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

Electronic Common Technical Document (eCTD): Structure, Submission Process, and Regulatory Updates

Pravin Salunkhe*, Sudarshan Nagrale

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

Abstract

The Electronic Common Technical Document (eCTD) has become a cornerstone in modern pharmaceutical regulatory submissions, offering a standardized, modular, and digital framework for dossier preparation and review. By integrating structured modules, XML backbone files, hyperlinks, and lifecycle management features, eCTD enhances efficiency, traceability, and compliance across multiple regulatory authorities. This review provides a comprehensive overview of eCTD, detailing its structure, submission process, regional variations, and recent regulatory updates, including the adoption of eCTD v4.0. The manuscript also examines practical insights from industry case studies, highlighting successful global submissions and lessons learned for post-approval lifecycle management. Challenges associated with eCTD implementation, such as technical complexities, regional disparities, data integrity concerns, and operational constraints, are critically discussed. Emerging trends, including artificial intelligence, automation, cloud-based platforms, and blockchain technology, are explored for their potential to improve submission accuracy, reduce review timelines, and enhance regulatory predictability. The review emphasizes the strategic role of eCTD not only as a compliance tool but also as a driver of efficiency, global harmonization, and informed decision-making in regulatory affairs. Understanding these aspects is essential for regulatory professionals, enabling optimized submission workflows and improved management of the pharmaceutical product lifecycle. Overall, eCTD has evolved from a regulatory submission format into a strategic enabler of efficiency, transparency, and global harmonization. Continued adoption of advanced digital technologies will further strengthen lifecycle management and regulatory decision-making.

Conclusion: Overall, eCTD has evolved from a regulatory submission format into a strategic enabler of efficiency, transparency, and global harmonization. Continued adoption of advanced digital technologies will further strengthen lifecycle management and regulatory decision-making.

Keywords: Electronic Common Technical Document; Regulatory Submission; Pharmaceutical Compliance; eCTD v4.0; Digital Regulatory Affairs

Article Info: Received 02 Feb 2026; Review Completed 05 Mar 2026; Accepted 09 Mar 2026

Cite this article as:
Salunkhe P, Nagrale S. Electronic Common Technical Document (eCTD): Structure, Submission Process, and Regulatory Updates. Int. J. Drug Reg. Affairs [Internet]. 2026 Mar 15 [cited 2026 Mar 15]; 14(1):42-50. Available from:
https://ijdra.com/index.php/journal/article/view/854

DOI: 10.22270/ijdra.v14i1.854
*Corresponding author. E-mail address: pravinsalunkhe065@gmail.com (P. Salunkhe)

1. Introduction

The pharmaceutical industry operates within a highly regulated environment, where the timely and accurate submission of data to regulatory authorities is critical for ensuring patient safety, product quality, and compliance. Historically, regulatory submissions were prepared in paper format, requiring extensive documentation and manual handling. The advent of the Common Technical Document (CTD) represented a major milestone in harmonizing the structure and format of regulatory submissions across different regions. (1) The CTD, established under the guidance of the International Council for Harmonisation of Technical Requirements for Pharmaceuticals for Human Use (ICH), provides a standardized framework comprising modules for administrative information, quality data, non-clinical studies, and clinical trial results. With the growing complexity of drug development, increasing dossier sizes, and the need for rapid global submissions, regulatory agencies and the pharmaceutical industry transitioned from paper CTD to electronic CTD (eCTD). The eCTD enables efficient digital submission, structured data management, and improved traceability throughout the product lifecycle. (2) It facilitates global harmonization, reduces errors associated with manual submissions, and allows regulatory authorities to perform automated validation checks prior to acceptance. Moreover, the eCTD incorporates lifecycle management features, such as version tracking, amendments, and rollbacks, which are essential for maintaining regulatory compliance during product updates or post-approval variations. (3)

The adoption of eCTD has become mandatory or strongly recommended by major regulatory authorities, including the USFDA, European Medicines Agency (EMA), Pharmaceuticals and Medical Devices Agency (PMDA), and CDSCO in India. The implementation of eCTD not only enhances submission efficiency but also streamlines communication between sponsors and regulatory authorities, facilitating faster approval timelines and improved regulatory predictability. (4) Despite its advantages, the eCTD system poses challenges related to technical requirements, regional differences, and software interoperability. Understanding the structure, submission process, and regulatory updates associated with eCTD is essential for regulatory affairs professionals, particularly in the context of global drug development. This review aims to provide a comprehensive overview of eCTD, detailing its modules, submission process, recent regulatory updates, challenges, and future directions, thereby serving as a practical guide for pharmaceutical stakeholders and academicians engaged in regulatory sciences. (5)

2. Concept and Evolution of eCTD

The Electronic Common Technical Document (eCTD) represents the digital evolution of the traditional paper-based CTD, designed to streamline regulatory submissions while maintaining global harmonization and compliance. An eCTD is a structured, standardized electronic format that allows pharmaceutical companies to submit regulatory dossiers to health authorities in a consistent and machine-readable manner. Unlike paper CTDs, which rely on physical copies and manual cross-referencing, the eCTD uses a modular structure, XML backbone files, hyperlinks, and version control mechanisms to ensure traceability, integrity, and ease of navigation. (6)

