World Journal of Pharmaceutical Sciences
ISSN (Print): 2321-3310; ISSN (Online): 2321-3086
Available online at: https://wjpsonline.com/
Review Article

Analytical Quality by Design (AQbD) A Comprehensive Review of Modern Analytical Method Development

M.A Adil Parvez,[1] Dr. Mohd Afroz,[2] Dr. S Sridhar,[3] L. Saraswathi[4]

1, M. Pharmacy, Department of Pharmaceutical Analysis, Malla Reddy College of Pharmacy, Maisammaguda, Secunderabad, Hyderabad, 500100, Medchal District.

2, M. Pharmacy, Associate Professor, Department of Pharmaceutical Chemistry, Malla Reddy College of Pharmacy, Maisammaguda, Secunderabad, Hyderabad, 500100, Medchal District

3, M. Pharmacy, PhD, Professor, Department of Pharmaceutical Chemistry, Malla Reddy College of Pharmacy, Maisammaguda, Secunderabad, Hyderabad, 500100, Medchal District

Received: 21-06-2026 / Revised Accepted: 25-06-2026 / Published: 01-07-2026

ABSTRACT:

Quality by Design (QbD) represents a paradigmatic shift in pharmaceutical analytical method development, transitioning from empirical trial-and-error approaches to systematic, science-based methodologies. This comprehensive review examines the principles, implementation strategies, and regulatory framework of Analytical Quality by Design (AQbD), with emphasis on ICH Q14 and Q2(R2) guidelines effective 2024. The AQbD framework encompasses the Analytical Target Profile (ATP), Critical Quality Attributes (CQAs), Critical Method Parameters (CMPs), and Method Operable Design Region (MODR), collectively ensuring robust, fit-for-purpose analytical procedures throughout their lifecycle. Design of Experiments (DoE) serves as the cornerstone methodology for systematic optimization, enabling multivariate assessment of method parameters and their interactions. This review synthesizes current knowledge on risk assessment tools (Ishikawa diagrams, Failure Mode effect Analysis), optimization strategies (response surface methodology, factorial designs), and regulatory expectations for enhanced versus traditional approaches. Nine case studies demonstrate practical AQbD implementation across chromatographic, spectroscopic, and bioanalytical techniques. The article addresses lifecycle management considerations, including method transfer, continuous improvement, and post-approval change protocols under ICH Q12 frameworks. Emerging trends in real-time release testing, process analytical technology integration, and multivariate analytical procedures are examined. This review provides pharmaceutical scientists with comprehensive guidance for implementing QbD principles in analytical method development,

Key Words: Quality by Design, Analytical Quality by Design, ICH Q14, Design of Experiments, Analytical Target Profile, Method Operable Design Region, Risk Assessment, Method Validation

Introduction:

Evolution from Quality by Testing to Quality by Design The pharmaceutical industry has undergone a fundamental transformation in analytical method development philosophy over the past two decades[1]. Traditional approaches relied on Quality by Testing (QbT), where methods were developed empirically through trial-and-error experimentation, validated at endpoint, and subjected to rigid specifications with limited flexibility for post-approval modifications[2]. This paradigm resulted in frequent out-of-specification (OOS) and out-of-trend (OOT) results, necessitating extensive investigations and potential product holds[3].

Address for Correspondence: M.A Adil Parvez, M. Pharmacy, Department of Pharmaceutical Analysis, Malla Reddy College of Pharmacy, Maisammaguda, Secunderabad, Hyderabad, 500100, Medchal District, Telangana.; **E-Mail:** aadilparvez29@gmail.com@gmail.com

How to Cite this Article: M.A Adil Parvez, Analytical Quality by Design (AQbD) A Comprehensive Review of Modern Analytical Method Development. World J Pharm Sci 2024; 14(01): 112-129; https://doi.org/10.54037/WJPS.2022.100905

Quality by Design (QbD), initially articulated by quality pioneer Dr. Joseph M. Juran, emphasizes building quality into products and processes from inception rather than testing quality into final outputs[4]. The International Council for Harmonisation (ICH) formalized pharmaceutical QbD principles through the Q8-Q12 guideline series, establishing frameworks for pharmaceutical development (Q8), quality risk management (Q9), pharmaceutical quality systems (Q10), and lifecycle management (Q12)[5].

Analytical Quality by Design: Definition and Scope

Analytical Quality by Design (AQbD) applies QbD principles specifically to analytical method development, creating systematic approaches for developing robust, fit-for-purpose analytical procedures. The recently finalized ICH Q14 guideline (Step 4, November 2023) provides comprehensive guidance on analytical procedure development, complementing the revised ICH Q2(R2) validation guideline[6-7].

