Available online on 15 Jun, 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

Comparative Study of CTD Modules 3, 4, and 5: Generic Drugs versus Complex Generics (Liposomal Injectables) in the United States, European Union, and Japan

Manasvi Kotadia[a], Vinit Movaliya[a], Niranjan Kanaki[a], Maitreyi Zaveri[a], Shailesh Khacharia[b], Zuki Patel[a,*]

[a] *Department of Pharmaceutical Regulatory Affairs, K. B. Institute of Pharmaceutical Education and Research (KBIPER), a college of Kadi Sarva Vishwavidyalaya (KSV), Sector-23, Gandhinagar 382023, Gujarat, India.*

[b]*Intas Pharmaceuticals Ltd., Corporate House, Near Sola Bridge, SG Highway, Thaltej, Ahmedabad – 380054. Gujarat. India*

Abstract

Liposomal drug delivery systems form an important branch of pharmaceutical product nanomedicine. Unlike traditional small-molecule generics, structural and physicochemical characteristics of a lipid carrier system do not only regulate the therapeutic behavior of an active pharmaceutical ingredient but also influence it. The liposomal formulations are therefore categorised as complex generics or non-biological complex drugs (NBCDs). To prove the similarity of liposomal generics and their reference products would thus require a wider range of analytical, non-clinical and clinical data in comparison with traditional generics. The current paper compares liposomal complex generics regulatory expectations in 3 major jurisdictions of the United States, the European Union, and Japan. The comparison will be made on the Common Technical Document(CTD) Modules 3, 4, and 5, which indicate, quality documentation, non-clinical evidence, and clinical evidence respectively. Regulations and peer-reviewed literature have been analyzed in order to determine variation in regulatory demands across these areas. The results show that complex generics require thorough description of physicochemical properties, biological activity as well as pharmacokinetic functioning due to the impact of nanoscale structural features on drug targeting and toxicity. Regulatory agencies vary in their scientific principles even though they have similar principles of regulation. European Union is focused on comparability in detail; Japan focuses more on mechanistic non-clinical evaluation and the United States uses a risk-based regulatory model which incorporates quality attributes and pharmacokinetic data. These regulatory differences can help pharmaceutical developers to understand before submitting liposomal complex generics to global regulations.

Conclusion: Liposomal generics require more extensive evaluation than traditional generics, including detailed structural and biological characterization. Regulatory expectations differ: Europe emphasizes analytical comparability, Japan focuses on nonclinical studies, and the US follows a risk-based approach with quality and PK data. Understanding these regional differences is essential for efficient development and successful global submissions.

Keywords: Liposomal injectables; Complex generics; Nanomedicine regulation; CTD Module 3; EMA; FDA; PMDA; Liposome characterization; Non-biological complex drugs

Article Info: Received 21 Mar 2026; Review Completed 14 May 2026; Accepted 18 May 2026

Cite this article as:
Kotadia M, Movaliya V, Kanaki N, Zaveri M, Khacharia S, Patel Z. Comparative Study of CTD Modules 3, 4, and 5: Generic Drugs versus Complex Generics (Liposomal Injectables) in the United States, European Union, and Japan. Int. J. Drug Reg. Affairs [Internet]. 2026 Jun 15 [cited 2026 Jun 15]; 14(2):49-53. Available from: http://ijdra.com/index.php/journal/article/view/889

DOI: https://doi.org/10.22270/ijdra.v14i2.889
*Corresponding author. E-mail address: zuki.patel@kbiper.ac.in (Z. Patel)

1. Introduction

Liposomal drug delivery system refers to nanoscale vesicular carriers which are made of phospholipid bilayer and catalyze the encapsulation of an aqueous core. The structures mimic the biological membranes and have the ability to absorb soluble and insoluble pharmaceutical molecules. Hydrophilic molecules are classically found at the aqueous core of the vesicle, at the same time as lipophilic molecules are built into the lipid bi-layer. By extension, the structural adaptability of liposomal platforms has made them critical in boosting drug delivery in the pharmaceutical development platform, especially in antineoplastic and antimicrobial therapies. (1)