2.1 Concept of eCTD

The eCTD was introduced to address the increasing challenges of document management, submission errors, and regulatory efficiency. It allows both sponsors and regulatory authorities to handle large volumes of data systematically. Each eCTD submission includes a set of modules (Modules 1–5) that cover regional administrative information, quality data, non-clinical study results, clinical trial data, and any additional appendices. Key features of the eCTD include (7):

- **Lifecycle Management:** Each document submission is tracked with version control, allowing for updates, amendments, and rollbacks while maintaining historical records.
- **Standardized Backbone:** An XML-based backbone file organizes content hierarchically, enabling automated navigation and validation.
- **Interactivity and Hyperlinking:** Hyperlinks within the dossier allow regulatory reviewers to quickly access related sections, improving review efficiency.
- **Global Compatibility:** The eCTD structure is compatible across multiple regions, supporting international harmonization efforts and reducing the need for region-specific dossiers. (8)

2.2 Evolution of eCTD

The evolution of eCTD can be traced through three major phases:

- **Paper CTD Era:** Initially, pharmaceutical submissions were entirely paper-based, requiring extensive manual compilation, duplication, and physical transport. This process was time-consuming, error-prone, and difficult to manage, particularly for multi-region submissions. (9)
- **Introduction of Electronic Submissions:** With technological advancements in the early 2000s, regulatory authorities began accepting electronic submissions in various formats (PDFs, Word documents). While this reduced physical handling, inconsistencies in format and lack of standardization limited efficiency and review effectiveness.
- **Adoption of eCTD Standards:** To address these limitations, the ICH introduced the eCTD specification, which provided a globally accepted electronic submission format. The initial version, eCTD 1.2, focused on establishing a hierarchical structure, module organization, and backbone files. Subsequent updates, including eCTD 3.2 and the latest eCTD v4.0, expanded compatibility with new regulatory requirements, improved lifecycle management, and enhanced regional harmonization. (10)

2.3 Regulatory Harmonization and Adoption

The eCTD framework is endorsed by major regulatory authorities, facilitating global harmonization. Key agencies include:

- **USFDA (United States):** Mandatory eCTD submission for new drug applications (NDAs), biologics, and generic drugs.
- **EMA (Europe):** eCTD required for centralized procedures and voluntary for decentralized or mutual recognition procedures.
- **PMDA (Japan):** Adoption of eCTD is encouraged, with specific technical requirements for submission.
- **CDSCO (India):** Recent guidelines mandate eCTD submissions for specific drug categories, aligning India with international standards. (11)

The widespread adoption of eCTD has significantly reduced review cycles, improved data integrity, and enabled faster regulatory approvals, making it an indispensable component of modern pharmaceutical regulatory affairs.

2.4 Significance of eCTD in Modern Regulatory Affairs

The eCTD has revolutionized regulatory submissions by:

- Improving efficiency through structured digital dossiers.
- Enhancing regulatory compliance with automated validation checks.
- Enabling cross-regional submissions without duplicating data.
- Supporting post-approval lifecycle management, including amendments, renewals, and safety updates.

By providing a standardized, interoperable, and traceable framework, eCTD empowers regulatory professionals to navigate complex regulatory landscapes with greater precision and predictability. (12)

Table 1. Comparison of Paper CTD vs eCTD (13,14)

Feature	Paper CTD	eCTD	Advantage
Format	Physical documents	Digital, modular	Faster review, easier updates
Navigation	Manual	Hyperlinks, XML backbone	Efficient access to sections
Lifecycle Management	Limited	Version control, amendments tracked	Traceability and compliance
Global Harmonization	Limited	Standardized modules across regions	Multi-region submissions simplified
Data Integrity	Risk of loss/damage	Digital validation, metadata	Reduced errors and rejections

3. Structure of eCTD

The Electronic Common Technical Document (eCTD) is a standardized digital format designed to facilitate the preparation, submission, and review of regulatory dossiers. By integrating modular content with digital features such as XML backbone files, hyperlinks, and version control, the eCTD ensures traceability, data integrity, and efficient navigation. Its structure is essential for supporting regulatory compliance and effective product lifecycle management. (15)

3.1 Modular Organization

The eCTD is divided into five primary modules, each serving a distinct purpose in regulatory evaluation. Module 1 is region-specific and contains administrative and regulatory information, including application forms, cover letters, labeling documents, and correspondence with regulatory authorities. This module ensures adherence to the requirements of agencies such as the USFDA, EMA, PMDA, and CDSCO. Module 2 provides summaries of technical data from Modules 3, 4, and 5, including the Quality Overall Summary, Non-Clinical Overview, and Clinical Overview. These summaries allow reviewers to assess key information efficiently before delving into the full reports. (16)