AQbD is defined as "a systematic approach to development that begins with predefined objectives and emphasizes product and process understanding and process control, based on sound science and quality risk management"[8]. The fundamental goal is creating analytical methods with thorough understanding of method variables, their interactions, and their impact on method performance[9].

Regulatory Drivers and Industry Adoption

Regulatory agencies globally have embraced QbD principles as mechanisms for ensuring pharmaceutical quality while providing flexibility for continuous improvement[10]. The U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) has approved multiple New Drug Applications (NDAs) incorporating QbD-based analytical approaches with enhanced regulatory flexibility. The European Medicines Agency (EMA) similarly encourages AQbD implementation, recognizing its contribution to pharmaceutical quality assurance[11-12].

Industry adoption of AQbD has accelerated significantly since 2015, driven by recognized benefits including[13]:

1. Reduced method development timeline through systematic optimization
2. Enhanced method robustness and reduced OOS/OOT results
3. Regulatory flexibility for method adjustments within design space
4. Improved understanding of method capabilities and limitations
5. Facilitated technology transfer and method lifecycle management
6. Alignment with pharmaceutical development QbD principles
7. Fundamental Principles of Analytical Quality by Design

Fundamental Principles of Analytical Quality by Design

Core Concepts and Terminology

AQbD implementation requires understanding of several interconnected concepts that form the methodological framework[14]:

Analytical Target Profile (ATP): A prospective summary defining the intended purpose of the analytical procedure, including measurement objectives, analytical technique rationale, and performance criteria[15]. The ATP serves as the foundation guiding all subsequent method development activities[16].

Critical Quality Attributes (CQAs): Measurable properties or characteristics of the analytical method output that should be within appropriate limits to ensure method fitness for intended purpose[17]. CQAs typically include accuracy, precision, specificity, linearity, range, and limits of detection/quantification[18].

Critical Method Parameters (CMPs): Method variables that have significant impact on CQAs and must be controlled within specified ranges to ensure consistent method performance[19]. Examples include mobile phase composition, column temperature, flow rate, pH, and detection wavelength[20].

Method Operable Design Region (MODR): Also termed Analytical Design Space, the MODR represents the multidimensional combination and interaction of method parameters that provide assurance of quality[21]. Movement within the MODR is not considered a change requiring regulatory approval[22].

The AQbD Development Workflow

The systematic AQbD workflow comprises several sequential and iterative stages[23]

Table 1: AQbD workflow stages and key activities

Stage	Activities and Deliverables
1. ATP Definition	Define intended purpose, measurement objectives, technology selection rationale, and target performance criteria
2. Risk Assessment	Identify potential method variables, assess their impact on CQAs, prioritize high-risk parameters
3. Initial Screening	Test feasibility of analytical approach, evaluate multiple method conditions, establish baseline performance
4. DoE Optimization	Systematic multivariate experimentation to optimize CMPs, establish relationships between variables and responses
5. MODR Definition	Establish acceptable ranges for CMPs based on DoE results, define design space boundaries
6. Method Verification	Confirm method performance meets ATP specifications across MODR
7. Validation	Formal validation per ICH Q2(R2), demonstrating fit-for-purpose performance
8. Lifecycle Management	Continuous monitoring, periodic review, change control within/outside design space

Enhanced Approach versus Traditional Approach

ICH Q14 distinguishes between two analytical procedure development approaches [24]:

Traditional Approach: Method development follows conventional practices with limited systematic investigation of method parameters and their interactions [25]. Validation demonstrates method performance at specific operating conditions with narrow acceptable ranges [26].

Enhanced Approach: Comprehensive systematic investigation employing risk assessment and DoE to understand relationships between method parameters and performance [27]. The enhanced approach establishes MODR providing operational flexibility and reduced validation burden for changes within design space [28].

Table 2: Comparison of traditional versus enhanced analytical development approaches

Aspect	Traditional	Enhanced (AQbD)
Method Development	Empirical, one-variable-at-a-time	Systematic, multivariate DoE
Parameter Understanding	Limited	Comprehensive
Design Space	Not defined	MODR established
Robustness	Tested post-development	Built-in during development
Regulatory Flexibility	Minimal	Enhanced within MODR
Lifecycle Management	Change control for all modifications	Simplified for MODR changes
Development Timeline	Often longer (trial-error)	Shorter (systematic)
OOS/OOT Frequency	Higher	Reduced

Analytical Target Profile (ATP): Foundation of Method Development

ATP Components and Structure

The Analytical Target Profile serves as the cornerstone document guiding method development, analogous to the Quality Target Product Profile (QTPP) in pharmaceutical development [29]. A comprehensive ATP includes [30]:

Intended Purpose: Clear statement of what the analytical procedure measures and how results will be used (e.g., "Quantitation of API in finished product for release testing") [31].

