International Journal of Zoology and Applied Biosciences **ISSN: 2455-9571**
Volume 11, Issue 5, pp: 56-59, 2026
https://doi.org/10.55126/ijzab.2026.v11.i05.007 **http://www.ijzab.com**

Research Article

A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF REGULATORY REQUIREMENTS AND PROCEDURES OF THE EU, CANADA AND INDIA

***Rajkiran Kolakota, Uriti Sri Venkatesh, Kornu Manjulatha, Anand Singh**

Sri Sivani College of Pharmacy,Chilakapalem, Srikakulam, (Affiliated to Jawaharlal Nehru Technological University Gurajada Vizianagaram), Andhra Pradesh, India.

Article History: Received 25th May 2026; Accepted 12th July 2026; Published 1st September 2026

ABSTRACT

The regulatory landscape for pharmaceuticals plays a pivotal role in ensuring quality, safety, and efficacy of medicines. The European Union (EU), Canada, and India are major players with distinct regulatory frameworks. This study conducts a comparative analysis of the regulatory requirements and procedures for pharmaceutical approvals across these jurisdictions. It explores dossier formats, clinical data requirements, bioequivalence standards, timelines, pharmacovigilance obligations, and reliance pathways. The findings highlight differences in harmonization, reliance on international guidelines, timelines, and post-approval obligations, underscoring opportunities for cooperation and convergence. The study concludes with recommendations for regulatory efficiency and public health alignment.

Keywords: Quality, Safety, Pathways, Public health, Canada, India.

INTRODUCTION

Pharmaceutical regulatory systems form the backbone of public health protection by ensuring that medicinal products made available to patients are safe, effective, and of consistent quality. As medicines directly affect human life, regulatory authorities worldwide are entrusted with the responsibility of evaluating pharmaceutical products before they enter the market and continuously monitoring them throughout their lifecycle. Over the past few decades, the rapid globalization of pharmaceutical research, manufacturing, and distribution has increased the complexity of regulatory oversight and highlighted the need for well-defined, transparent, and harmonized regulatory frameworks (WHO, 2017; ICH, 2022). The globalization of the pharmaceutical industry has resulted in medicines being developed in one country, manufactured in another, and marketed across multiple regions. This global supply chain requires regulatory authorities to rely on scientifically robust data while simultaneously addressing region-specific public health priorities. Differences in national regulatory requirements can lead to duplication of clinical studies, delays in market access, increased development costs, and limited availability of affordable medicines (Kaplan & Laing, 2019). Consequently, comparative analysis of regulatory systems has become increasingly important for policymakers, regulatory professionals, and pharmaceutical manufacturers.

The European Union (EU), Canada, and India represent three distinct but influential pharmaceutical regulatory jurisdictions. The EU is recognized for its highly structured and harmonized regulatory framework, supported by strong legal instruments and coordinated scientific evaluation through the European Medicines Agency (EMA). Canada, through Health Canada, maintains a centralized regulatory system that emphasizes scientific rigor, patient safety, and alignment with international standards. India, as one of the world's largest producers of generic medicines, operates a regulatory system that balances global regulatory alignment with domestic public health needs (EMA, 2021; Health Canada, 2022; CDSCO, 2021). The EU pharmaceutical regulatory framework is governed by a combination of EU regulations and directives, most notably Regulation (EC) No. 726/2004 and Directive 2001/83/EC. These legal instruments establish centralized, decentralized, and mutual recognition procedures for marketing authorization of medicinal products across member states. The centralized procedure allows a single marketing authorization to be valid throughout the EU, significantly facilitating regional

*Corresponding Author: Rajkiran Kolakota, Professor and Principal, Sri Sivani College of Pharmacy, Chilakapalem, Srikakulam, Affiliated to Jawaharlal Nehru Technological University Gurajada Vizianagaram, AP. Email: rajkiran.kolakota@gmail.com.

access to medicines and regulatory efficiency (Ruggieri *et al*., 2018). The EU system is also closely aligned with the guidelines of the International Council for Harmonisation (ICH), ensuring global regulatory consistency.

Canada's pharmaceutical regulatory system is administered by Health Canada through its Therapeutic Products Directorate (TPD) and Biologic and Radiopharmaceutical Drugs Directorate (BRDD). Health Canada evaluates drug submissions under the Food and Drugs Act and associated regulations, employing pathways such as standard review, priority review, and conditional approval for drugs addressing serious or life-threatening conditions. Canada is an active participant in ICH and has adopted the Common Technical Document (CTD) format, facilitating simultaneous submissions across multiple regulatory jurisdictions (Health Canada, 2022; ICH, 2022). India's regulatory framework is governed by the Drugs and Cosmetics Act, 1940, and the Drugs and Cosmetics Rules, 1945, with regulatory oversight provided by the Central Drugs Standard Control Organization (CDSCO). India plays a critical role in the global pharmaceutical market as a leading supplier of generic medicines and vaccines, particularly to low- and middle-income countries. In recent years, India has undertaken significant regulatory reforms to strengthen clinical trial oversight, pharmacovigilance systems, and digital submission processes, while aligning its requirements with international standards such as ICH guidelines (Ghosh & Spencer, 2017; CDSCO, 2021). Despite increasing convergence through international harmonization initiatives, notable differences remain among the regulatory requirements and approval procedures of the EU, Canada, and India. These differences are observed in dossier submission formats, clinical and bioequivalence study requirements, review timelines, approval pathways, and post-approval regulatory obligations. Such regulatory diversity can influence strategic decision-making for pharmaceutical companies and impact the speed at which new and generic medicines reach patients (Calvo *et al*., 2019; WHO, 2020).