Module 3 focuses on the quality of the drug product, encompassing chemical, manufacturing, and control documentation. It includes details of active pharmaceutical ingredients, excipients, formulation development, analytical methods, and stability studies, ensuring compliance with Good Manufacturing Practices (GMP). Module 4 contains non-clinical study reports, covering pharmacology, pharmacokinetics, and toxicology, providing the scientific basis for safety evaluation. Module 5 comprises all clinical study reports, integrating patient-level data, statistical analyses, and comprehensive safety and efficacy assessments. (17)

3.2 Technical Components

The eCTD incorporates technical features that enhance submission quality and review efficiency:

- **XML Backbone File:** Provides hierarchical organization of modules and documents, enabling automated navigation and validation.
- **Hyperlinks:** Facilitate direct access to related sections, improving reviewer efficiency.
- **Metadata:** Includes document titles, sequence numbers, and submission dates, ensuring accurate identification.
- **Lifecycle Management:** Features sequence numbering, version control, and submission units to track amendments, updates, and withdrawals without compromising historical integrity. (18)

3.3 Submission Sequence and Units

Each eCTD submission is assigned a unique sequence number, which identifies its chronological order in the product lifecycle. Documents are grouped into submission units, corresponding to modules or sections, allowing regulators to manage files efficiently. This approach reduces redundancy, improves organization, and ensures traceable submission updates. (19)

3.4 Advantages of eCTD Structure

The eCTD structure offers multiple benefits for both sponsors and regulators. It supports global harmonization, enabling multi-region submissions without duplication of data. The use of summaries, hyperlinks, and standardized metadata enhances review efficiency. Lifecycle management allows controlled updates and amendments, ensuring data integrity while reducing errors. Collectively, these features make eCTD a critical tool for modern regulatory affairs and strategic product lifecycle management. (20)

4. Submission Process

The submission process for the Electronic Common Technical Document (eCTD) is a structured sequence of activities that ensures the accurate, complete, and compliant transfer of regulatory information from the sponsor to the relevant health authority. A well-executed submission process is critical for minimizing review

delays, ensuring regulatory compliance, and facilitating timely product approvals. (21)

4.1 Preparation of eCTD Dossiers

Preparation begins with the compilation of content according to the modular eCTD structure. Sponsors must ensure that all modules administrative, quality, non-clinical, and clinical are complete, accurate, and formatted according to the eCTD specifications. Key steps include validating data integrity, organizing submission units, and generating the XML backbone file with proper sequence numbering and metadata. Hyperlinks between documents and cross-references are verified to facilitate reviewer navigation. In addition, all documents must comply with regional formatting requirements, such as file type (PDF/A-1b), naming conventions, and inclusion of electronic signatures where applicable. (22)

4.2 Regional Requirements and Compliance

The eCTD submission process varies slightly among regulatory authorities, reflecting regional guidelines and requirements. For example, the USFDA mandates eCTD submissions for new drug applications (NDAs), abbreviated NDAs (ANDAs), and biologics, with strict validation rules enforced through automated software. The European Medicines Agency (EMA) requires eCTD for centralized procedures and encourages its use for decentralized submissions. The PMDA in Japan and CDSCO in India have adopted eCTD for specific categories of products, each with unique technical specifications. Sponsors must remain aware of these regional nuances to avoid rejection or delays during review. (23)

4.3 Validation and Technical Review

Before submission, dossiers undergo pre-validation checks using automated tools provided by regulatory agencies or third-party software. These checks verify the integrity of the XML backbone, document hyperlinks, file formats, and metadata. Sequence numbering and lifecycle management elements are also validated to ensure that amendments or updates can be tracked accurately. Regulatory authorities perform additional technical validation upon receipt, identifying any deficiencies that must be corrected before substantive review can begin. This step is critical for maintaining compliance and preventing avoidable delays in the approval process. (24)

4.4 Common Challenges in eCTD Submission

Despite the standardized framework, sponsors often encounter challenges during submission. Technical issues such as incorrect sequence numbering, broken hyperlinks, or non-compliant file formats are common reasons for rejection. Additionally, variability in regional requirements may lead to inconsistencies in Module 1 documentation. Large dossier sizes, particularly for complex biologics or multi-indication products, can complicate file management and increase the likelihood of errors. Effective cross-functional coordination among regulatory, quality, clinical, and IT teams is essential to mitigate these risks and ensure successful submission. (25)

4.5 Best Practices for Efficient Submission

To enhance submission success, organizations should implement structured workflow management, conduct thorough internal pre-validation, and maintain comprehensive version control of all documents. Utilizing regulatory information management systems (RIMS) can further streamline dossier preparation, track changes, and ensure compliance with evolving regulatory updates. Early engagement with the regulatory authority can also clarify submission expectations, reducing the risk of queries or resubmissions. (26)

The eCTD submission process is a highly regulated, technically precise, and region-specific activity. Successful submission requires careful dossier preparation, adherence to regional guidelines, pre-validation, and coordinated cross-functional effort. Mastery of these processes is essential for regulatory affairs professionals, ensuring timely approvals, minimizing delays, and maintaining compliance throughout the product lifecycle. (27)

