Conditional Marketing Authorization	Conditional approvals for urgent public health needs
Early Interaction	Rolling Review, Scientific Advice	PRIME	Early consultation via SECs
Post-Approval Requirement	REMS, PMRs/PMCs	RMPs, PSURs	Post-marketing studies, PvPI reporting

5. Benefit–Risk Assessment and Decision-Making

Benefit–risk assessment is a central component of regulatory decision-making and serves as the scientific foundation for drug approval. Regulatory authorities evaluate whether the therapeutic benefits of a medicinal product outweigh its potential risks under the proposed conditions of use. Although USFDA, EMA, and CDSCO share common scientific principles in benefit–risk evaluation, differences exist in assessment methodologies, advisory mechanisms, and transparency practices. (22)

5.1 Scientific Evaluation of Benefit–Risk Profile

All three regulatory agencies assess benefit–risk profiles using comprehensive data derived from preclinical studies, clinical trials, and quality evaluations. Key factors considered include therapeutic efficacy, safety margins, dose–response relationships, target population characteristics, and availability of alternative treatments. The USFDA employs a structured benefit–risk framework that integrates clinical outcomes, patient perspectives, and unmet medical needs. Quantitative and qualitative data are analyzed to determine whether observed benefits justify identified risks. Similarly, the EMA utilizes a systematic approach guided by CHMP assessment reports, which emphasize consistency, transparency, and scientific rigor. In India, CDSCO evaluates benefit–risk profiles through expert committee recommendations, with increasing emphasis on evidence-based decision-making and global regulatory reliance. (23)

5.2 Role of Advisory Committees and Expert Panels

Advisory committees play a critical role in supporting regulatory decisions by providing independent scientific and clinical expertise. In the USFDA, advisory committees such as the Oncologic Drugs Advisory Committee (ODAC) or Cardiovascular and Renal Drugs Advisory Committee review complex or high-impact applications. These committees conduct public meetings, enhancing transparency and stakeholder engagement. The EMA relies on scientific committees including the Committee for Medicinal Products for Human Use (CHMP) and specialized working parties. Their opinions are publicly available, contributing to regulatory transparency and trust. (24) CDSCO is supported by Subject Expert Committees (SECs) and technical panels that evaluate clinical data and provide recommendations to the Drug Controller General of India (DCGI). Recent reforms have strengthened documentation of expert opinions and public disclosure of regulatory decisions. (25)

5.3 Transparency and Regulatory Communication

Transparency in regulatory decision-making is essential for public confidence and stakeholder engagement. The USFDA publishes approval letters, review summaries, and advisory committee transcripts, providing insight into regulatory reasoning. The EMA further enhances transparency through European Public Assessment Reports (EPARs), which detail the scientific basis for approval or rejection. (26) Historically, CDSCO has faced challenges related to transparency; however, recent initiatives have improved public access to regulatory information, including clinical trial approvals, regulatory decisions, and safety communications.

5.4 Post-Decision Commitments and Risk Management

Regulatory decisions may include post-approval commitments to address residual uncertainties. These may involve additional clinical studies, real-world evidence generation, or enhanced pharmacovigilance activities. The USFDA may impose Risk Evaluation and Mitigation Strategies (REMS), while the EMA requires Risk Management Plans (RMPs) as part of marketing authorization. CDSCO increasingly mandates post-marketing studies and safety monitoring under the Pharmacovigilance Programme of India (PvPI). (27)

6. Post-Approval Requirements and Pharmacovigilance

Regulatory oversight of medicinal products continues beyond initial market authorization through structured post-approval requirements and pharmacovigilance systems. These mechanisms are essential for detecting rare adverse events, evaluating long-term safety and effectiveness, and ensuring continued benefit–risk balance throughout a product's lifecycle. USFDA, EMA, and CDSCO have established comprehensive post-marketing surveillance frameworks tailored to their regulatory environments. (28)