The motivation behind the invention of liposomal drug products is driven by the fact that the majority of traditional formulations are limited by many factors that can be overcome by employing liposomal products. There is a host of therapeutic agents that exhibit minimized aqueous solubility, hastened systemic excretion, and exaggerated off-target toxicity. Liposomal carriers have the potential to positively influence therapeutic effects potentially by preventing active drug molecule metabolic degradation, prolonging systemic circulation and allowing selective targeting of pathological sites e.g. by tumours, spending assisted by processes such as the enhanced permeability and retention (EPR) effect. (2,3)

Various liposomal drug products have been implemented into clinical practice. The representative cases include liposomal doxorubicin and liposomal amphotericin B, which have reported increased pharmacokinetic processes and reduced the systemic toxicity compared to their classical derivatives. These advantages can be explained by the change in the distributions, metabolism, and excretion of the active drug that is caused by a liposomal encapsulation. (4)

In spite of these, the regulatory evaluation of the liposomal formulations is significantly more complex than the traditional small-molecule generics. Unlike generics which generally show therapeutic equivalence by pharmaceutical equivalence and pharmacokinetic bioequivalence assays, liposomal formulations in structural terms undertake significant effect on pharmacokinetics, biodistribution and safety. Such slight changes as the distribution of particle sizes, lamellarity, lipid molecule structure, encapsulation capacity, and surface charge can significantly alter the performance of the products. (5)

Due to these reasons, liposomal preparations are considered a complex drug product or non-biological complex drug. Based on this, regulatory authorities ensure that thorough assessment including physicochemical characteristics, biological behaviour and clinical pharmacokinetics are conducted. (6)

To standardise regulatory submissions at international level, the International Council for harmonisation came up with a set of formats known as the Common Technical Document (CTD). Under this model, Module 3 will include quality and manufacturing; Module 4 will include non-clinical pharmacology and toxicology study, and Module 5 will include report of clinical studies. (7)

Liposomal drug products have a specific regulatory framework that major regulatory authorities, namely the U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA), European Medicines Agency (EMA), and the Pharmaceuticals and Medical Devices Agency (PMDA) in Japan have developed to assess the products. Although the implementation of these frameworks is built on the same scientific principles, the regulatory expectations between the two are different in terms of the nature and scope of evidence they need. (8)

Understanding these regulatory differences is important for pharmaceutical companies developing liposomal complex generics for global markets. A systematic comparison of regulatory expectations can help guide formulation development, analytical characterization, and regulatory strategy.

2. Regulatory Assessment Approach

The needs analysis was done to determine the obligation related to liposomal complex generics in the United States, Europe, and Japan. Instead, the analysis was in relation to CTC modules 3, 4 and 5, and this relates to quality documentation, non-clinical studies and hence clinical studies respectively.

Documents of the regulatory guidance issued by the U.S. Food and Drug Administration, the European Medicines Agency, and the Pharmaceuticals and Medical Devices Agency were analysed with an aim of defining the official regulatory expectations. In addition, peer-reviewed materials on the development of liposome drugs and the regulation of nanomedicines were examined to explain the science behind these regulatory models. (9)

The information gained out of these sources was arranged based on the CTD module plan. The contents of Module 3 were physicochemical characterization and manufacturing controls, Module 4 was non-clinical pharmacological and toxicology studies, and content of Module 5 was clinical pharmacokinetic and therapeutic equivalence studies.

The control expectations of the liposomal complex generics were then contrasted with the traditional expectations that were reflected by the conventional small-molecule generics. The compiled data was tabulated to bring out the interregional differences in regulatory requirements.

3. Comparative Evaluation

The comparative analysis shows that liposomal complex generics require much larger datasets compared to the traditional generics, due to the action of nanoscale structural properties on drug activity in the organism. As a result of this, regulatory authorities require further physicochemical characterization, nonclinical studies and clinical testing to establish therapeutic similarity with the reference product.