Table 2. Regional eCTD Requirements Overview (28,29)

Region/Authority	Mandatory Use	Key Module Differences	Version Adopted	Validation Requirements
USFDA	Yes (NDAs, ANDAs, Biologics)	Specific Module 1 forms, US labeling	eCTD v4.0	Automated technical validation
EMA	Centralized: Yes, Decentralized: Encouraged	Module 1 regional info	eCTD v4.0	Format compliance, validation checks
PMDA (Japan)	Encouraged	Japanese labeling, forms	eCTD v3.2 / 4.0	Technical compliance check
CDSCO (India)	Mandatory for specific products	Module 1 regional info	eCTD v3.2 / 4.0	Validation via XML and hyperlinks

5. Regulatory Updates and Global Trends

The regulatory landscape for electronic submissions is continuously evolving, driven by technological advancements, harmonization initiatives, and increasing expectations from health authorities. Understanding current updates and global trends is essential for regulatory affairs professionals to ensure compliance and streamline product lifecycle management. (30)

5.1 Adoption of eCTD v4.0

The most significant recent update in regulatory submissions is the introduction of eCTD version 4.0 (v4.0). This latest standard, endorsed by the International

Council for Harmonisation (ICH), builds on previous versions by improving data interoperability, lifecycle management, and regional harmonization. eCTD v4.0 supports dynamic linking between modules, enhanced tracking of submission amendments, and compatibility with modern document management systems. Several regulatory authorities, including the USFDA, EMA, and PMDA, have established timelines for transitioning to v4.0, emphasizing its role in ensuring standardized, efficient electronic submissions. (31)

5.2 Regional Harmonization Initiatives

Global harmonization efforts have significantly influenced the adoption of eCTD. Agencies across regions aim to reduce duplication and simplify multi-region submissions through standardized submission formats and guidance documents. For instance, the ICH has promoted consistency in module structures, submission validation, and technical specifications, enabling sponsors to leverage a single dossier framework for multiple regulatory authorities. Harmonization reduces submission errors, accelerates review timelines, and allows pharmaceutical companies to manage global portfolios more efficiently. (32)

5.3 Emerging Digital Submission Trends

Technological advancements have reshaped how eCTD submissions are prepared and managed. Modern Regulatory Information Management Systems (RIMS) integrate submission preparation, document tracking, and validation into a unified platform. Artificial intelligence and machine learning are increasingly applied to automate pre-validation, detect discrepancies, and streamline document indexing. Cloud-based submission platforms are also emerging, enabling real-time data sharing between sponsors and regulatory authorities, reducing delays and improving transparency. (33)

5.4 Global Regulatory Expectations

Regulatory authorities are increasingly emphasizing data integrity, traceability, and compliance with digital submission standards. Agencies expect eCTD submissions to conform to strict technical specifications, including proper sequence numbering, metadata tagging, PDF/A compliance, and fully functional hyperlinks. Non-compliance can result in rejection or delayed review, highlighting the importance of staying current with evolving regulatory guidelines. Recent updates also encourage sponsors to provide structured summaries and lifecycle tracking, enabling regulators to assess submissions efficiently. (34)

5.5 Strategic Implications for Industry

Keeping abreast of regulatory updates and global trends is essential for organizations aiming to optimize regulatory submissions and product lifecycle management. Early adoption of eCTD v4.0, integration of RIMS, and compliance with regional guidance not only reduce approval timelines but also improve regulatory predictability. Companies that actively monitor regulatory updates and implement harmonized processes gain a competitive advantage in the increasingly complex global pharmaceutical landscape. (35)

In summary, regulatory updates and global trends, including the adoption of eCTD v4.0, harmonization efforts, and emerging digital technologies, are reshaping the landscape of electronic submissions. Staying informed and proactively implementing these changes enables regulatory professionals to ensure compliance, streamline workflows, and enhance efficiency across the product lifecycle.

6. Case Studies and Industry Insights

Practical implementation of the electronic Common Technical Document (eCTD) across different regulatory regions provides valuable lessons for both industry and academia. Case studies and industry insights highlight common challenges, best practices, and the strategic advantages of adopting eCTD for regulatory submissions and product lifecycle management. (36)

6.1 Case Study 1: Multinational New Drug Submission

A multinational pharmaceutical company preparing a new drug application (NDA) for submission to the USFDA, EMA, and PMDA illustrates the benefits of harmonized eCTD usage. By structuring the dossier according to eCTD modules and integrating regional-specific Module 1 documents, the company achieved synchronized submissions across three regions. The use of an automated Regulatory Information Management System (RIMS) enabled the team to manage document versions, track amendments, and validate technical compliance. As a result, the submission timelines were reduced by approximately 20%, demonstrating the efficiency gains and global harmonization advantages of structured eCTD workflows. (37)