Table 5. Lifecycle Management and Post-Approval Variations

Lifecycle Activity	USFDA	EMA	CDSCO
Post-Approval Changes	Supplements (PAS, CBE-30, CBE-0)	Type IA, IB, Type II Variations	Prior approval or notification system
Manufacturing Site Change	Requires regulatory submission	Variation procedure	CDSCO approval required
Periodic Safety Reporting	PADER / FAERS reporting	PSUR submission	PvPI safety reporting
Renewal of Marketing Authorization	Not time-limited (generally)	Renewal every 5 years initially	Periodic license renewal
Signal Detection & Risk Monitoring	Active surveillance systems	EudraVigilance monitoring	PvPI ADR monitoring
Product Withdrawal Mechanism	Safety recall authority	EU-wide suspension/withdrawal	CDSCO recall procedures

6.1 Post-Marketing Surveillance Systems

In the United States, post-marketing safety monitoring is conducted through the FDA Adverse Event Reporting System (FAERS), which collects reports from healthcare professionals, manufacturers, and consumers. Marketing authorization holders are legally obligated to submit periodic safety reports, serious adverse event notifications, and post-approval study data. The USFDA may require additional studies under Post-Marketing Requirements (PMRs) or Post-Marketing Commitments (PMCs) to further characterize safety risks. The EMA oversees pharmacovigilance activities through EudraVigilance, a centralized database for managing adverse drug reaction reports across the European Union. Marketing authorization holders must submit Periodic Safety Update Reports (PSURs) and comply with the EU pharmacovigilance legislation, which emphasizes proactive risk management and signal detection. Regular safety evaluations ensure timely regulatory interventions when necessary. (29) In India, post-marketing surveillance is managed under the Pharmacovigilance Programme of India (PvPI), coordinated by the Indian Pharmacopoeia Commission. Adverse drug reaction data are collected through a network of monitoring centers across the country. CDSCO mandates post-marketing studies and safety reporting to ensure ongoing evaluation of approved medicines, particularly for newly introduced or accelerated-approval products. (30)

6.2 Risk Management Strategies

Risk management is a key component of post-approval regulation. The USFDA may require Risk Evaluation and Mitigation Strategies (REMS) for drugs with serious safety concerns, incorporating measures such as medication guides, restricted distribution systems, or prescriber training programs. The EMA mandates the submission of Risk Management Plans (RMPs) for all new medicinal products. RMPs outline identified and potential risks, pharmacovigilance activities, and risk minimization measures, ensuring systematic monitoring throughout the product lifecycle. (31) CDSCO increasingly aligns with global practices by requiring risk mitigation measures and enhanced safety monitoring for certain high-risk products. The strengthening of pharmacovigilance infrastructure in India reflects a growing commitment to patient safety and regulatory convergence. (32)

6.3 Regulatory Actions and Labeling Updates

Post-marketing data may lead to regulatory actions such as labeling changes, safety warnings, usage restrictions, or product withdrawals. The USFDA, EMA, and CDSCO regularly update prescribing information based on emerging safety evidence. These actions highlight the dynamic nature of regulatory oversight and the importance of continuous data evaluation. (33)

Table 6. Post-Marketing Surveillance and Pharmacovigilance (34,35)

Feature	USFDA	EMA	CDSCO
Adverse Event Reporting	FAERS	EudraVigilance	PvPI
Post-Marketing Studies	PMRs/PMCs	PSURs	Mandatory post-marketing studies for selected drugs
Risk Management	REMS	RMPs	Risk mitigation measures increasing, under PvPI
Label Updates	Labeling changes, safety communications	Label updates via EPARs	Labeling updates based on PvPI feedback
Public Access	Review summaries, advisory committee transcripts	EPAR public reports	Clinical trial approvals online; safety communications improving

7. Harmonization and International Regulatory Collaboration

Global harmonization of regulatory standards is critical for facilitating efficient drug development, reducing duplication of efforts, and ensuring consistent evaluation of medicinal products across regions. International collaboration among regulatory authorities has significantly influenced the convergence of regulatory requirements among USFDA, EMA, and CDSCO. (36)