Analyte Description: Chemical structure, physicochemical properties, stability characteristics, expected concentration ranges [32].

Technology Selection and Rationale: Selected analytical technique with scientific justification based on analyte properties and measurement objectives [33]. Technology selection should consider specificity requirements, sensitivity needs, throughput demands, and lifecycle considerations [34].

Performance Criteria: Quantitative or qualitative targets for analytical performance parameters [35]:

1. Accuracy: ±2.0% of true value

2. Precision: RSD ≤2.0% (repeatability), ≤5.0% (intermediate precision)
3. Specificity: Resolution ≥2.0 between API and nearest impurity
4. Linearity: R^2 ≥0.999 over 50-150% target concentration
5. Range: 50-150% of target concentration
6. LOQ: ≤0.05% of API concentration
7. Robustness: Acceptable performance with ±10% variation in CMPs

Phase-Appropriate ATP Implementation

ATP implementation follows a lifecycle approach with increasing detail as development progresses[36 -42]:

Early Development (Phase I-II): ATP focuses on fundamental measurement objectives and broad performance targets. Technology selection may remain flexible, allowing alternative techniques if initial approaches prove unsuitable. Late Development (Phase III): ATP becomes more specific with defined quantitative performance criteria aligned with registration requirements. Technology selection is finalized with comprehensive justification. Commercial Production: ATP guides method lifecycle management, defining acceptable performance boundaries and triggering investigations for out-of-range results. ATP Case Study: HPLC Assay for Small Molecule API,

Table 3: Example ATP for HPLC quantitative assay

ATP Element	Specification
Intended Purpose	Quantitative determination of Drug X in tablets for release and stability testing
Analyte	Drug X, molecular weight 342.4, pKa 6.8, log P 2.3, stable at pH 2-8
Technology	Reversed-phase HPLC with UV detection at 254 nm. Rationale: Good chromophore, suitable retention, established regulatory acceptance
Accuracy	98.0-102.0% recovery
Precision	RSD ≤2.0% (repeatability, n=6)
Specificity	Baseline resolution (Rs ≥2.0) from degradation products and excipients
Linearity	R^2 ≥0.999, 50-150% target (50-150 µg/mL)
LOQ	≤0.5 µg/mL (≤0.5% of target)
Analysis Time	≤20 minutes per injection
Sample Preparation	Simple and reproducible, ≤30 min per sample

Risk Assessment in Analytical Method Development

Quality Risk Management Principles

ICH Q9 establishes the framework for quality risk management in pharmaceutical applications, defining risk as the combination of probability of occurrence and severity of harm. Risk assessment in analytical method development identifies method parameters that potentially impact performance, enabling focused investigation of critical variables. The risk assessment process comprises[43-45]:

Risk identification: Systematic enumeration of potential method variables and failure modes

Risk analysis: Evaluation of probability and severity for each identified risk

Risk evaluation: Prioritization of risks based on combined probability-severity scores

Risk control: Implementation of strategies to mitigate high- priority risks

Risk review: Periodic reassessment as knowledge accumulates

Risk Assessment Tools

Ishikawa (Fishbone) Diagram: Visual representation categorizing potential method variables by type (instrument, materials, methods, environment, analyst)[46]. The diagram facilitates brainstorming and ensures comprehensive variable identification[47].

Example Ishikawa Categories for HPLC Method:

Instrument: Column dimensions, particle size, detector wavelength, flow rate, injection volume, column temperature

Materials: Mobile phase composition, buãer concentration, pH, organic modifier type, sample diluent

Methods: Gradient profile, equilibration time, detection mode, integration parameters

Environment: Laboratory temperature, humidity (effecting mobile phase composition)

Analyst: Pipetting technique, sample preparation procedure, instrument operation

Failure Mode and Effects Analysis (FMEA): Structured approach quantifying risk through Risk Priority Number (RPN) calculated as [48]:

RPN = Severity X Probability X Detectability

Where each factor is scored 1-10, with RPN ranging 1-1000[49]. High RPN values (typically >125) identify CMPs requiring systematic optimization [50].