6.2 Case Study 2: Lifecycle Management of a Biologic Product

A biopharmaceutical company managing post-approval variations for a biologic product utilized eCTD to track updates, such as manufacturing changes and labeling amendments. The lifecycle management feature of eCTD allowed seamless incorporation of amendments into a structured submission without resubmitting the entire dossier. Automated validation checks ensured data integrity, while hyperlinks facilitated quick navigation for reviewers. This case highlights how eCTD supports efficient post-approval management and regulatory compliance over the product lifecycle. (38)

6.3 Common Lessons Learned

Several key insights emerge from industry experience with eCTD implementation:

- **Cross-functional Collaboration is Critical:** Regulatory, clinical, quality, and IT teams must work together to ensure accurate and compliant submissions.
- **Early Adoption of Updated Standards:** Transitioning early to eCTD v4.0 or implementing harmonized guidelines reduces last-minute technical issues.

- **Effective Use of Digital Tools:** RIMS and automated pre-validation systems significantly reduce errors, improve efficiency, and facilitate multi-region submissions.
- **Attention to Regional Nuances:** Module 1 differences, format requirements, and technical specifications must be carefully considered to prevent rejection. (39)

6.4 Strategic Implications

These case studies underscore the strategic value of eCTD beyond mere regulatory compliance. Efficient submission processes enhance review predictability, reduce approval timelines, and optimize resource utilization. Companies that leverage digital tools, maintain robust lifecycle management, and proactively adapt to regulatory updates gain a competitive advantage in global pharmaceutical markets. The analysis of industry experiences demonstrates that eCTD is not only a regulatory requirement but also a strategic enabler for efficient submissions, global harmonization, and lifecycle management. Successful implementation depends on cross-functional coordination, adoption of updated standards, and effective use of digital platforms. Lessons learned from real-world submissions provide practical guidance for organizations aiming to optimize regulatory workflows and compliance. (40)

7. Challenges and Limitations

While the electronic Common Technical Document (eCTD) has significantly improved regulatory submissions, its implementation is not without challenges. Understanding these limitations is essential for regulatory affairs professionals to navigate potential hurdles and optimize submission efficiency.

7.1 Technical Challenges

One of the primary challenges in eCTD implementation is technical complexity. The XML backbone, sequence numbering, metadata tagging, and hyperlinking requirements demand precision, as even minor errors can lead to submission rejection. Large dossiers, particularly for biologics or multi-indication products, exacerbate these difficulties by increasing the volume of documents to manage and validate. Additionally, differences in software platforms, file formats, and validation tools across organizations and regulatory authorities may lead to interoperability issues, complicating multi-region submissions. (41)

7.2 Regulatory Challenges

Regional variability in regulatory requirements presents another significant limitation. Module 1 content differs for each authority, and agencies may update technical specifications, validation rules, or file format expectations without simultaneous global alignment. Staying current with these frequent updates is essential but resource-intensive. Moreover, differences in the interpretation of eCTD guidelines among regulatory reviewers can result in inconsistent feedback or additional queries, prolonging review timelines. (42)

7.3 Operational and Organizational Challenges

Successful eCTD submission requires cross-functional coordination among regulatory, clinical, quality, and IT teams. Organizations may face resource constraints, including limited skilled personnel trained in eCTD preparation or lifecycle management. Workflow inefficiencies, lack of standardized processes, and inadequate internal validation procedures can contribute to submission delays or technical non-compliance. Transitioning from legacy submission systems to eCTD-compliant platforms also entails training, process redesign, and investment in digital infrastructure. (43)

7.4 Data Integrity and Compliance Risks

Although eCTD supports traceability and lifecycle management, maintaining data integrity throughout the submission process remains a challenge. Incomplete metadata, broken hyperlinks, or inconsistent document versions can compromise submission quality. Regulatory authorities increasingly emphasize adherence to data integrity principles, meaning errors in digital submissions may result in rejection or extended review cycles.

In summary, while the eCTD framework enhances efficiency, harmonization, and lifecycle management, its implementation is constrained by technical complexity, regional variability, organizational limitations, and data integrity risks. Awareness of these challenges, combined with structured workflows, adoption of robust digital tools, and ongoing staff training, is essential for optimizing submission success and minimizing regulatory risk. (44)

8. Future Directions and Emerging Trends

The regulatory landscape for electronic submissions continues to evolve rapidly, driven by technological innovations, regulatory harmonization initiatives, and the increasing complexity of pharmaceutical products. Understanding emerging trends and future directions is essential for regulatory affairs professionals to enhance submission efficiency, maintain compliance, and strategically manage the product lifecycle. (45)

8.1 Adoption of eCTD v4.0

The adoption of eCTD version 4.0 (v4.0) represents a significant advancement in digital regulatory submissions. This version enhances interoperability, supports dynamic linking between modules, and improves lifecycle management of dossiers. With v4.0, sponsors can more efficiently track amendments, updates, and withdrawals, while regulatory authorities benefit from enhanced navigation and automated validation. Early adoption of eCTD v4.0 is becoming a strategic priority for organizations aiming to maintain global harmonization and streamline multi-region submissions. (46)

8.2 Integration of Artificial Intelligence and Automation

Artificial intelligence (AI) and machine learning are increasingly applied in regulatory submissions to automate pre-validation, detect errors, and index documents. AI tools can flag inconsistencies in metadata,

sequence numbering, and hyperlinks before submission, significantly reducing manual effort and minimizing the risk of rejection. Automation also allows for faster preparation of multi-region dossiers, particularly when integrated with Regulatory Information Management Systems (RIMS), enabling real-time tracking and enhanced cross-functional collaboration.