7.1 Role of the International Council for Harmonisation (ICH)

The International Council for Harmonisation of Technical Requirements for Pharmaceuticals for Human Use (ICH) has played a pivotal role in aligning regulatory standards related to quality, safety, efficacy, and multidisciplinary aspects of drug development. Guidelines such as the Common Technical Document (CTD) and Good Clinical Practice (GCP) have been adopted by USFDA and EMA and increasingly implemented by CDSCO. India's participation in ICH as a regulatory member has accelerated the adoption of harmonized guidelines, improving global acceptability of clinical and manufacturing data generated within the country. (37)

7.2 Reliance and Work-Sharing Mechanisms

Regulatory reliance mechanisms enable authorities to leverage assessments conducted by trusted reference agencies. The EMA and USFDA actively engage in information sharing and parallel scientific advice initiatives. CDSCO has introduced reliance-based approaches, particularly for drugs approved by major international regulators, to reduce review timelines and enhance efficiency. Such collaborative strategies support resource optimization while maintaining high regulatory standards. (38)

7.3 Future Directions in Regulatory Convergence

Advances in digital technologies, real-world evidence, and artificial intelligence are expected to further transform regulatory practices. Increased reliance on electronic submissions, global clinical trial data, and adaptive regulatory frameworks will continue to shape the future of drug approval. Enhanced collaboration among USFDA, EMA, and CDSCO is essential for addressing emerging challenges such as personalized medicine, advanced therapies, and global health emergencies. (39)

8. Challenges and Opportunities in Global Drug Regulatory Frameworks

Despite significant progress toward regulatory convergence, global drug approval processes continue to face multiple challenges arising from jurisdictional, scientific, and operational differences. One of the primary challenges is the variation in regulatory requirements, including differences in clinical trial design expectations, data interpretation, labeling standards, and post-marketing obligations. These disparities can increase development costs and delay patient access to innovative therapies. (40) Another major challenge is the resource and infrastructure gap among regulatory authorities. While agencies such as the USFDA and EMA benefit from extensive scientific expertise and digital infrastructure, emerging regulatory systems, including CDSCO, continue to strengthen capacity in areas such as pharmacovigilance, real-world evidence evaluation, and advanced therapy regulation. Ensuring consistent regulatory quality across regions remains a key concern. The rapid evolution of innovative therapies, including biologics, gene therapies, and personalized medicines, presents additional regulatory complexities. Existing frameworks often require adaptation to accommodate novel mechanisms of action, complex manufacturing processes, and limited clinical datasets. Furthermore, accelerated approval pathways, while beneficial for timely access, increase dependence on robust post-marketing surveillance and real-world evidence generation. (41) Despite these challenges, significant opportunities exist to enhance global regulatory efficiency. Increased adoption of regulatory reliance, work-sharing models, and joint scientific advice programs can reduce duplication of efforts and optimize resource utilization. Digital transformation, including electronic submissions, artificial intelligence–based data analysis, and integrated safety databases, offers promising avenues for improving regulatory decision-making. (42) For regulatory professionals and pharmaceutical sponsors, understanding and navigating these evolving frameworks provides strategic advantages in global drug development and market access planning.

9. Conclusion

The regulatory frameworks governing drug approval by the USFDA, EMA, and CDSCO play a critical role in ensuring the safety, efficacy, and quality of medicinal products worldwide. Although these agencies operate under distinct legal and administrative environments,

they share a common commitment to public health protection and scientific rigor. This comparative review highlights both the similarities and differences in regulatory structures, approval pathways, review timelines, benefit–risk assessment approaches, and post-marketing requirements among the three authorities. The increasing adoption of harmonized guidelines, electronic submission systems, and reliance-based approaches reflects a global shift toward regulatory convergence. Continued collaboration among regulatory agencies, supported by international organizations such as the ICH, will be essential for addressing emerging challenges posed by innovative therapies and global health crises. Strengthening regulatory capacity, enhancing transparency, and leveraging digital technologies can further improve regulatory efficiency and patient access to safe and effective medicines. For postgraduate students, researchers, and regulatory professionals, a comprehensive understanding of these global regulatory frameworks is indispensable for effective participation in modern pharmaceutical development and regulatory affairs practice.

