IntuitionLabs

INTUITIONLABS / RESEARCH & PRACTICAL GUIDANCE

eCTD Publishing Process: A Guide to Regulatory Submissions

> Build practical AI for pharma and biotech with IntuitionLabs. We help life-science teams turn complex information and workflows into useful software, governed knowledge systems and AI tools.

Published by IntuitionLabs · 2026-01-13 · ectd · ectd publishing · regulatory submissions · regulatory affairs · fda submissions · ectd v4.0

Original article: https://intuitionlabs.ai/articles/ectd-publishing-process-guide



In this article

1. Executive Summary
2. Introduction and Background
3. 1. The eCTD Specification and Technical Standards
4. 1.1 Structure and Modules
5. 1.2 File Format and PDF Requirements
6. 1.3 eCTD Versions (3.2.2 vs 4.0)
7. 1.4 Standards, Vocabularies, and Validation
8. 2. The eCTD Publishing Workflow
9. 2.1 Document Preparation and Conversion
10. 2.2 Metadata Entry and Backbone Construction
11. 2.3 Publication Quality Control
12. 2.4 Submission Packaging and Transmission
13. 3. Regulatory Entry and Implementation
14. 3.1 United States (FDA) and Canada
15. 3.2 Europe (EMA and EU Member States, UK MHRA)
16. 3.3 Asia-Pacific (Japan, China, India, Australia, etc.)
17. 3.4 Latin America and Other Markets
18. 4. Data Analysis and Evidence
19. 4.1 Adoption Data and Trends
20. 4.2 Performance Metrics
21. 4.3 Case Study: eCTD Quality Failure
22. 4.4 Case Study: Regulatory Efficiency Gains
23. 5. Best Practices and Common Pitfalls
24. 6. Case Studies
25. 6.1 Technical Rejection Due to eCTD Format Errors
26. 6.2 Cross-Region Submission Efficiency
27. 6.3 Emerging Market Transition
28. 6.4 Brazil’s Digital Initiative
29. 7. Implications and Future Directions
30. Conclusion

[Revised May 7, 2026] This article has been reviewed and updated to reflect the latest eCTD v4.0 implementation milestones (FDA, EMA, PMDA, ANVISA, Health Canada, MHRA), regional mandate timelines through 2026, current adoption statistics, and the latest tooling/vendor landscape (Lorenz, EXTEDO, Certara/GlobalSubmit, Veeva Vault Submissions).

Executive Summary

The electronic Common Technical Document (eCTD) has become the international standard for pharmaceutical regulatory submissions. Developed under the ICH M2 guideline (Step 5, 2002) to complement the ICH M4 CTD structure, the eCTD provides a unified, XML-based framework for packaging and transmitting drug applications electronically (grokipedia.com) (globalforum.diaglobal.org). By replacing paper dossiers and earlier electronic (NeeS) formats, eCTD has dramatically improved the efficiency, consistency, and traceability of submissions. For example, eCTD adoption is credited with "simpler access for reviewers worldwide and swifter approvals," reflecting its significant impact on submission speed and accuracy (globalforum.diaglobal.org). Indeed, by 2022 it was reported that over 94% of all FDA-regulated submissions were in eCTD format (over *8 million* sequences processed via FDA's Electronic Submissions Gateway) (globalforum.diaglobal.org).

Regulatory agencies globally have mandated eCTD for most applications: the US FDA and Health Canada require eCTD for NDAs/BLAs/ANDAs, the EMA has required eCTD for centralized EU applications since 2010, and Japan's PMDA, which has accepted eCTD for years, moved to eCTD v4.0 for new drug applications in 2026 (grokipedia.com) (globalforum.diaglobal.org). Emerging markets (e.g. India, Brazil, China) are also transitioning to mandatory eCTD in the coming years (www.freyrsolutions.com) (www.freyrsolutions.com). The FDA's latest guidance notes that eCTD v3.2.2 has been required for most CDER/CBER application types since 2017, and that CDER and CBER have accepted eCTD v4.0 submissions since September 16, 2024 (FDA has not finalized a date by which v4.0 becomes mandatory) (grokipedia.com) (www.fda.gov). EMA opened optional acceptance of eCTD v4.0 for Centralised Procedure MAAs on December 22, 2025, with mandatory use expected by 2027 in the EU centralized path (globalforum.diaglobal.org) (globalforum.diaglobal.org).