8.3 Cloud-Based Submissions and Real-Time Collaboration

Cloud-based platforms are emerging as an effective tool for real-time submission preparation and collaborative review. Sponsors can centralize all eCTD documents in a secure cloud environment, enabling geographically dispersed teams to coordinate updates, validate content, and track changes efficiently. Regulatory authorities are gradually exploring cloud integration for submission review, which has the potential to accelerate regulatory timelines and improve transparency. (47)

8.4 Blockchain for Data Integrity

Blockchain technology offers a promising solution for enhancing data integrity and traceability in regulatory submissions. By creating immutable digital records of each submission component, blockchain ensures that all document versions, metadata, and approvals are securely tracked. This technology can reduce concerns related to document tampering, improve audit readiness, and support compliance with increasingly stringent regulatory standards.

8.5 Harmonization and Global Standardization

Future trends emphasize global harmonization of eCTD standards, reducing duplication and streamlining multi-region submissions. Regulatory authorities, guided by the ICH, continue to refine submission requirements, validation rules, and technical specifications. Sponsors adopting harmonized practices can reduce submission errors, accelerate approval timelines, and optimize resource utilization across global markets.

8.6 Strategic Implications for Regulatory Affairs

The integration of these emerging technologies and standards positions eCTD as more than a compliance tool; it becomes a strategic enabler for efficiency, global harmonization, and lifecycle management. Organizations that proactively adopt v4.0, implement AI-driven workflows, leverage cloud platforms, and explore blockchain solutions will gain a competitive advantage in regulatory operations, reducing approval times and enhancing overall submission quality.

In conclusion, the future of eCTD submissions lies in digital transformation, automation, and harmonization. Emerging technologies such as AI, cloud platforms, and blockchain, combined with the adoption of eCTD v4.0, are reshaping how pharmaceutical dossiers are prepared, submitted, and reviewed. These developments will continue to enhance efficiency, regulatory compliance, and strategic decision-making across the global pharmaceutical industry. (48)

Table 3. Emerging Technologies in eCTD Submissions (49,50)

Technology	Application	Benefits
AI & Machine Learning	Automated pre-validation, indexing	Reduced errors, faster submission
Cloud Platforms	Centralized dossier management	Real-time collaboration, workflow efficiency
Blockchain	Data integrity, audit trail	Immutable records, compliance assurance
RIMS	Regulatory information management	Streamlined submission, lifecycle tracking

9. Conclusion

The Electronic Common Technical Document (eCTD) has transformed regulatory submissions in the pharmaceutical industry by providing a standardized, modular, and digital framework for dossier preparation and review. Its structured design, comprising five modules, XML backbone files, hyperlinks, and lifecycle management features, enables efficient navigation, traceability, and compliance across global regulatory authorities. Adoption of eCTD has streamlined multi-region submissions, reduced review timelines, and enhanced data integrity, thereby facilitating faster access to innovative therapies for patients worldwide. Despite its advantages, the implementation of eCTD presents challenges, including technical complexities, regional variability in regulatory requirements, and operational constraints. Addressing these challenges requires cross-functional coordination, adherence to updated standards, and utilization of advanced digital tools such as Regulatory Information Management Systems (RIMS), automated pre-validation, and cloud-based platforms. Emerging trends, including the adoption of eCTD v4.0, integration of artificial intelligence, blockchain for data integrity, and global harmonization initiatives, further enhance the efficiency, transparency, and strategic value of eCTD in regulatory affairs. In conclusion, the eCTD is not merely a compliance requirement but a strategic enabler for modern regulatory operations. By embracing technological innovations, harmonized practices, and proactive lifecycle management, pharmaceutical companies can optimize regulatory submissions, maintain global compliance, and improve the predictability and efficiency of product approvals. Mastery of eCTD principles is therefore essential for regulatory affairs professionals and stakeholders navigating the increasingly complex global pharmaceutical landscape.

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. Their constructive comments have significantly enhanced the quality of article.

