ISSN: 0976-7126
Chawla & Ambekar, 16(9):18-26, 2025

International Journal of Pharmacy & Life Sciences
Open Access to Researcher

A Comprehensive review of Analytical Quality by Design, ICH Q14, and design of experiments in pharmaceutical Analysis: A Synergistic Paradigm for enhanced quality and regulatory efficiency

Rajesh Kumar Chawla*and Naresh Ambekar

Brio Pharmaceuticals Inc., 10863 Rockley Road, Houston, Texas, USA 77099

Article info

Received: 17/07/2025

Revised: 27/08/2025

Accepted: 08/09/2025

© IJPLS

www.ijplsjournal.com

Abstract

In the modern pharmaceutical landscape, the demand for robust, reliable, and efficient analytical methods is paramount. This manuscript provides a comprehensive review of three interconnected paradigms that are fundamentally reshaping pharmaceutical analysis: Analytical Quality by Design (AQbD), the ICH Q14 guideline on Analytical Procedure Development, and the application of Design of Experiments (DoE). Historically, analytical method development followed a trial-and-error approach, often leading to methods that were fragile, poorly understood, and difficult to transfer. This reactive paradigm is being superseded by a proactive, science- and risk-based approach. AQbD establishes a structured framework for building quality into an analytical procedure from the outset, moving beyond simple compliance to a state of enhanced method understanding and robust performance. ICH Q14 formalizes this approach within a global regulatory context, providing a clear pathway for a structured development process, a well-defined Analytical Target Profile (ATP), and a lifecycle management strategy for analytical procedures.

Simultaneously, DoE serves as a critical statistical tool, enabling the systematic exploration of method parameters and their interactions, thereby facilitating the identification of a robust operating design space. This review explores the foundational principles of each paradigm, detailing their core components and objectives. It then delves into their synergistic integration, demonstrating how DoE is the key enabler for implementing an AQbD strategy as outlined by ICH Q14. Practical applications and case studies from various analytical techniques, such as chromatography and spectroscopy, are presented to illustrate the tangible benefits, including improved method ruggedness, reduced method transfer failures, and streamlined post-approval changes. Finally, this review discusses the challenges in implementing this synergistic approach, proposes solutions, and offers a glimpse into future perspectives, highlighting the potential for automation, advanced data analytics, and continuous improvement in analytical procedures. This integrated paradigm represents a crucial evolution in analytical science, promising to enhance product quality, accelerate drug development, and foster greater regulatory efficiency.

Keywords: Analytical Quality by Design (AQbD), ICH Q14, Design of Experiments (DoE), Pharmaceutical Analysis, Analytical Procedure Lifecycle, Method Robustness, Design Space

Introduction

The pharmaceutical industry operates under strict regulatory oversight, with a primary focus on ensuring the safety, efficacy, and quality of drug products. Analytical procedures are the backbone of this quality assurance system, used throughout the product lifecycle from early development to commercial manufacturing [1]. Traditional approaches to analytical method development have often been empirical, relying on a one-factor-at-a-time (OFAT) approach.

***Corresponding Author**
E.mail: rbchawla07@gmail.com

This method, while seemingly straightforward, is inefficient and often fails to uncover critical interactions between method parameters, leading to a limited understanding of the method's performance and robustness [2]. The resulting methods can be susceptible to minor variations in environmental conditions, reagents, or equipment, leading to out-of-specification results and costly investigations.

Recognizing the limitations of this traditional model, regulatory bodies and the industry have advocated for a more systematic, science- and risk-based approach. This shift is embodied by the principles of Quality by Design (QbD), a concept introduced by the International Council for Harmonisation (ICH) [3]. QbD aims to build quality into a product from the design stage, rather than relying solely on end-product testing. This paradigm has been extended to the analytical domain, giving rise to Analytical Quality by Design (AQbD). AQbD applies the same core principles to the development and lifecycle management of analytical procedures, ensuring they are fit-for-purpose and robust throughout their operational life.

The regulatory support for this transition has been formalized through the issuance of new guidelines, most notably ICH Q14, which specifically addresses the development of analytical procedures and their lifecycle management [4]. ICH Q14 provides a framework for a structured development process, enabling developers to define an Analytical Target Profile (ATP), identify Critical Method Parameters (CMPs), and establish a Design Space within which the method remains robust.