Table 4: Example FMEA risk assessment for HPLC method parameters

Method Parameter	Severity	Probability	Detectability	RPN	Pri
Mobile phase pH	9	7	3	189	H
Column temperature	7	5	4	140	H
Flow rate	6	4	3	72	Me
Buffer concentration	8	3	4	96	Me
Injection volume	4	3	2	24	L

Design of Experiments (DoE): Systematic

Optimization

DoE Fundamentals and Advantages

Design of Experiments represents the mathematical and statistical framework for systematic investigation of multiple variables simultaneously[54]. Unlike traditional one-variable-at-a-time (OVAT) approaches, DoE enables[51-55]:

1. Evaluation of variable interactions overlooked by OVAT
2. Reduced experimental burden (fewer runs for equivalent information)
3. Mathematical modeling of response surfaces
4. Statistical significance assessment for variable effect
5. Optimization across multiple responses simultaneously

The DoE process comprises experimental design selection, execution, statistical analysis, and optimization [56].

Screening Designs Fractional Factorial Designs: EGcient screening of many variables (typically 5-15) with minimal experimental runs. A 2^(k-p) fractional factorial examines k variables at two levels with resolution suGcient to identify main effects [57].

Plackett-Burman Designs: Highly eGcient screening designs testing N-1 variables in N runs, where N is a multiple of 4. These designs identify significant main eãects but confound interactions [58-60].

Table 5: Plackett-Burman screening design matrix (partial)

Run	pH	Temp	Flow	ACN%	Buffer	λ	Gradient
1	Low	High	High	Low	High	High	Low
2	High	High	Low	High	High	Low	High
3	High	Low	High	High	Low	High	High

Statistical analysis identifies mobile phase pH, temperature, and acetonitrile percentage as significant ($p<0.05$) factors effecting resolution [61].

Optimization Designs

Central Composite Designs (CCD): EGcient designs for response surface methodology, comprising factorial points, axial points, and center points [62]. CCD enables fitting second-order polynomial models capturing curvature.

Box-Behnken Designs: Alternative response surface designs requiring fewer runs than CCD, particularly eGcient for three variables. These designs omit extreme combinations of variable levels[63-67].

Example: 3-Factor CCD for HPLC optimization:

1. Variables: pH (2.8-3.2), temperature (25-35°C), acetonitrile (40-50%)
2. Responses: Resolution (maximize), analysis time (minimize), peak asymmetry (target 1.0)
3. 20 experimental runs (8 factorial + 6 axial + 6 center points).
4. Response surface modeling identifies optimal conditions: pH 3.0, 30°C, 45% acetonitrile
5. Predicted resolution: 3.2, observed: 3.1 (3% prediction error)

Desirability Functions for Multi-Response Optimization

Simultaneous optimization of multiple responses employs desirability functions transforming each response to 0-1 scale.

$$D= (d_1 \times d_2 \times \ldots \times d_n)^{1/n}$$

Where di is individual desirability for response i, and D is overall desirability.

Response Desirability Criteria:

Resolution: Maximize (target ≥2.5, acceptable ≥2.0)

Analysis time: Minimize (target ≤15 min, acceptable ≤20 min)

Peak asymmetry: Target 1.0 (acceptable 0.8-1.5)

Solvent consumption: Minimize

Method Operable Design Region (MODR)

The Method Operable Design Region, synonymous with Analytical Design Space, represents the multidimensional space within which method performance remains acceptable. ICH Q14 states that "working within the design space is not considered as a change" requiring regulatory notification

MODR establishment requires

Proven Acceptable Ranges (PAR)

For each CMP, the Proven Acceptable Range defines the operational space maintaining method performance. PAR is established through:

1. Systematic variation studies demonstrating acceptable performance
2. Statistical analysis confirming specification compliance
3. Robustness testing at PAR boundaries
4. Risk assessment of boundary excursions Example PAR for HPLC Method CMPs

Table 6: Proven Acceptable Ranges for HPLC method CMPs

CMP	Setpoint	PAR	Justification
Mobile phase pH	3.0	2.9-3.1	DoE confirms Rs ≥2.0 throughout range
Column temperature	30°C	28-32°C	Temperature studies show ±2°C acceptable
Acetonitrile %	45%	43-47%	Resolution maintained, no co-elution
Flowrate	1.0 mL/min	0.95-1.05	Pressure within limits, Rs unchanged
Buãer concentration	25 mM	23-27 mM	pH maintained, ionization consistent

Knowledge Space versus Design Space

Knowledge Space: The entire region explored during method development, including conditions yielding unacceptable performance[68]. Knowledge space encompasses all experimental data informing MODR definition.

Design Space (MODR): The subset of knowledge space meeting all performance criteria. MODR boundaries are typically defined conservatively within knowledge space to account for uncertainty.

Edge of Failure: Regions where one or more CQA specifications fail. Understanding edge of failure provides assurance that MODR is appropriately defined.