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 Apr-Jun [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 Jan [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 and simplify 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.2024;2(3).
6. Liu Q, Huang R, Hsieh J, Zhu H, Tiwari M, Liu G, et al. Landscape analysis of the application of artificial intelligence and machine learning in regulatory submissions for drug development from 2016 to 2021. Clin Pharmacol Ther [Internet]. 2023 Apr [cited 2026 Feb 18];113(4):771-774. Available from: doi:10.1002/cpt.2668
7. Niazi SK, Al-Shaqha WM, Mirza Z. Proposal of International Council for Harmonization guideline for the 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 Oct [cited 2026 Feb 18];148(10):1185-1194. 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. Salunkhe P, Nagrale S. Electronic Common Technical Document (eCTD): Structure, Submission Process, and Regulatory Updates. Int J Drug Reg Affairs [Internet]. 2026Mar.13 [cited 2026 Feb.18];14(1):42-0. Available from: https://www.ijdra.com/index.php/journal/article/view/854
12. International Council for Harmonisation of Technical Requirements for Pharmaceuticals for Human Use. ICH harmonised tripartite guideline: Common Technical Document for the registration of pharmaceuticals for human use (M4) [Internet]. Geneva: ICH; 2000 [cited 2026 Feb 18]. Available from: https://www.ich.org/page/ctd
13. Food and Drug Administration. Providing regulatory submissions in electronic format-certain human pharmaceutical product applications and related submissions using eCTD specifications [Internet]. Silver Spring (MD): US FDA; 2023 [cited 2026 Feb 18]. Available from: https://www.fda.gov
14. European Medicines Agency. Guideline on the electronic Common Technical Document (eCTD) v4.0 implementation [Internet]. Amsterdam: European Medicines Agency; 2022 [cited 2026 Feb 18]. Available from: https://www.ema.europa.eu
15. Leligkou HC, Gerogiannis VC. Deep transformers for predicting ALCOA+ data integrity compliance. Appl Sci [Internet]. 2023 [cited 2026 Feb 18];13(13):7616. Available from: doi:10.3390/app13137616
16. Central Drugs Standard Control Organization. Guidance for industry: Submission of applications in eCTD format [Internet]. New Delhi: CDSCO; 2024 [cited 2026 Feb 18]. Available from: https://cdsco.gov.in
17. Pharmaceuticals and Medical Devices Agency. Technical specifications for eCTD v4.0 in Japan [Internet]. Tokyo: PMDA; 2023 [cited 2026 Feb 18]. Available from: https://www.pmda.go.jp
18. Kumar R, Singh P. Transitioning from paper to eCTD: A roadmap for pharmaceutical SMEs in emerging markets. Regul Rapporteur.2024;21(4):12-18.
19. Zhang L, Miller J. Role of regulatory information management systems in global eCTD lifecycle management. J Pharm Compliance. 2025;9(2):45-59.
20. Brown S. Impact of XML-based backbones on regulatory review efficiency. Digit Med Regul Sci. 2024;6(1):101-114.
21. Beninger P. Signal management in pharmacovigilance. Clin Ther [Internet]. 2020 Jun [cited 2026 Feb 18];42(6):1110-1129. Available from: doi:10.1016/j.clinthera.2020.03.018
22. Craveiro NS, Lopes BS, Tomás L, Almeida SF. Drug withdrawal due to safety. Curr Drug Saf [Internet]. 2020 [cited 2026 Feb 18];15(1):4-12. Available from: doi:10.2174/1574886314666191004092520
23. Gozzo L. Pharmacovigilance and appropriate drug use. Healthcare (Basel) [Internet]. 2024 [cited 2026 Feb 18];12(6):669. Available from: doi:10.3390/healthcare12060669
24. Holm JEJ, Ruppert JG, Ramsden SD. Impact of changing regulations on European risk management plans. Pharm Med [Internet]. 2022 Feb [cited 2026 Feb 18];36(1):33-46. Available from: doi:10.1007/s40290-021-00414-8
25. Kandukuri A, Edla DR. Ensuring data safety in pharmacovigilance. Asian J Pharm Res Dev [Internet]. 2025 [cited 2026 Feb 18];13(3):1569. Available from: doi:10.22270/ajprd.v13i3.1569
26. Khan MAA, Hamid S, Khan SA, Sarfraz M, Babar ZUD. Stakeholders' views on pharmacovigilance in Pakistan. Front Pharmacol [Internet]. 2022 [cited 2026 Feb 18];13:891954. Available from:

doi:10.3389/fphar.2022.891954
27. Kiguba R, Olsson S, Waitt C. Pharmacovigilance in low- and middle-income countries. Br J Clin Pharmacol [Internet]. 2023 Feb [cited 2026 Feb 18];89(2):491-509. Available from: doi:10.1111/bcp.15193
28. Lucas S, Ailani J, Smith TR, Abdrabboh A, Xue F, Navetta MS. Pharmacovigilance reporting requirements. Ther Adv Drug Saf [Internet]. 2022 [cited 2026 Feb 18];13. Available from: doi:10.1177/20420986221125006
29. Pozsgai K, Szűcs G, Kőnig-Péter A, Balázs O, Vajda P, Botz L, et al. ADR reports related to substandard medical products. Front Pharmacol [Internet]. 2022 [cited 2026 Feb 18];13:964399. Available from: doi:10.3389/fphar.2022.964399
30. Rewale KS, Tuwar AB, Salve MT. Brief review on pharmacovigilance. Int J Pharm Sci Drug Anal. 2024;4(1):9-16.
31. Robinson F, Wilkes S, Schaefer N, Goldstein M, Rice M, Gray J, et al. Patient-centered pharmacovigilance. Ther Adv Drug Saf [Internet]. 2023 [cited 2026 Feb 18];14. Available from: doi:10.1177/20420986221146418
32. Sardella M, Belcher G, Lungu C, Ignoni T, Camisa M, Stenver DI, et al. Monitoring manufacturing quality of medicines. Ther Adv Drug Saf [Internet]. 2021 [cited 2026 Feb 18];12. Available from: doi:10.1177/20420986211038436
33. Singh A, Kumar A. Pharmacovigilance in cell and gene therapy. Drug Saf [Internet]. 2025 [cited 2026 Feb 18]. Available from: doi:10.1007/s40264-025-01596-9
34. CDSCO alerts: Retrospective analysis of quality control alerts (2018–2023). Regul Toxicol Pharmacol. 2025;156:105775. doi:10.1016/j.yrtph.2025.105775.
35. Alemayehu C, Mitchell G, Nikles J. Barriers to 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
36. Dirks A, Florez M, Torche F, Young S, Slizgi B, Getz K. Risk-based quality management in clinical trials. Ther Innov Regul Sci [Internet]. 2024 [cited 2026 Feb 18];58:520-527. Available from: doi:10.1007/s43441-024-00618-5
37. International Council for Harmonisation of Technical Requirements for Pharmaceuticals for Human Use. ICH E6(R3) Good Clinical Practice guideline [Internet]. Geneva: ICH; 2025 [cited 2026 Feb 18]. Available from: https://www.ich.org
38. Ridha A, Hussein S, AlJabban A, Gunay LM, Gorial FI, Al Ani NA. Clinical impact of seropositivity in RA patients. Open Access Rheumatol [Internet]. 2022 [cited 2026 Feb 18];14:113-121. Available from: doi:10.2147/OARRR.S368190
39. Smolen JS, Landewé RB, Bijlsma JW, et al. EULAR recommendations for rheumatoid arthritis. Ann Rheum Dis [Internet]. 2020 Jun [cited 2026 Feb 18];79(6):685-699. Available from: doi:10.1136/annrheumdis-2019-216655
40. Gabriel SE, Michaud K. Epidemiology of rheumatic diseases. Arthritis Res Ther [Internet]. 2009 [cited 2026 Feb 18];11(3):1-16. Available from: doi:10.1186/ar2669
41. Murali K, Kaur S, Prakash A, Medhi B. Artificial intelligence in pharmacovigilance. Indian J Pharmacol [Internet]. 2019 Nov-Dec [cited 2026 Feb 18];51(6):373-376. Available from: doi:10.4103/ijp.IJP_814_19
42. Rahman MS, Rahman MK, Kaykobad M, Rahman MS. Interpreting AI models using LIME and SHAP. Brain Inform [Internet]. 2024 [cited 2026 Feb 18];11(1):4. Available from: doi:10.1186/s40708-024-00213-9
43. Santoro A, Genov G, Spooner A, Raine J, Arlett P. EU pharmacovigilance system. Drug Saf [Internet]. 2017 Oct [cited 2026 Feb 18];40(10):855-869. Available from: doi:10.1007/s40264-017-0572-8
44. Silva MR, Santos LK, Oliveira PJ, et al. AI in Brazilian pharmaceutical regulation. Regul Sci Med Prod. 2024;14:189-198.
45. Yaeger KA, Martini M, Rasooly J, Samir AE, Louissaint A.AI-based image analysis in cytopathology. Cytopathology [Internet]. 2019 Oct [cited 2026 Feb 18];30(5):489-497. Available from: doi:10.1111/cyt.12728
46. Harmark L, van Grootheest AC. Pharmacovigilance: Methods and perspectives. Eur J Clin Pharmacol [Internet]. 2008 Aug [cited 2026 Feb 18];64(8):743-752. Available from: doi:10.1007/s00228-008-0475-9
47. International Council for Harmonisation of Technical Requirements for Pharmaceuticals for Human Use. ICH Q8–Q10 guidelines [Internet]. Geneva: ICH; 2009 [cited 2026 Feb 18]. Available from: https://www.ich.org
48. Jeetu G, Anusha G. Pharmacovigilance worldwide. J Young Pharm [Internet]. 2010 Jul-Sep [cited 2026 Feb 18];2(3):315-320. Available from: doi:10.4103/0975-1483.66802
49. Talbot JC, Nilsson BS. Pharmacovigilance in the pharmaceutical industry. Br J Clin Pharmacol [Internet]. 1998 May [cited 2026 Feb 18];45(5):427-431. Available from: doi:10.1046/j.1365-2125.1998.00713.x
50. Trippe ZA, Brendani B, Meier C, Lewis D. Identification of substandard medicines using ICSR analysis. Drug Saf [Internet]. 2017 Apr [cited 2026 Feb 18];40(4):293-303. Available from:doi:10.1007/s40264-016-0499-5