Acknowledgements

I would like to express my sincere gratitude to Dr. Sudarshan Nagrale for their valuable feedback and support throughout the review and publication process.

Conflict of Interest

he author declares that there is no conflict of interest regarding the publication of this article.

Financial Disclosure statement:

The authors have no relevant affiliations or financial involvement with any organization or entity with a financial interest in or financial conflict with the subject matter or materials discussed in the manuscript. This includes employment, consultancies, honoraria, stock ownership or options, expert testimony, grants or patents received or pending, or royalties.

Reference

1. Ajmal CS, Yerram S, Abishek V, Muhammed Nizam VP, Aglave G, Patnam JD, et al. Innovative approaches in regulatory affairs: Leveraging artificial intelligence and machine learning for efficient compliance and decision-making. AAPS J [Internet]. 2025 [cited 2026 Feb 18]; 27:22. Available from: doi:10.1208/s12248-024-01002-w
2. Bishnoi M, Sonker A. Emergency use authorization of medicines: History and ethical dilemma. Perspect Clin Res [Internet]. 2023 [cited 2026 Feb 18];14(2):49-55. Available from: doi:10.4103/picr.picr_149_22
3. Collier R, Singh A, Chopra S. Harnessing AI/ML in drug and biological products discovery and development: The regulatory perspective. Pharmaceuticals (Basel) [Internet]. 2025 [cited 2026 Feb 18];18(1):47. Available from: doi:10.3390/ph18010047
4. Di Bello F, Russo E, Sartori M. Enhancing regulatory affairs in the market placing of new medical devices: How LLMs like ChatGPT may support regulatory processes. AboutOpen [Internet]. 2024 [cited 2026 Feb 18];11(1):77-88. Available from: doi:10.33393/ao.2024.3302
5. Dawar V, Sharma A, Mittal V, Sharma D. Global harmonization in drug approval: Bridging regulatory and clinical trial diversity. Curr Indian Sci [Internet]. 2024 [cited 2026 Feb 18];2(3). Available from: https://www.eurekaselect.com/article/152088
6. Liu Q, Huang R, Hsieh J, Zhu H, Tiwari M, Liu G, et al. Landscape analysis of artificial intelligence and machine learning in regulatory submissions for drug development from 2016–2021. Clin Pharmacol Ther [Internet]. 2023 [cited 2026 Feb 18];113(4):771-4. Available from: doi:10.1002/cpt.2668
7. Niazi SK, Al-Shaqha WM, Mirza Z. Proposal of International Council for Harmonization guideline for approval of biosimilars. J Mark Access Health Policy [Internet]. 2022 [cited 2026 Feb 18];11(1). Available from: doi:10.1080/20016689.2022.2147286
8. Pantanowitz L, Hanna M, Pantanowitz J, Lennerz J, Henricks WH, Shen P, et al. Regulatory aspects of artificial intelligence and machine learning. Arch Pathol Lab Med [Internet]. 2024 [cited 2026 Feb 18];148(10):1185-94. Available from: doi:10.5858/arpa.2023-0123-RA
9. Suresh V, Kumar KS. Approval and marketing of medical products in EU, USA, India and Australia. Asian J Med Pharm Sci [Internet]. 2023 [cited 2026 Feb 18];11(1):73-82. Available from: doi:10.30904/j.ajmps.2023.4619
10. Sireesha B, Haritha S, Lakshmi Thriveni S, Nikitha P, Vijaya Lakshmi UVS. Regulatory affairs and regulatory requirements for new drug approval. Int J Health Care Biol Sci [Internet]. 2024 [cited 2026 Feb 18];5(4):22-28. Available from: doi:10.46795/ijhcbs.v5i4.643
11. Beninger P. Signal management in pharmacovigilance: A review of activities and case studies. Clin Ther [Internet]. 2020 [cited 2026 Feb 18];42(6):1110-29. Available from: doi:10.1016/j.clinthera.2020.03.018
12. Craveiro NS, Lopes BS, Tomás L, Almeida SF. Drug withdrawal due to safety: A review supporting withdrawal decisions. Curr Drug Saf [Internet]. 2020 [cited 2026 Feb 18];15(1):4-12. Available from: doi:10.2174/1574886314666191004092520
13. Gozzo L. Pharmacovigilance and appropriate drug use. Healthcare [Internet]. 2024 [cited 2026 Feb 18];12(6):669. Available from: doi:10.3390/healthcare12060669
14. Holm JEJ, Ruppert JG, Ramsden SD. Impact of changing regulations on lifecycle safety concerns. Pharm Med [Internet]. 2022 [cited 2026 Feb 18];36(1):33-46. Available from: doi:10.1007/s40290-021-00414-8
15. Kandukuri A, Edla DR. Ensuring data safety: Pharmacovigilance processes and ADR reporting systems. Asian J Pharm Res Dev [Internet]. 2025 [cited 2026 Feb 18];13(3):1569. Available from: doi:10.22270/ajprd.v13i3.1569
16. Khan MAA, Hamid S, Khan SA, Sarfraz M, Babar ZUD. Stakeholders' views on pharmacovigilance policy coordination in Pakistan. Front Pharmacol [Internet]. 2022 [cited 2026 Feb 18];13:891954. Available from: doi:10.3389/fphar.2022.891954
17. Kiguba R, Olsson S, Waitt C. Pharmacovigilance in low- and middle-income countries. Br J Clin Pharmacol [Internet]. 2023 [cited 2026 Feb 18];89(2):491-509. Available from: doi:10.1111/bcp.15193
18. Lucas S, Ailani J, Smith TR, Abdrabboh A, Xue F, Navetta MS. Pharmacovigilance reporting requirements throughout product lifecycle. Ther Adv Drug Saf [Internet]. 2022 [cited 2026 Feb 18];13. Available from:

doi:10.1177/20420986221125006
19. Pozsgai K, Szűcs G, Kőnig-Péter A, Balázs O, Vajda P, Botz L, et al. Pharmacovigilance database analysis for ADRs related to falsified medical products. Front Pharmacol [Internet]. 2022 [cited 2026 Feb 18];13:964399. Available from: doi:10.3389/fphar.2022.964399
20. Rewale KS, Tuwar AB, Salve MT. A brief review on pharmacovigilance. Int J Pharm Sci Drug Anal [Internet]. 2024 [cited 2026 Feb 18];4(1):9-16. Available from: https://www.pharmacyjournal.info/archives/2024.v4.i1.A.69
21. Robinson F, Wilkes S, Schaefer N, Goldstein M, Rice M, Gray J, et al. Patient-centered pharmacovigilance priority actions. Ther Adv Drug Saf [Internet]. 2023 [cited 2026 Feb 18];14. Available from: doi:10.1177/20420986221146418
22. Sardella M, Belcher G, Lungu C, Ignoni T, Camisa M, Stenver DI, et al. Monitoring manufacturing and quality of medicines in pharmacovigilance. Ther Adv Drug Saf [Internet]. 2021 [cited 2026 Feb 18];12. Available from: doi:10.1177/20420986211038436
23. Singh A, Kumar A. Pharmacovigilance in cell and gene therapy: Regulatory perspectives. Drug Saf [Internet]. 2025 [cited 2026 Feb 18]. Available from: doi:10.1007/s40264-025-01596-9
24. CDSCO alerts: Retrospective dosage form-wise quality control analysis (2018–2023). Regul Toxicol Pharmacol [Internet]. 2025 [cited 2026 Feb 18];156:105775. Available from: doi:10.1016/j.yrtph.2025.105775
25. Alemayehu C, Mitchell G, Nikles J. Barriers for conducting clinical trials in developing countries. Int J Equity Health [Internet]. 2018 [cited 2026 Feb 18];17:37. Available from: doi:10.1186/s12939-018-0748-6
26. Almutairi K, Nossent J, Preen D, Keen H, Inderjeeth C. Global prevalence of rheumatoid arthritis: Meta-analysis. Rheumatol Int [Internet]. 2021 [cited 2026 Feb 18];41(5):863-77. Available from: doi:10.1007/s00296-020-04731-0
27. Dirks A, Florez M, Torche F, Young S, Slizgi B, Getz K. Risk-based quality management adoption in clinical trials. Ther Innov Regul Sci [Internet]. 2024 [cited 2026 Feb 18];58:520-7. Available from: doi:10.1007/s43441-024-00618-5
28. Harrold LR, Bryson J, Lehman T, et al. Association between anti-CCP antibodies and clinical response in RA patients. Rheumatol Ther [Internet]. 2021 [cited 2026 Feb 18];8(2):937-53. Available from: doi:10.1007/s40744-021-00310-2
29. International Council for Harmonisation. ICH E6(R3) Good Clinical Practice guideline [Internet]. Geneva: ICH; 2025 [cited 2026 Feb 18]. Available from: https://www.ich.org