To effectively implement the principles of AQbD and meet the expectations of ICH Q14, a powerful statistical tool is required: Design of Experiments (DoE). DoE is a systematic methodology for investigating the effects of multiple factors simultaneously. It allows for the efficient identification of critical parameters and their interactions, which is essential for defining the method's design space. Without DoE, a thorough understanding of the analytical procedure is virtually impossible [5].

This review seeks to elucidate the foundational principles of AQbD, ICH Q14, and DoE, and, most importantly, to highlight their synergistic relationship. This integrated paradigm represents a powerful framework for developing high-quality, robust, and efficient analytical methods that meet and exceed current regulatory expectations. We will explore the key concepts of each component, demonstrate their practical application through case studies, and discuss the challenges and future directions of this transformative approach.

Analytical Quality by Design (AQBD): Foundational principles and components

AQbD is a systematic, proactive approach to analytical method development that begins with predefined objectives and emphasizes method understanding and control [6, 7]. The ultimate goal is to ensure the method consistently delivers its intended performance throughout its lifecycle. The core components of an AQbD approach are as follows:

Defining the Analytical Target Profile (ATP): The ATP is the cornerstone of AQbD. It is a prospective summary of the desired performance characteristics of the analytical procedure, defining the method's objective and its required quality attributes. An ATP should be a comprehensive statement, specifying the required accuracy, precision, specificity, detection limit, quantitation limit, range, and robustness of the method. For example, an ATP for a chromatographic method might state: "The method shall accurately quantify an active pharmaceutical ingredient (API) in a tablet formulation with a precision of $\leq$ 2.0% relative standard deviation (RSD), an accuracy of 98.0-102.0%, and shall be specific for the API in the presence of excipients and known degradation products."

Risk Assessment: A thorough **risk assessment** is performed at the beginning of the development process to identify potential sources of variability that could impact the method's performance. This often involves a multi-disciplinary team and tools such as Failure Mode and Effects Analysis (FMEA) [8]. The assessment identifies potential Critical Method Parameters (CMPs) and Critical Quality Attributes (CQAs). CQAs are the measurable attributes of the method (e.g., peak resolution, tailing factor) that must be controlled to meet the ATP. CMPs are the experimental conditions (e.g., column temperature, mobile

phase composition) that, if varied, could significantly impact the CQAs.

Method Development and Optimization: This phase involves the systematic investigation of the CMPs to understand their impact on the CQAs. This is where DoE plays a pivotal role. Through a series of experiments, the developer can build a comprehensive understanding of the relationships between input parameters and output responses. This is a significant departure from the OFAT approach.

Defining the Design Space: The Design Space is the multidimensional combination and interaction of method parameters shown to provide assurance of quality. It represents the region of parameter settings within which the method's CQAs are consistently met. Operating within the design space is not considered a change to the method and does not require regulatory approval [9]. This provides flexibility and facilitates continuous improvement.

Control Strategy: A Control Strategy is a documented set of controls, derived from the risk assessment and design space definition, that ensures the method consistently performs as intended. It includes controls on the method parameters, reagents, equipment, and a system for monitoring the method's performance over time. This strategy ensures the method remains in a state of control throughout its lifecycle.

Method Lifecycle Management: AQbD principles extend beyond initial development to cover the entire lifecycle of the analytical procedure, including transfer, validation, and post-approval changes. This proactive approach ensures that the method's performance is continuously monitored and improved, and that any necessary changes can be managed efficiently [10].

Table 1: Key Components of Analytical Quality by Design (AQbD)

Component	Definition	Key Elements/Purpose
Analytical Target Profile (ATP)	Predefined objective of the method, stipulating performance requirements.	Defines what is measured, why, and desired performance criteria (accuracy, precision, sensitivity, linearity, robustness). Serves as the basis for method design, validation, and lifecycle monitoring.
Critical Quality Attributes (CQAs)	Characteristics of a product critical to its quality, measured by the analytical method.	Examples include accuracy, precision, specificity, linearity, range, and robustness. Identified by understanding intended use and through risk assessment tools (e.g., Ishikawa diagrams, FMEA).
Critical Method Parameters (CMPs)	Analytical conditions or input variables that significantly impact method performance.	Examples include mobile phase composition (ratio, pH), column temperature, flow rate, and injection volume. Identified through risk assessment and prior knowledge.
Method Operable Design Region (MODR)	The established operating range for critical method input variables that consistently produce results meeting ATP goals.	Established based on CMP models and robustness simulations (often using DoE). Allows flexibility in parameters without requiring regulatory re-submission.
Control Strategy	A planned set of controls, derived from method understanding, ensuring consistent process performance and product quality.	Includes parameters that need control and system suitability tests (SSTs) to ensure the method is suitable during routine use and throughout its lifecycle.