The eCTD "publishing" process – the assembly of application documents into a compliant submission package – is therefore a critical operation for sponsors and CROs. Publishing involves *converting* vast technical dossiers into PDF files (with embedded fonts, searchable text, no security, etc.), *generating* the XML "backbone" that holds metadata, table-of-contents and lifecycle instructions, *linking* between documents via bookmarks and anchors, and *validating* the final eCTD against agency requirements (www.pharmaregulatory.in) (www.extedo.com). Expert publishing teams and specialized software (e.g. Lorenz DocuBridge/eCTDmanager, EXTEDO LIQUENT, Certara GlobalSubmit/CoAuthor, Veeva Vault Submissions, or proprietary platforms — Certara joined the Veeva AI Partner Program in October 2025 to integrate GlobalSubmit/CoAuthor with Veeva RIM (certara.com)) are typically used to manage these tasks and catch errors early (www.pharmaregulatory.in) (www.pharmaregulatory.in). This report provides an in-depth analysis of each step in the eCTD publishing workflow, the underlying technical standards, regional requirements, and practical best practices. We review historical evolution of eCTD, current state-of-the-art (including version 4.0), and future directions, with evidence from agency guidelines and industry case studies. Key findings include:

- **Structured Format and Standards:** The eCTD organizes submissions into five modules (1–5) covering administrative to clinical data, all indexed by a single XML backbone file (grokipedia.com) (www.pharmaregulatory.in). Files must meet strict format rules (an accepted PDF version, fonts

embedded, text-searchable, no encryption) to ensure reliable archiving and review (www.extedo.com) (www.extedo.com). Hyperlinks, bookmarks and standardized titles are required to facilitate navigation (www.extedo.com) (www.pharmaregulatory.in).

- **Workflow & Quality Control:** Compiling an eCTD involves careful document conversion and metadata capture. Automated validation (internal QC and agency validators) is essential: an anonymized published case describes an ANDA whose approval was delayed by *nine months* because of technical eCTD formatting errors (erroneous folder hierarchy, missing bookmarks, non-PDF/A files) (www.pharmaregulatory.in). Pre-submission eCTD validators (e.g. Lorenz eValidator or the validators built into publishing platforms) are used to eliminate errors beforehand.
- **Regulatory Landscape:** The report details regional eCTD policies. For example, FDA mandated eCTD for NDAs/BLAs/ANDAs by May 2017 (under section 745A(a) of the FD&C Act and FDA's electronic-submission guidance), and since 2024 accepts eCTD v4.0 submissions (grokipedia.com) (www.fda.gov). EMA requires eCTD for all centralized EU submissions since 2010 (globalforum.diaglobal.org), with mandatory eCTD v4.0 by 2027. Health Canada requires eCTD 3.2.2 since January 2018 (grokipedia.com). China's NMPA now requires all drug registration dossiers be submitted electronically (as of Dec 2022) (www.pharmalex.com), with eCTD guidelines drafted in recent years. Other agencies (MHRA UK, PMDA Japan, ANVISA Brazil, TGA Australia) have similar mandates or forthcoming pilots. (Table 1 below summarizes regional adoption.)
- **Digital Transformation Impact:** eCTD submission has measurably improved regulatory efficiency.Beyond faster reviews, eCTD enhances version control, reduces paper handling, and enables partial updates (amendments) rather than full re-submissions (grokipedia.com) (globalforum.diaglobal.org). Looking ahead, eCTD v4.0 – built on HL7's Regulated Product Submissions (RPS) framework – introduces even greater flexibility such as dynamic table-of-contents management and multi-document lifecycle operations (globalforum.diaglobal.org) (www.certara.com). eCTD v4.0 also paves the way for new features (two-way agency communication, content reuse across applications, enhanced metadata) that can drive further gains in speed and data interoperability (globalforum.diaglobal.org) (globalforum.diaglobal.org).
- **Challenges & Recommendations:** Despite global harmonization, country-specific variations persist in Module 1 requirements, language versions, and portal configurations, complicating multi-region submissions (grokipedia.com) (www.pharmaregulatory.in). High-quality eCTD publishing requires rigorous internal controls. Best practices include standardized file titling/granularity, multi-tier document review, and routine use of agency validation software (www.pharmaregulatory.in) (www.pharmaregulatory.in). Industry trends (cloud-based submission platforms, integration with IDMP/SPOR regulatory databases, AI-assisted QC) are evolving to meet these demands (globalforum.diaglobal.org) (www.freyrsolutions.com).

In summary, the eCTD publishing process is a cornerstone of modern regulatory affairs. Across all major markets, sponsors rely on eCTD to communicate dossier content. Mastery of the eCTD process – from correct document formatting to fully compliant sequencing and submission – has become essential to avoid delays. This comprehensive report explains the technical specifications, operational workflows, policy context, and future outlook for eCTD publishing, supported by detailed references, data, and case insights.