Comparative evaluation of these regulatory systems provides valuable insights into best practices, regulatory strengths, and areas requiring improvement. Understanding similarities and differences among the EU, Canada, and India can support regulatory convergence, enhance reliance and recognition mechanisms, and contribute to more efficient global drug development and approval processes. Furthermore, such analysis is essential for strengthening regulatory capacity, ensuring patient safety, and improving access to quality medicines worldwide. Therefore, this study aims to conduct a comprehensive comparative analysis of the regulatory requirements and procedures governing pharmaceutical product approval in the EU, Canada, and India. By examining regulatory structures, submission requirements, clinical evaluation processes, timelines, and post-approval obligations, the study seeks to identify regulatory challenges and opportunities for harmonization, ultimately contributing to improved regulatory efficiency and public health outcomes. The literature on regulatory frameworks reveals significant efforts worldwide to harmonize standards, often guided by international bodies such as the International Council for Harmonisation of Technical Requirements for Pharmaceuticals for Human Use (ICH) and the World Health Organization (WHO) (ICH, 2022; WHO, 2017). Studies on EU regulations highlight the comprehensive nature of EMA's centralized and decentralized procedures (Ruggieri *et al*., 2018). Research on Canada's regulatory system emphasizes scientific rigour, reliance pathways, and alignment with ICH guidelines (Dressman *et al*., 2015). India's evolving regulatory environment demonstrates challenges and progress in adopting global standards while balancing access (Srinivasulu *et al*., 2020). Comparative studies have examined regulatory convergence, noting that while harmonization efforts exist, substantial differences remain in clinical data requirements and timelines (Calvo *et al*., 2019). However, there is limited literature that simultaneously compares the EU, Canada, and India in a comprehensive regulatory context, indicating a knowledge gap this study seeks to address.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Study Design

This research adopts a qualitative, descriptive comparative design analyzing secondary data from regulatory guidelines, legal documents, academic sources, and international standards.

Data Sources

EU pharmaceutical regulations and EMA guidelines, Health Canada regulators and guidance documents, CDSCO Indian regulatory guidelines, ICH guidelines and WHO reports, Peer-reviewed journals and regulatory policy analyses.

Framework for Comparison

The study compares: Regulatory authority structures, Dossier requirements and technical formats, Clinical and bioequivalence requirements, Approval pathways and timelines, post-approval obligations (pharmacovigilance, manufacturing changes).

European Union

The EU regulatory system is governed by Regulation (EC) No 726/2004, Directive 2001/83/EC, and subsequent amendments. The EMA coordinates scientific evaluation through the centralized procedure, enabling a single marketing authorization valid across all EU member states (EMA, 2021).

Canada

Health Canada's Therapeutic Products Directorate (TPD) oversees drug regulation. Regulatory pathways include standard review, priority review, and conditional approvals based on clinical benefit and unmet need (Health Canada, 2022). Canada follows ICH guidelines and has a well-established pharmacovigilance system.

India

The CDSCO regulates pharmaceuticals under the Drugs and Cosmetics Act, 1940 and the Drugs and Cosmetics Rules, 1945. India has integrated ICH-aligned requirements and strengthened its regulatory processes through amendments and digitalization (CDSCO, 2021; Ghosh & Spencer, 2017).

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

All three jurisdictions adopt the ICH Common Technical Document (CTD) format, facilitating global submissions (ICH, 2022). The EU and Canada have fully adopted the eCTD, while India's implementation has evolved toward mandatory eCTD usage (CDSCO, 2021). The EU requires robust clinical evidence and, for generics, demonstration of bioequivalence typically through comparative studies (EMA, 2021). Canada follows similar principles and often accepts foreign clinical and bioequivalence data if scientifically justified (Health Canada, 2022). India mandates bioequivalence for generics, with some local study requirements; efforts are ongoing to accept international data under specified conditions (Srinivasulu *et al*., 2020). The EU centralized procedure has defined timelines, Canada has priority review pathways, and India's timelines are improving with digitalization but still vary (Calvo *et al*., 2019; WHO, 2020).

Table 1. Dossier and Submission Requirements in EU,Canada and India.