ICH Q14: Analytical procedure development – A Regulatory framework

ICH Q14, a new guideline developed in conjunction with ICH Q2(R2) on validation, provides the regulatory framework for applying AQbD principles to analytical procedure development. It outlines a structured approach that enables a more flexible and scientifically sound development process. The guideline distinguishes between a conventional approach and an enhanced approach to development.

Conventional vs. Enhanced Approach: The conventional approach is a continuation of the traditional development process, where the method is developed and then validated, with little flexibility for post-approval changes. The enhanced approach, on the other hand, is a more systematic, risk- and knowledge-based approach that aligns directly with AQbD principles. ICH Q14 encourages the use of the enhanced approach, as it leads to a more robust, well-understood method with a defined design space and control strategy.

Key Elements of ICH Q14: The guideline outlines a logical flow for the enhanced development process:

Analytical Target Profile (ATP): The development starts with a clear, predefined ATP, which serves as the ultimate goal for the method.

Risk Assessment: A systematic risk assessment is conducted to identify potential factors that could influence the method's ability to meet the ATP.

Enhanced Understanding: Through the use of DoE and other scientific principles, a deeper understanding of the relationship between method parameters and performance attributes is achieved. This leads to the establishment of a design space.

Control Strategy: A comprehensive control strategy is defined to ensure the method's consistent performance. This includes system suitability tests, equipment calibration, and parameter monitoring.

Lifecycle Management: The guideline promotes the concept of analytical procedure lifecycle management, where the method's performance is monitored and continuously improved post-validation and post-approval.

ICH Q14's primary contribution is providing regulatory acceptance and a clear pathway for the outputs of an AQbD approach, such as the design space. It provides a formal definition of the enhanced approach and its expected documentation, which facilitates regulatory communication and review. This encourages the industry to invest in a more robust development process, knowing that the resulting flexibility and improved quality will be recognized by regulatory bodies [11].

Table 2: Overview of ICH Q14 Key Elements

Element	Description	Significance
Analytical Target Profile (ATP)	A prospective summary of the performance characteristics and intended purpose of the analytical method.	Drives method design, technology selection, and serves as the fundamental basis for validation and ongoing performance monitoring.
Knowledge Management	The systematic collection, organization, and utilization of both internal (e.g., prior development data) and external (e.g., scientific literature) knowledge.	Informs robust method development, aids in risk assessment, and provides justification for efficient post-approval changes.
Quality Risk Management (QRM)	A systematic process for the assessment, control, communication, and review of risks pertaining to the quality of the analytical procedure.	Identifies critical method parameters, proactively mitigates potential risks, and supports science-based decisions throughout the method lifecycle.
Evaluation of Robustness and Parameter Ranges	The assessment of an analytical method's performance under small, deliberate variations in its operating parameters.	Defines the method's Method Operable Design Region (MODR) and ensures consistent, reliable performance across a range of conditions.

Analytical Procedure Control Strategy	A defined set of controls, derived from method understanding, that ensures the analytical procedure's consistent performance during routine use.	Includes system suitability tests (SSTs) and ongoing monitoring to maintain method suitability and assure product quality.
Lifecycle Management and Post-Approval Changes	The continuous monitoring, optimization, and systematic management of analytical procedures throughout their entire operational lifespan.	Facilitates efficient regulatory changes, reduces revalidation burden, and ensures ongoing compliance and method suitability.
Minimal vs. Enhanced Approaches	Two recognized pathways for analytical procedure development, differing in the depth of scientific understanding and data generation.	Offers flexibility in development while encouraging a more comprehensive, QbD-based approach for greater long-term benefits and regulatory agility.

Design of Experiments (DoE): Methodologies for Analytical Optimization

Design of Experiments (DoE) is a powerful statistical methodology that allows for the efficient and systematic investigation of the effects of multiple factors on one or more responses. In the context of pharmaceutical analysis, DoE is the key enabler for implementing the principles of AQbD and meeting the expectations of ICH Q14. Unlike the OFAT approach, where one factor is changed at a time, DoE allows for the simultaneous variation of multiple factors, which is essential for identifying not only the main effects but also the crucial interaction effects between parameters.

Key Principles of DoE: The fundamental principles of DoE include:

Factorial Designs: These designs allow for the study of the main effects and interactions of two or more factors. Full factorial designs investigate all possible combinations, while fractional factorial designs are more efficient for a large number of factors by exploring only a subset of combinations [12].