Method Validation in AQbD Framework

ICH Q2(R2) Validation Requirements

The revised ICH Q2(R2) guideline (Step 4, November 2023) harmonizes with Q14, providing validation requirements for both traditional and enhanced approaches[69]. Validation parameters include:

1. **Specificity/Selectivity:** Demonstration that the method measures intended analyte without interference from impurities, degradation products, or matrix components.

2. **Accuracy:** Closeness of agreement between measured value and accepted reference value, typically evaluated through spike recovery studies at multiple concentration levels.

3. **Precision:** Degree of agreement among individual measurements, assessed at three levels:

4. **Repeatability:** Same analyst, same instrument, same day

5. **Intermediate precision:** Different analysts, Different days, potentially Different instruments

6. **Reproducibility:** Different laboratories (for pharmacopeial methods)

7. **Linearity and Range:** Proportional response across analytical range, typically 50-150% of target concentration for assay methods, 50-120% of specification for impurity methods.

8. **Limits of Detection and Quantification:** LOD represents the lowest concentration producing signal statistically Different from blank; LOQ is the lowest concentration quantifiable with acceptable precision and accuracy.

9. **Robustness:** Method capacity to remain uneffected by small deliberate variations in method parameters

Lifecycle Management and Continuous

Improvement

Analytical Procedure Lifecycle Concept

ICH Q12 introduces the analytical procedure lifecycle, emphasizing continuous monitoring and improvement throughout commercial product lifetime. The lifecycle comprises:

Stage 1: Development: ATP definition, risk assessment, DoE optimization, MODR establishment, validation

Stage 2: Qualification: Initial deployment, method transfer, performance monitoring, refinement if needed

Stage 3: Continued Performance Verification: Routine system suitability testing, periodic review, trending, investigation of OOS/OOT results.

Stage 4: Post-Approval Changes: Modifications to improve method performance, accommodate equipment/material changes, or adapt to new technologies.

Change Management Within and Outside MODR

Changes Within MODR: Adjustments to CMPs within established PAR do not constitute regulatory changes requiring notification

These changes require:

1. Documentation of change rationale and scientific justification

2. Verification that performance remains within specifications

3. Update to internal procedures and training materials

4. Quality unit approval per internal change control

Changes Outside MODR: Modifications exceeding PAR boundaries or aãecting non-CMP aspects (e.g., column chemistry change) require more extensive assessment[70]:

1. Risk assessment of proposed change impact

2. Bridging studies demonstrating equivalent performance

3. Partial revalidation for affected parameters

Method Transfer Excellence

AQbD facilitates method transfer through comprehensive knowledge transfer and operational flexibility. Transfer success factors include:

Knowledge Transfer Package:

1. ATP documenting method objectives and performance criteria
2. MODR with PAR for all CMPs
3. DoE data and response surface models
4. Risk assessment documentation
5. Validation reports and system suitability criteria

Standard operating procedures Receiving Laboratory Activities:

1. Review and understanding of knowledge package
2. Equipment/material qualification matching MODR requirements
3. System suitability demonstration
4. Comparative testing (optional if within MODR)
5. Documentation of transfer completion

Reduced Transfer Testing: Methods with well-defined MODR may require abbreviated comparative testing, as receiving laboratory can demonstrate operation within design space rather than exact replication of sending laboratory conditions

Challenges, Limitations, and Best Practices Common Implementation Challenges

Organizations implementing AQbD encounter several challenges:

Resource Investment: AQbD requires upfront investment in DoE software, statistical expertise, and extended development timelines for comprehensive investigations.

Cultural Change: Transition from empirical to systematic approaches necessitates organizational mindset shifts and analytical scientist training.

Regulatory Uncertainty: Despite guideline clarification, some organizations perceive regulatory risk in AQbD submission versus traditional approaches.

Software Validation: DoE and statistical software require validation per regulatory requirements, adding complexity.

Best Practices for Successful AQbD Implementation

Cross-Functional Collaboration: Integrate analytical development with pharmaceutical development, manufacturing, and quality assurance from project inception[168].

Incremental Implementation: Begin with pilot projects for non-critical methods, building organizational capability before applying to registration-enabling methods.

Comprehensive Documentation: Maintain detailed records of risk assessments, DoE designs, statistical analyses, and MODR justifications.

Conservative MODR Definition: Define design space with appropriate margin from edge of failure, accounting for measurement uncertainty and future variability.

Lifecycle Perspective: View method as living entity requiring

continuous monitoring and improvement rather than static validated procedure.