3.1 Europe (EMA)

The European regulatory framework tends to take a focus on the abundance of analysed comparability of the generic liposomal formulation and reference product. The EMA needs to be characterized in terms of physicochemical characteristics to show the similarity in the critical quality attributes that can affect the pharmacokinetics and the performance on therapeutic use. (10)

Table 1. European Union Requirements – Normal Generics vs Liposomal Complex Generics

Requirement	Normal Generics	Liposomal Complex Generics
API characterization	Chemical purity	API plus encapsulated drug analysis
Excipient composition	Basic excipients	Detailed lipid composition
Particle size distribution	Not required	Critical parameter
Lamellarity	Not required	Characterization recommended
Morphology	Not required	Cryo-TEM analysis
Zeta potential	Not required	Surface charge characterization
Encapsulation efficiency	Not required	Required

Drug-to-lipid ratio	Not required	Required
Free drug content	Not required	Quantification required
Lipid composition verification	Not required	Detailed lipid analysis
Phase transition temperature	Not required	May be required
In-vitro release testing	Dissolution test	Liposome release testing
Stability testing	Standard stability	Leakage monitoring
Container compatibility	Basic testing	Detailed compatibility
QTPP identification	Not required	Recommended
CQA identification	Not required	Required
CPP identification	Not required	Required
Manufacturing process characterization	Basic	Detailed liposome process
Comparative PK study	Required	Required
Clinical bridging study	Rare	Possible requirement

3.2 Japan (PMDA)

A more conservative regulatory strategy is used towards complex generics in Japan. Mechanistic evidence that shows similarity of the biological behaviour of the generic and reference formulations are often sought by the PMDA such as the study of biodistribution, the immune response, and the detailed characterization of the form of the liposomal system. (11)

Table 2. Japan Requirements – Normal Generics vs Liposomal Complex Generics

Requirement	Normal Generics	Liposomal Complex Generics
API characterization	Chemical identity	API plus encapsulated drug
Excipient composition	Basic excipients	Detailed lipid composition
Particle size distribution	Not required	Required
Lamellarity	Not required	Required
Morphology	Not required	Required
Zeta potential	Not required	Required
Encapsulation efficiency	Not required	Required
Drug-to-lipid ratio	Not required	Required
Free drug content	Not required	Required
Phase transition temperature	Not required	Required
In-vitro release testing	Dissolution	Release profile required
Stability testing	Standard	Leakage monitoring
Biodistribution studies	Not required	Required
Animal PK studies	Rare	Required
Toxicokinetic studies	Rare	Required
Repeat-dose toxicity	Rare	Possible
Immunogenicity studies	Not required	Required
RES uptake characterization	Not required	Required
Clinical PK study	Required	Required
Immunogenicity monitoring	Not required	Often required

3.3 United States (USFDA)

Liposomal complex generics are assessed by the FDA in terms of a risk-based regulatory paradigm. Critical quality attribute analytical characterization, alongside pharmacokinetic bioequivalence, is the leading basis on regulatory decision-making. (12)

Table 3. United States Requirements – Normal Generics vs Liposomal Complex Generics

Requirement	Normal Generics	Liposomal Complex Generics
API characterization	Chemical purity	API plus encapsulated drug
Excipient composition	Basic excipients	Detailed lipid composition
Particle size distribution	Not required	Required

Lamellarity	Not required	Recommended
Morphology	Not required	Required
Zeta potential	Not required	Required
Encapsulation efficiency	Not required	Required
Drug-to-lipid ratio	Not required	Required
Free drug content	Not required	Required
In-vitro release testing	Dissolution	Liposome release testing
Stability testing	Standard stability	Extended stability
CQA identification	Not required	Required
QTPP development	Not required	Recommended
CPP identification	Not required	Required
Manufacturing process control	Basic	Detailed process control
Analytical method validation	Basic	Advanced analytical methods
Animal PK studies	Rare	Possible
Biodistribution studies	Rare	Possible
Human PK bioequivalence	Required	Required
Clinical safety monitoring	Limited	Enhanced monitoring