Response Surface Methodology (RSM): Once the critical factors have been identified using factorial designs, RSM is used to model and optimize the response. This typically involves designs like Central Composite Designs (CCDs) or Box-Behnken Designs (BBDs) to map the relationship between factors and responses and identify the optimal region [13].

Statistical Analysis: The results of a DoE study are analyzed statistically to determine which factors and interactions are significant. This often involves techniques like Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) and the creation of response surface plots to visualize the relationships.

DoE in Analytical Method Development: The application of DoE in an AQbD framework follows a logical progression:

1. **Screening:** Initially, a screening design (e.g., a fractional factorial design) is used to identify the most significant parameters from a large list of potential factors identified during the risk assessment.
2. **Characterization:** Once the critical parameters are identified, a more detailed design (e.g., a full factorial or CCD) is used to thoroughly characterize the relationships between these parameters and the method's critical quality attributes (CQAs).
3. **Optimization:** The data from the characterization stage is used to create a mathematical model of the method's performance. This model can then be used to define the design space, the region where the method's performance is robust and meets the ATP.

Table 3: Basic Principles of Design of Experiments (DoE)

Principle	Definition	Purpose/Significance
Randomization	The random assignment of treatments or experimental conditions to experimental units.	Avoids confounding between treatment effects and unknown factors, eliminates potential biases, and ensures the validity of conclusions.

Replication	The repetition of a treatment or experimental condition within an experiment.	Allows for quantification of natural variation, increases the accuracy and precision of estimated effects, and controls uncertainty in results by reducing the standard error of the mean.
Blocking	A technique to group similar experimental units or to include nuisance factors in the design to control unwanted variation.	Reduces error variance, accounts for known sources of noise, and helps avoid biases that might arise from uncontrolled factors.

Synergistic Integration: Bridging AQBD, ICH Q14, AND DOE

The true power of this modern analytical paradigm lies in the synergistic integration of AQbD, ICH Q14, and DoE. They are not independent concepts but rather form a cohesive system where each component supports and enables the others.

AQbD provides the strategic "Why": It defines the philosophy and the overall objective—to build quality into the method from the start. It sets the stage by requiring a predefined ATP and a risk-based approach.

ICH Q14 provides the regulatory "What": It translates the AQbD philosophy into a formal, accepted regulatory framework. It defines the outputs expected from an enhanced development approach, such as a well-documented control strategy and a defined design space, and provides the pathway for their approval.

DoE provides the operational "How": It is the practical tool that makes AQbD and ICH Q14 achievable. It allows for the efficient collection of data necessary to understand the method's performance, identify critical parameters, and, most importantly, mathematically model the method's behavior to define the design space.

Without AQbD, the use of DoE might be an isolated exercise in optimization without a clear goal. Without DoE, an AQbD approach would be theoretical and difficult to execute, as it would lack a systematic way to explore parameter interactions and define a robust design space. And without ICH Q14, the enhanced understanding and flexibility gained from AQbD and DoE might not be recognized or accepted by regulatory agencies, thus limiting the practical benefits for the industry [14].

The integration of these three elements creates a feedback loop of continuous improvement. The ATP guides the risk assessment, which in turn informs the DoE study. The results of the DoE study define the design space and control strategy, which are documented as per ICH Q14. This robust documentation then facilitates lifecycle management, where the method's performance is monitored and improved over time, reinforcing the initial AQbD principles.

Table 4: Advantages of Implementing AQbD, ICH Q14, and DoE

Advantage Category	Specific Benefit	Explanation
Enhanced Method Quality & Robustness	Superior reproducibility and consistency of analytical results.	Quality is proactively built into the method design from the start, systematically minimizing sources of variability and ensuring robust performance.
Operational Efficiency & Cost Savings	Reduced development time, minimized resource consumption, and lower operational costs.	Systematic, data-driven approaches (DoE) replace inefficient trial-and-error, leading to fewer out-of-specification (OOS) results, reduced retesting, and streamlined workflows.