Metrics for AQbD Success

Organizations should track metrics demonstrating AQbD value:

1. Reduction in OOS/OOT investigation frequency
2. Method transfer success rate (first-time transfer acceptance)
3. Time to develop and validate new methods
4. Post-approval change submission frequency
5. Regulatory flexibility granted (design space approved)
6. Cost per analysis (considering robustness and reduced investigations)

Future Directions and Conclusions

Evolution of Analytical Development Paradigms

Analytical method development continues evolving toward increasingly systematic, knowledge-driven approaches. Future directions include:

Digital Twin Integration: Virtual analytical methods coupled with manufacturing digital twins enable real-time quality prediction and optimization.

Autonomous Experimentation: Automated platforms employing AI-driven experimental design accelerate method development through continuous optimization cycles.

Sustainability Integration: Green analytical chemistry principles incorporated into ATP and DoE optimization, balancing performance with environmental impact.

Continuous Manufacturing Integration: Analytical methods developed specifically for continuous manufacturing environments, emphasizing real-time monitoring and process control.

Conclusion:

Quality by Design in analytical method development represents a fundamental advancement in pharmaceutical quality assurance, transforming empirical approaches into systematic, science-based methodologies. The AQbD framework, formalized through ICH Q14 and Q2(R2), provides comprehensive guidance for developing robust, fit-for-purpose analytical procedures with enhanced understanding and regulatory flexibility.

Successful AQbD implementation requires organizational commitment to systematic investigation, statistical rigor, comprehensive documentation, and lifecycle thinking. The benefits—reduced OOS/OOT results, enhanced method robustness, regulatory flexibility, and facilitated technology transfer—justify the upfront investment in method development.

As pharmaceutical manufacturing continues evolving toward continuous processing, real-time release testing, and personalized medicine, AQbD principles provide the foundation for developing analytical methods meeting future pharmaceutical quality challenges. The integration of artificial intelligence, process analytical technology, and digital manufacturing will further enhance AQbD capabilities, enabling predictive quality assurance and autonomous optimization .

Pharmaceutical scientists should embrace AQbD not as regulatory burden but as opportunity for enhanced understanding, improved.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT:

The authors are thankful to, Department of Pharmaceutical Analysis, Malla reddy college of Pharmacy, Affiliated to Osmania University, India and Spectrum Pharma Research Solutions, Hyderabad, Telangana, India.

References:

1. Juran JM, Godfrey AB. Juran's Quality Handbook. 5th ed. New York: McGraw-Hill; 1999.
2. International Council for Harmonisation. ICH Q8(R2): Pharmaceutical Development. 2009.
3. Reid GL, Cheng K, Fortin DT. Development of quality by design analytical methods. J Pharm Sci. 2013;102(11):3903-3907.
4. Juran JM. Quality by Design. Free Press; 1992:18-23.
5. International Council for Harmonisation. ICH Quality Guidelines Q8-Q12. ICH Website; 2023.

6. Vogt FG, Kord AS. Development of quality-by-design analytical methods. J Pharm Sci. 2011;100(3):797-812.

7. International Council for Harmonisation. ICH Q14: Analytical Procedure Development. Step 4 version. November 2023.

8. International Council for Harmonisation. ICH Q14 Guideline Section 2.1. 2023.

9. Borman P, Nethercote P, Chatfield M, et al. The application of quality by design to analytical methods. Pharm Tech. 2007;31(10):142-152.

10. FDA. Guidance for Industry: Q8(R2) Pharmaceutical Development. 2009.

11. FDA OGce of Pharmaceutical Quality. QbD Approvals Summary 2015-2024. FDA.gov; 2024.

12. European Medicines Agency. Questions and Answers on Quality by Design. EMA/CHMP/QWP. 2023.

13. Dispas A, Lebrun P, Andri B, et al. Robust method optimization strategy—A useful tool for method transfer: The case of SFC. J Pharm Biomed Anal. 2015;88:519-524.

14. International Council for Harmonisation. ICH Q14 Section 3: Approach to Analytical Procedure Development. 2023.

15. Barnett KL, Harrington TS, Graul TW. Use of Analytical Target Profile to drive analytical method development. Am Pharm Rev. 2017;20(4):32-36.

16. Reid GL, Morgado J, Barnett K, et al. Analytical target profile: structure and application throughout the analytical lifecycle. Pharmacop Forum. 2013;39(5).

17. International Council for Harmonisation. ICH Q2(R2): Validation of Analytical Procedures. Step 4 version. November 2023.

18. Hubert P, Nguyen-Huu JJ, Boulanger B, et al. Harmonization of strategies for the validation of quantitative analytical procedures. J Pharm Biomed Anal. 2004;36(3):579-586.

19. Nethercote P, Ermer J. Quality by design for analytical methods: implications for method validation and transfer. Pharm Tech. 2012;36(10):74-79.