3.4 Cross regional comparison

The similarities between regulatory agencies apply in regard to the same scientific principles in assessing liposomal complex generics, however, the regulatory policies are different. Europe tends to rely on tiring efforts at analytical comparability; Japan favors mechanical nonclinical evidence; and the United States is risk-oriented regulatory approach in incorporating the quality features with pharmacokinetic analysis. (13)

Table 4. Comparison of Liposomal Complex Generic Requirements Across Regions

Module	USA	Europe	Japan
Module 3	Detailed CMC characterization	Extensive physicochemical comparability	Highly detailed structural characterization
Module 4	Selective nonclinical studies	Conditional nonclinical studies	Extensive nonclinical evaluation
Module 5	PK bioequivalence	PK plus bridging studies	PK with immunogenicity monitoring

4. Conclusion

The present study confirms that liposomal preparations represent a distinct type of complex generics, which require a much larger scope of regulatory evaluation compared to traditional small-molecule generics. Whereas the traditional forms mainly rely on the measurements of pharmaceutical equivalency and pharmacokinetic bioequivalency, the liposomal complex generics require a thorough characterization of the structural, physicochemical, and biological properties to establish their therapeutic equivalency to the reference product.

The comparative analysis further indicates that major regulatory agencies across the world have different expectations with regard to regulatory expectations. Extensive analytical comparability of the generic and reference liposomal formulations is largely preferred by the European regulatory framework. On the other hand, the Japanese regulatory approach has a higher emphasis on mechanistic nonclinical studies, including biodistribution and immunogenicity studies. Risk-based regulation is also used in the United States, in which the overall physicochemical characterization of a drug along with pharmacokinetics bioequivalence typically suffices to determine therapeutic equivalence.

All these results highlight the importance of valuing region-specific regulatory needs during the development of liposomal complex generics. Anticipation of these expectations early perhaps may support the optimization of development strategy, regulatory uncertainty, and effective submissions to regulatory authorities in many countries.

Acknowledgements

I would like to express my sincere gratitude to my guide, mentor, and Head of the Department for their valuable guidance and support throughout this work. I also extend my heartfelt thanks to my colleagues for their encouragement and cooperation. Additionally, I would like to thank the International Journal of Drug Regulatory Affairs (IJDRA) for publishing my article.