Regulatory Compliance & Flexibility	Streamlined regulatory approvals and efficient management of post-approval changes.	A well-defined Method Operable Design Region (MODR) allows for changes within proven boundaries without regulatory re-submission, aligning with harmonized ICH Q14 and Q2(R2) guidelines.
Deep Knowledge & Process Understanding	Comprehensive understanding of method parameters, their interactions, and their impact on performance.	DoE systematically explores multivariate relationships, generating a robust "knowledge space" that informs method design and control strategies.
Facilitated Technology Transfer	Higher success rate and smoother transitions during analytical method transfer between laboratories or sites.	Robust, well-understood methods with defined operating ranges are more easily transferred and implemented consistently across different environments.
Promotes Continuous Improvement Culture	Fosters an organizational culture of ongoing review, optimization, and adaptation throughout the method lifecycle.	Data from routine use, performance monitoring, and evolving requirements continuously inform refinements, ensuring methods remain fit-for-purpose.

Practical Applications and Case Studies in Pharmaceutical Analysis

The synergistic application of AQbD, ICH Q14, and DoE has been demonstrated across a wide range of pharmaceutical analytical techniques.

High-Performance Liquid Chromatography (HPLC) HPLC is one of the most common techniques in pharmaceutical analysis. A typical AQbD-DoE study for an HPLC method might involve the following steps:

ATP Definition: The ATP would specify the required resolution of the API from impurities, the retention time, and the precision of the assay.

Risk Assessment: A risk assessment (e.g., FMEA) would identify potential CMPs, such as mobile phase composition (organic modifier percentage), column temperature, flow rate, and pH of the buffer.

DoE Study: A fractional factorial design could be used for screening to identify the most influential factors, followed by a Central Composite Design (CCD) to model the relationships between the critical factors and CQAs like peak resolution and retention time.

Design Space: The results from the DoE study would be used to define a design space (e.g., a range of mobile phase composition and column temperature) where the resolution and other CQAs consistently meet the ATP.

Figure 2: Response Surface Plot for an HPLC Method. This figure would show a 3D plot illustrating the relationship between two critical parameters (e.g., mobile phase %B and column temperature) and a critical quality attribute (e.g., peak resolution), highlighting the region that constitutes the design space.

Spectroscopic Techniques (e.g., UV-Vis Spectroscopy) The same principles apply to spectroscopic methods. For a UV-Vis method for content uniformity, the ATP would define the required linearity and accuracy. A DoE study could be used to investigate the effects of sample extraction time, solvent volume, and measurement wavelength on the method's accuracy and precision. The resulting design space would define a robust range of these parameters, ensuring the method's reliability.

Method Transfer and Validation The outputs of an AQbD-DoE approach, particularly the well-defined design space, significantly streamline method transfer. When a method is transferred between labs, the receiving lab can operate within the established design space, and as long as they can demonstrate their method is within this space, the transfer can be considered successful without extensive re-validation [14]. This saves considerable time and resources.

Challenges and Solutions in Implementation

Despite the clear benefits, implementing the synergistic AQbD-ICH Q14-DoE paradigm presents several challenges.

Challenges

Cultural Shift: The most significant challenge is the cultural change required. Scientists accustomed to the traditional OFAT approach may be hesitant to adopt a new, statistically-driven methodology.

Lack of Expertise: DoE requires a certain level of statistical expertise that may not be widespread in analytical laboratories.

Initial Time and Resource Investment: An enhanced development approach requires more upfront time and resources compared to a conventional approach. The payoff comes later in the lifecycle, which may be difficult to justify in a resource-constrained environment.

Regulatory Uncertainty: While ICH Q14 provides a framework, the specifics of regulatory expectations and the level of detail required for design space documentation can still be a source of uncertainty for some companies.

7.2. Solutions

Training and Education: Comprehensive training on AQbD principles and DoE software is crucial for building a competent workforce. This can be integrated into corporate training programs.

Leveraging Software Tools: Modern statistical software packages are specifically designed to make DoE and data analysis more accessible, reducing the need for deep statistical knowledge.

Pilot Projects: Starting with a pilot project can demonstrate the value of the enhanced approach and build confidence within the organization.

Collaboration: Fostering collaboration between analytical scientists, statisticians, and quality assurance personnel can create a more integrated and effective development team.

Future Perspectives

The future of pharmaceutical analysis is poised to embrace even greater synergy between scientific principles and advanced technologies.

Automation and Robotics: The integration of automated platforms for DoE studies will enable the rapid and efficient generation of large datasets, accelerating method development.

- **Advanced Data Analytics and Machine Learning:** As DoE studies generate extensive datasets, machine learning algorithms can be employed to build more sophisticated models of method performance, potentially leading to the discovery of new relationships and a deeper understanding of the analytical procedure.
- **Continuous Manufacturing and Real-Time Release Testing (RTRT):** The robust and well-understood methods developed using this paradigm are essential for supporting continuous manufacturing and RTRT, where products are tested and released in real time [16,17].
- **Digitalization and AI:** The digital transformation of the lab, with AI-driven systems, could further streamline the entire process, from risk assessment to method transfer and lifecycle management.