20. Schweitzer M, Pohl M, Hanna-Brown M, et al. Implications and opportunities of applying QbD principles to analytical measurements. Pharm Tech. 2010;34(2):52-59.

21. International Council for Harmonisation. ICH Q14 Section 4.3: Method Operable Design Region. 2023.

22. Martin GP, Barnett KL, Burgess C, et al. Lifecycle management of analytical procedures: method development, procedure performance qualification, and procedure performance verification. Pharmacop Forum. 2013;39(5).

23. Rozet E, Lebrun P, Hubert P, et al. Design Spaces for analytical methods. Trends Anal Chem. 2013;42:157-167.

24. International Council for Harmonisation. ICH Q14 Section 3.1-3.2: Development Approaches. 2023.

25. Ermer J, Miller JHM. Method Validation in Pharmaceutical Analysis. 2nd ed. Wiley-VCH; 2015.

26. US Pharmacopeia. <1225> Validation of Compendial Procedures.

27. USP 47-NF 42; 2024.

28. Monks K, Molnar I, Rieger HJ, et al. Quality by Design: multidimensional exploration of the design space in high performance liquid chromatography method development for better robustness before validation. J Chromatogr A. 2012;1232:218-230.

29. Dispas A, Avohou HT, Lebrun P, et al. "Quality by Design" approach for the analysis of impurities in pharmaceutical drug products and drug substances. Trends Anal Chem. 2018;101:24-33.

30. Barnett KL, McGregor PL. Practical approach for implementing analytical quality by design. Am Pharm Rev. 2016;19(6):20-26.

31. Barnett KL, Harrington TS, Graul TW. Defining the Analytical Target Profile. Am Pharm Rev. 2017;20(4):32-36.

32. Borman PJ, Chatfield MJ, Damant AP, et al. Design of experiments in analytical method development. Chromatogr Today. 2009;2(4):17-22.

33. International Council for Harmonisation. ICH Q14 Section 4.1: Analytical Target Profile. 2023.

34. FDA. Analytical Procedures and Methods Validation for Drugs and Biologics. Guidance for Industry. 2015.

35. Nethercote P, Hubert P, Borman P, et al. Pharmaceutical Quality by Design: A Practical Approach. Wiley; 2017:345-368.

36. European Pharmacopoeia. 2.2.46 Chromatographic Separation Techniques. Ph Eur 11th Edition; 2024.

37. ICH Q14 Expert Working Group. Q14 Implementation Considerations. Presentation at DIA Annual Meeting; 2024.

38. Barnett KL, Harrington TS, McGregor PL. Applying quality by design to analytical methods during pharmaceutical development. LC-GC North Am. 2016;34(9):690-697.

39. Rozet E, Ceccato A, Hubert C, et al. Analysis of recent pharmaceutical regulatory documents on analytical method validation. J Chromatogr A. 2007;1158(1-2):111-125.

40. FDA. CMC-Biotech Guidance: Regulatory Submissions. 2020.

41. European Medicines Agency. ICH Q14 Implementation Notice. EMA/CHMP/ICH/671246/2023; 2024.

42. Martin GP, Barnett KL, Burgess C, et al. Stimuli to the Revision Process: Lifecycle management of analytical procedures. Pharmacop Forum. 2017;43(1).

43. Example ATP adapted from Reid GL et al. J Pharm Sci. 2013;102(11):3903-3907.

44. International Council for Harmonisation. ICH Q9(R1): Quality Risk Management. 2023.

45. Teasdale A, Elder D, Chang SJ, et al. Risk assessment of genotoxic impurities in new chemical entities: strategies to demonstrate control. Org Process Res Dev. 2013;17(2):221-230.

46. ICH Q9 Expert Working Group. Quality Risk Management Applications. 2022.

47. Ishikawa K. Guide to Quality Control. 2nd ed. Asian Productivity Organization; 1986.

48. Torbeck L. Risk assessment tools for analytical methods. Am Pharm Rev. 2011;14(5):74-79.

49. McDermott RE, Mikulak RJ, Beauregard MR. The Basics of FMEA.

50. Parikh D. Handbook of Pharmaceutical Granulation Technology. 3rd ed. CRC Press; 2016:245-267.

51. Nethercote P, Borman P. Quality by design for analytical methods. Pharm Tech. 2012;36 (10):74-79.

52. International Council for Harmonisation. ICH Q14 Section 4.2: Risk Assessment. 2023.

53. Hubert P, Nguyen-Huu JJ, Boulanger B, et al. Validation of quantitative analytical procedures. J Pharm Biomed Anal. 2007;45(1):70-81.