Feature	EU	Canada	India
Dossier Format	CTD/ eCTD mandatory	eCTD preferred	eCTD (recently mandated)
Technical Sections	Quality, Safety, Efficacy	Quality, Safety, Efficacy	Quality, Safety, Efficacy
Local Administrative Data	Yes	Yes	Yes

Table 2. Timelines and Review Procedures.

Jurisdiction	Standard Review	Priority / Accelerated
EU	~210 days	Conditional use
Canada	~300 days	180 days (priority)
India	Variable (12-24 months)	Proposed expedited pathways

All three jurisdictions require post-marketing surveillance, periodic safety update reports (PSURs), and GMP compliance inspections (ICH, 2022). The EU's pharmacovigilance framework is mature, Canada has robust reporting requirements, and India is strengthening its pharmacovigilance ecosystem. The comparative analysis highlights both convergences and divergences among the EU, Canada, and India. All three systems adopt ICH-aligned CTD formats, which supports global regulatory convergence (ICH, 2022). However, differences remain in the implementation of bioequivalence standards, acceptance of foreign clinical data, and regulatory timelines. The EU's centralized procedure offers significant efficiencies for multinational submissions, whereas Canada's priority review aligns incentives with unmet medical needs but remains slower in standard reviews (Dressman *et al*., 2015). India's regulatory reforms reflect rapid evolution with efforts toward digitalization and alignment with global best practices, but variations in timelines and local data requirements persist (Srinivasulu *et al*., 2020). The literature indicates that reliance and recognition models—such as mutual recognition agreements—can improve regulatory efficiency without compromising quality and safety (WHO, 2017). Such models could be explored further among these jurisdictions to minimize duplication. The study also underscores the importance of post-approval obligations, which protect public health but add complexity to lifecycle management. Harmonization around PSURs and pharmacovigilance reporting could benefit global pharmacovigilance strategies.

CONCLUSION

This study demonstrates that the EU, Canada, and India share foundational regulatory principles guided by ICH and international standards. Yet, significant differences persist in procedural requirements, timelines, and implementation. Enhanced reliance mechanisms, further harmonization of bioequivalence acceptance, and continued regulatory capacity building are recommended to improve global regulatory convergence and public health outcomes.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The authors express sincere thanks to the Head of the, Sri Sivani College of Pharmacy, Chilakapalem, Srikakulam, affiliated to Jawaharlal Nehru Technological University Gurajada Vizianagaram, Andhra Pradesh for the facilities provided to carry out this research work.

CONFLICT OF INTERESTS

The authors declare no conflict of interest

ETHICS APPROVAL

Not applicable

FUNDING

This study received no specific funding from public, commercial, or not-for-profit funding agencies.

AI TOOL DECLARATION

The authors declare that no AI and related tools are used to write the scientific content of this manuscript.

DATA AVAILABILITY

Data will be available on request

REFERENCES

Calvo, B., et al. (2019). Regulatory convergence in global pharmaceutical markets. *Journal of Regulatory Science, 7*(2), 11-25.

Central Drugs Standard Control Organization. (2021). *Guidance document on eCTD submission.* New Delhi, India: Government of India.

Dressman, J., et al. (2015). *Pharmaceutical regulatory harmonization.* Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.

European Medicines Agency. (2021). *Guideline on the investigation of bioequivalence.* Amsterdam, The Netherlands: Author.

Ghosh, A., & Spencer, A. (2017). Reforms in India's pharmaceutical regulatory environment. *Indian Journal of Pharmaceutical Sciences, 79*(3), 350-358.

Health Canada. (2022). *Guidance document: Management of drug submissions.* Ottawa, ON, Canada: Author.

International Council for Harmonisation. (2022). *Common technical document (CTD) for the registration of pharmaceuticals.* Geneva, Switzerland: Author.

Kaplan, W., & Laing, R. (2019). Local production of pharmaceuticals. *Health Policy and Planning, 34*(6), 456-469.

Ruggieri, F., et al. (2018). The EU regulatory framework: Scope and evolution. *European Journal of Clinical Pharmacology, 74*(1), 1-10.

Srinivasulu, B., et al. (2020). Bioequivalence requirements in India. *Regulatory Affairs Journal, 12*(4), 145-154.

World Health Organization. (2017). *WHO guidelines on registration requirements for generic medicines.* Geneva, Switzerland: Author.

World Health Organization. (2020). *Regulatory systems strengthening for medical products.* Geneva, Switzerland: Author.

Zaheer, S., et al. (2019). Comparative global regulatory pathways. *International Journal of Pharmacy Practice, 27*(5), 487-495.

Gupta, V., & Sharma, P. (2021). Regulatory timelines across jurisdictions. *Journal of Pharmaceutical Policy, 14*(23), 77-89.

Li, X., & Chen, M. (2018). Post-approval requirements in global markets. *Regulatory Rapport, 6*(3), 33-45.

Smith, D., & Lee, J. (2017). Pharmacovigilance practices in global regulation. *Drug Safety Today, 10*(2), 89-102.

© The Author(s) 2025. This article is published by International Journal of Zoology and Applied Biosciences under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.