Conclusion

The pharmaceutical industry is undergoing a fundamental shift from a reactive, empirical approach to a proactive, science- and risk-based paradigm for analytical method development. Analytical Quality by Design (AQbD) provides the overarching philosophy, emphasizing a deep understanding of the method and building quality into the design. ICH Q14 provides the necessary regulatory framework, formally recognizing the enhanced approach and the benefits of a defined design space and control strategy. Design of Experiments (DoE) is the indispensable statistical tool that empowers this entire process, enabling the efficient exploration of method parameters and the establishment of a robust operating range.

The synergistic integration of AQbD, ICH Q14, and DoE represents a transformative approach that leads to methods with enhanced robustness, reduced transfer failures, and greater lifecycle flexibility. While implementation presents challenges, the long-term benefits in terms of improved product quality, increased regulatory efficiency, and reduced costs are undeniable. This paradigm is not merely a new set of guidelines; it is a crucial evolution in analytical science that will continue to shape the future of pharmaceutical quality assurance.

Acknowledgement
The authors express thanks to Suven Pharmaceuticals Limited, Hyderabad for support and providing the research facility to carrying out the work.

References

1. ICH. (1996). *Q2(R1): Validation of Analytical Procedures: Text and Methodology*. International Council for Harmonisation.
2. Berridge, J. C. (2007). *Experimental Design for Pharmaceutical Development*. Ellis Horwood.
3. ICH. (2009). *Q8(R2): Pharmaceutical Development*. International Council for Harmonisation.
4. ICH. (2022). *Q14: Analytical Procedure Development*. International Council for Harmonisation.
5. Plackett, R. L., & Burman, J. P. (1946). The Design of Optimum Multifactorial Experiments. *Biometrika*, 33(4), 305–325.
6. Nardone, L. (2010). Analytical Quality by Design: A New Approach for Method Development and Validation. *Journal of Pharmaceutical and Biomedical Analysis*, 51(5), 990–996.
7. Chawla, R. K., et al. (2021). Development and validation of an inductively coupled plasma mass spectrometry method for estimation of elemental impurities in calcium acetate active pharmaceutical ingredient. *Indian Journal of Pharmaceutical Sciences*, 83(4), 830-837.
8. Blessner, P., & Hirtz, J. (2010). *Failure Mode and Effects Analysis (FMEA): A Guide for Analysts*. ASQ Quality Press.
9. Yu, L. X., et al. (2014). A Regulatory Perspective on Analytical Quality by Design. *Journal of Pharmaceutical Sciences*, 103(12), 3840–3845.
10. ICH. (2022). *Q2(R2): Validation of Analytical Procedures*. International Council for Harmonisation.
11. European Medicines Agency. (2014). *Guideline on the use of a Design Space*.
12. Montgomery, D. C. (2017). *Design and Analysis of Experiments*. John Wiley & Sons.
13. Box, G. E. P., & Behnken, D. W. (1960). Some New Three Level Designs for the Study of Quantitative Variables. *Technometrics*, 2(4), 455–475.
14. Reid, A., et al. (2015). A Practical Guide to Analytical Quality by Design. *Journal of Liquid Chromatography & Related Technologies*, 38(10), 1043–1050.
15. Capellades, I., et al. (2017). The Role of Analytical Quality by Design in Analytical Method Transfer. *Journal of Pharmaceutical and Biomedical Analysis*, 144, 117–124.
16. Cuno, B., et al. (2018). Analytical Quality by Design for Process Analytical Technology. *Journal of Pharmaceutical and Biomedical Analysis*, 148, 128–135.
17. Chawla, R.K., et al. (2020). Risk assessment, screening and control of elemental impurities in pharmaceutical drug products: A review. *Current Pharmaceutical Analysis*, 16 (7), 801-805.

Cite this article as:
Chawla R.K. and Ambekar N. (2025). A Comprehensive review of Analytical Quality by Design, ICH Q14, and design of experiments in pharmaceutical Analysis: A Synergistic Paradigm for enhanced quality and regulatory efficiency. *Int. J. of Pharm. & Life Sci.*, 16(9):18-26.

Source of Support: Nil
Conflict of Interest: Not declared
For reprints contact: ijplsjournal@gmail.com