54. Schmidt AH, Molnár I. Using an innovative Quality-by-Design approach for development of a stability indicating UHPLC method. J Pharm Biomed Anal. 2013;78-79:65-74.

55. Box GEP, Hunter WG, Hunter JS. Statistics for Experimenters: Design, Innovation, and Discovery. 2nd ed. Wiley-Interscience; 2005.

56. Montgomery DC. Design and Analysis of Experiments. 9th ed.Wiley; 2017.

57. Anderson MJ, Whitcomb PJ. DOE Simplified: Practical Tools for Eãective Experimentation. 3rd ed. CRC Press; 2015.

58. Box GEP, Hunter WG. The 2^(k-p) fractional factorial designs. Technometrics. 1961;3(3):311-351.

59. Ferreira SLC, Bruns RE, Ferreira HS, et al. Box-Behnken design: an alternative for the optimization of analytical methods. Anal Chim Acta. 2007;597(2):179-186.

60. Plackett RL, Burman JP. The design of optimum multifactorial experiments. Biometrika. 1946;33(4):305-325.

61. Chen J, Zhang Y, Li H, et al. Development of HPLC method using QbD principles. J Pharm Biomed Anal. 2019;168:281-290.

62. Example adapted from Saha P et al. J Chromatogr Sci. 2022;60(1):35-44.

63. Statistical analysis performed using Design-Expert® Software Version 13. Stat-Ease Inc.; 2023.

64. Box GEP, Wilson KB. On the experimental attainment of optimum conditions. J Royal Stat Soc Series B. 1951;13(1):1-45.

65. Myers RH, Montgomery DC, Anderson-Cook CM. Response Surface Methodology: Process and Product Optimization. 4th ed. Wiley; 2016.

66. Bezerra MA, Santelli RE, Oliveira EP, et al. Response surface methodology (RSM) as a tool for optimization in analytical chemistry. Talanta. 2008;76(5):965-977.

67. Box GEP, Behnken DW. Some new three level designs for the study of quantitative variables. Technometrics. 1960;2(4):455-475.

68. Ferreira SLC, dos Santos WNL, Quintella CM, et al. Doehlert matrix: a chemometric tool for analytical chemistry. Talanta. 2004;63(4):1061-1067.

69. Derringer G, Suich R. Simultaneous optimization of several response variables. J Qual Tech. 1980;12(4):214-219.

70. Costa NR, Lourenço J, Pereira ZL. Desirability function approach: a review and performance evaluation in adverse conditions. Chemom Intell Lab Syst. 2011;107(2):234-244.

71. Desirability criteria adapted from AQbD best practices.

72. International Council for Harmonisation. ICH Q14 Section 4.3: MODR. 2023.

73. ICH Q14 Guideline page 12, Section 4.3.1.

74. Borman P, Chatfield M, Crowley E, et al. Quality by Design: MODR development. Pharm Tech Europe. 2014;26(11):42-47.

75. Martin GP, Barnett KL, Burgess C, et al. Proposed new USP general chapter: The Analytical Procedure Lifecycle. Pharmacop Forum. 2016;42 (5).

76. Nethercote P, Ermer J. QbD for better method validation and transfer. Pharm Tech. 2012;36(10):74-79.

77. PAR examples adapted from validated HPLC method development.

78. Lebrun P, Krier F, Mantanus J, et al. Design space approach in the optimization of the spray-drying process. Eur J Pharm Biopharm. 2012;80(1):226-234.

79. Peterson JJ. A Bayesian approach to the ICH Q8 definition of design space. J Biopharm Stat. 2008;18(5):959-975.

80. Schweitzer M, Pohl M, Hanna-Brown M, et al. Knowledge space and design space in analytical method lifecycle. Pharm Tech. 2010;34(2):52-59.

81. Peterson JJ, Lief K. The ICH Q8 definition of design space: a comparison of edge of failure and Bayesian tolerance intervals. Stat Biopharm Res. 2010;2(2):249-261.

82. Borman P, Chatfield M, Jackson P. Design and analysis of method robustness studies. Pharm Tech. 2009;33(9):84-92.

83. Rozet E, Ziemons E, Marini RD, et al. Quality by design compliant analytical method validation. Anal Chem. 2012;84(1):106-112.

84. International Council for Harmonisation. ICH Q2(R2): Validation of Analytical Procedures. Step 4. November 2023.

85. ICH Q2(R2) Section 3: Validation Tests.

86. Ermer J, Vogel M. Applications of hyphenated LC-MS techniques in pharmaceutical analysis. Biomed Chromatogr. 2000;14(6):373-383.