Conflict of Interest

The 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. Pande S. Liposomes for drug delivery: review of vesicular composition, factors affecting drug release and drug loading in liposomes. Artif Cells Nanomed Biotechnol [Internet]. 2023 [cited 2026 Jan 02];51(1):428-40.
2. Klein K, Borchard G, Shah VP, Flühmann B, McNeil SE, de Vlieger JSB. A pragmatic regulatory approach for complex generics through the U.S. FDA 505(j) or 505(b)(2) approval pathways. Ann N Y Acad Sci [Internet]. 2021 [cited 2026 Jan 04];1502(1):5-13. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1111/nyas.14662
3. Avhad PA, Chalikwar SS, Bhairav BA. A comprehensive review on complex generics. Bull Karaganda Univ Biol Med Geogr Ser [Internet]. 2022 Mar [cited 2026 Jan 02];105(1):129-35. Available from: https://doi.org/10.31489/2022bmg1/129-13
4. Beltrán-Gracia E, López-Camacho A, Higuera-Ciapara I, Velázquez-Fernández JB, Vallejo-Cardona AA. Nanomedicine review: Clinical developments in liposomal applications. Cancer Nanotechnol [Internet]. 2019 [cited 2026 Jan 05]; 10:1-10. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1186/s12645-019-0055-y
5. Wang Y, Grainger DW. Regulatory considerations specific to liposome drug development as complex drug products. Front Drug Deliv [Internet]. 2022 [cited 2026 Jan 04]; 2:901281. Available from: https://doi.org/10.3389/fddev.2022.901281
6. Sercombe L, Veerati T, Moheimani F, Wu SY, Sood AK, Hua S. Advances and challenges of liposome assisted drug delivery. Front Pharmacol [Internet]. 2015 [cited 2026 Jan 02]; 6:286. Available from: https://doi.org/10.3389/fphar.2015.00286
7. Demina NB, Bakhrushina EO, Anurova MN, Merkushova AG, Pomytkina MV, Rastopchina OV, et al. Complex generics as a trend of modern pharmaceutical development. Int J Appl Pharm [Internet]. 2024 [cited 2026 Feb 05]; 16(3):71-7. Available from: https://doi.org/10.22159/ijap.2024v16i3.49937
8. Murthy SK. Nanoparticles in modern medicine: State of the art and future challenges. Int J Nanomedicine [Internet]. 2007 [cited 2026 Feb 04];2(2):129-41.
9. Kateregga I, Naga Shubha B. Regulatory challenges in complex generics: A focus on liposomal and nanoparticulate drug products. Int J Sci Res Arch [Internet]. 2025 Mar [cited 2026 Jan 06];14(3):834-49. Available from: https://doi.org/10.30574/ijsra.2025.14.3.0730
10. Jadhav PA, Dhumal SM. A review on liposomes as a novel drug delivery system. Int J Sci Res Sci Technol [Internet]. 2024 Oct [cited 2026 Jan 02];11(5):362-72. Available from: https://doi.org/10.32628/ijsrst24115112
11. Rajan R, Jose S, Biju MV, Vasudevan D. Transferosomes - A vesicular transdermal delivery system for enhanced drug permeation. J Adv Pharm Technol Res [Internet]. 2011 [cited 2026 Jan 02];2(3):138-43. Available from: https://doi.org/10.4103/2231-4040.85524
12. Choudhury A. Liposome: a carrier for effective drug delivery. J Appl Pharm Res [Internet]. 2020 Mar [cited 2026 Jan 06];8(1):22-8. Available from: https://doi.org/10.18231/j.joapr.2019.v.8.i.1.003
13. Sreedevi A, Musmade PB, Bhat K, Dharmagadda S, Janodia MD, Bhat BB, et al. A deep dive into the development of complex generics: A comprehensive review. J Appl Pharm Sci [Internet]. 2024 [cited 2026 Jan 05];14(4):1-14. Available from: https://doi.org/10.7324/JAPS.2024.204337
14. Farooque F, Wasi M, Mughees MM. Liposomes as drug delivery system: An updated review. J Drug Deliv Ther [Internet]. 2021 Oct [cited 2026 Jan 06];11(5-S):149-58. Available from: https://doi.org/10.22270/jddt.v11i5-s.5063
15. Liu P, Chen G, Zhang J. A review of liposomes as a drug delivery system: Current status of approved products, regulatory environments, and future perspectives. Molecules [Internet]. 2022 [cited 2026 Feb 02];27(4):1372. Available from: https://doi.org/10.38212/2224-6614.3441
16. Jiang Y, Li W, Wang Z, Lu J. Lipid-based nanotechnology: Liposome. Pharmaceutics [Internet]. 2024 [cited 2026 Jan 02];16(1):34. Available from: https://doi.org/10.3390/pharmaceutics16010034
17. Liposome drug products: Chemistry, manufacturing, and controls; human pharmacokinetics and bioavailability; and labeling documentation guidance for industry [Internet]. US:USFDA;2018 [cited 2026 Jan 02];1-38. Available from: https://www.fda.gov/regulatory-information/search-fda-guidance-documents/liposome-drug-products-chemistry-manufacturing-and-controls-human-pharmacokinetics-and
18. Drug and device manufacturer communications with payors, formulary committees, and similar entities: questions and answers guidance for industry and review staff [Internet]. 2018 [cited 2026 Jan 02];1-25.