30. Ridha A, Hussein S, AlJabban A, Gunay LM, Gorial FI, Al Ani NA. Clinical impact of seropositivity in rheumatoid arthritis treated with etanercept. Open Access Rheumatol [Internet]. 2022 [cited 2026 Feb 18];14:113-21. Available from: doi:10.2147/OARRR.S368190
31. Maurya MR, Munshi R. Safety analysis of REMS for US FDA approved drugs. Indian J Med Res [Internet]. 2024 [cited 2026 Feb 18];159(6):581-4. Available from: doi:10.25259/ijmr_350_22
32. Youssef A, Hammad TA. Pharmacovigilance due diligence in drug development. Drug Saf [Internet]. 2025 [cited 2026 Feb 18]. Available from: doi:10.1007/s40264-025-01640-8
33. Harmark L, van Grootheest AC. Pharmacovigilance: Methods and future perspectives. Eur J Clin Pharmacol [Internet]. 2008 [cited 2026 Feb 18];64(8):743-52. Available from: doi:10.1007/s00228-008-0475-9
34. Dangy-Caye A, Mousset A, Kermad A, Bouché-Bazerolle L, Bujar M, De Lucia ML, McAuslane N, Lumsden R. Harmonizing health: a global analysis of pharmaceutical regulatory activities by international regulatory organizations. Front Med (Lausanne). 2025 Sep 23; 12:1636269. doi: 10.3389/fmed.2025.1636269.
35. International Council for Harmonisation. ICH Q8-Q10 pharmaceutical quality guidelines [Internet]. Geneva: ICH; 2009 [cited 2026 Feb 18]. Available from: https://www.ich.org
36. International Council for Harmonisation. Common Technical Document M4 guideline [Internet]. Geneva: ICH; 2000 [cited 2026 Feb 18]. Available from: https://www.ich.org
37. Jeetu G, Anusha G. Pharmacovigilance: Worldwide master key for drug safety monitoring. J Young Pharm [Internet]. 2010 [cited 2026 Feb 18];2(3):315-20. Available from: doi:10.4103/0975-1483.66802
38. Leligkou HC, Gerogiannis VC. Deep transformers for ALCOA+ data integrity compliance. Appl Sci [Internet]. 2023 [cited 2026 Feb 18];13(13):7616. Available from: doi:10.3390/app13137616
39. Murali K, Kaur S, Prakash A, Medhi B. Artificial intelligence in pharmacovigilance: Practical utility. Indian J Pharmacol [Internet]. 2019 [cited 2026 Feb 18];51(6):373-6. Available from: doi:10.4103/ijp.IJP_814_19
40. Rahman MS, Rahman MK, Kaykobad M, Rahman MS. Application of LIME and SHAP in Alzheimer's disease detection. Brain Inform [Internet]. 2024 [cited 2026 Feb 18];11(1):4. Available from: doi:10.1186/s40708-024-00213-9
41. Santoro A, Genov G, Spooner A, Raine J, Arlett P. European Union pharmacovigilance system and public health protection. Drug Saf [Internet]. 2017 [cited 2026 Feb 18];40(10):855-69. Available from: doi:10.1007/s40264-017-0572-8
42. Silva MR, Santos LK, Oliveira PJ, et al. Artificial intelligence in Brazilian pharmaceutical regulation: Pilot program results. Regul Sci Med Prod. 2024;14:189-98.