Introduction and Background

The **Common Technical Document (CTD)** was first developed in the late 1990s by the ICH (International Council for Harmonisation) as a **paper-based** standard for pharmaceutical submissions (globalforum.diaglobal.org). It harmonized the format of applications across the US, EU, and Japan into five modules (administrative/regionals, quality, nonclinical, and clinical) (globalforum.diaglobal.org) (grokipedia.com). By 2003 the CTD structure (ICH M4(R4) guideline) became the *expected format* for new drug applications worldwide. However, as data volumes grew (driven by more complex manufacturing processes and post-**thalidomide** safety requirements), the limitations of paper and simple electronic submissions became apparent (grokipedia.com) (globalforum.diaglobal.org). Entire NDA dossiers could fill truckloads of paper, border logistic hurdles, and reviewers often had to hunt manually through volumes for relevant data. Moreover, earlier "flat" electronic submissions (known as NeeS – *non-eCTD electronic Submissions*) still lacked efficient version control and systematic metadata. With these challenges, the industry and regulators sought a **fully electronic, metadata–rich format** to streamline review and lifecycle management (grokipedia.com) (globalforum.diaglobal.org).

The **electronic CTD (eCTD)** emerged as the solution. Introduced by the ICH M2 Expert Working Group (Step 4 endorsement in 2002 (grokipedia.com)), the eCTD specification built on the existing CTD structure with an **XML backbone** that defines a hierarchical Table of Contents and document lifecycle operations (insert, replace, delete) (grokipedia.com) (www.pharmaregulatory.in). Each submitted dossier sequence is a set of PDF files organized into the five-module folder tree, linked by the backbone XML (often called the *backbone file*) which contains metadata (document IDs, titles, attributes) and navigation bookmarks (grokipedia.com) (www.pharmaregulatory.in). This allowed regulatory agencies to automatically track exactly how a submission has changed over time (e.g. what document is new, what has been superseded) instead of treating each filing as a standalone set. From the first eCTD guidelines, agencies piloted the format (FDA and EMA performed feasibility tests in 2003–2004) and gradually required its use (globalforum.diaglobal.org) (www.pharmalex.com). By the mid-2010s, eCTD had largely replaced paper: for example, FDA mandated that all new NDAs/BLAs/ANDAs be submitted in eCTD format by May 2017 (grokipedia.com).

The **core objectives** of the eCTD were to *harmonize global submissions*, *reduce review timelines*, and *improve data integrity*. The format ensures that Modules 2–5 are presented identically regardless of country, with Module 1 serving as a localization layer of region-specific documents (forms, labels, regional summaries) (grokipedia.com) (www.pharmaregulatory.in). By scanning all content into searchable PDF (with embedded fonts and standardized titles) and enforcing an XML-based structure, eCTD allows reviewers to click through to any cited section in seconds, rather than relying on paper pagination. According to one industry review, eCTD implementation has "streamlin [ed] global regulatory review processes through a unified format" and " [reduced] reliance on paper-based submissions" (grokipedia.com). For instance, one reference summary notes that eCTD enables reviewers to verify a claim in at most "two clicks" by linking Module 2 summaries directly to Module 3/4/5 source documents (grokipedia.com) (www.pharmaregulatory.in).

Today's regulatory environment fully embraces eCTD. The ICH continues to maintain the specification (latest versions 3.2.2 and 4.0) and publishes controlled vocabularies and Q&A documents for clarifications. Agencies worldwide publish detailed eCTD guidance and validation criteria. Sponsors must understand not only the

content requirements of each regulatory region, but also the **technical publishing rules** (file naming, formats, metadata) to ensure a submission is review-ready. Failure to comply can lead to *technical rejects*. One anonymized case published by a regulatory-training site recounts a nine-month delay in the U.S. approval of an ANDA attributed to technical eCTD errors (incorrect folder hierarchy, missing bookmarks and non-compliant PDFs) (www.pharmaregulatory.in). Such examples underscore the importance of mastering the eCTD publishing process.

In this report, we first outline the **technical framework** of eCTD (specifications, file formats, and versions). We then detail the **publishing workflow** – how master documents are converted and assembled – and highlight key quality controls. Subsequent sections survey regional regulatory requirements (FDA, EMA, PMDA, etc.), followed by an analysis of usage data and specific case studies. Finally, we discuss the **implications and future directions** of eCTD, including the transition to version 4.0, integration with new data standards (IDMP/SPOR), and emerging technologies. Through extensive citations and examples, our objective is to give a **comprehensive understanding of the eCTD publishing process** and its role in modern regulatory affairs.

1. The eCTD Specification and Technical Standards

1.1 Structure and Modules

The eCTD format preserves the **five-module CTD structure** while adding an overarching XML layer. Broadly, the modules are: **Module 1** (Administrative and Regional Information), **Module 2** (Summaries and Overviews), **Module 3** (Quality data), **Module 4** (Nonclinical reports), and **Module 5** (Clinical study reports) (grokipedia.com). Modules 2–5 are harmonized across ICH regions, containing the scientific substantiation of product safety and efficacy, whereas Module 1 is region-specific (containing local application forms, environmental assessments, labels, etc.). For example, the EU requires a local Marketing-Authorisation Application (MAA) form in M1, the US requires FDA form 356h, Japan requires additional device data, etc (grokipedia.com) (grokipedia.com). This design “ensures global consistency” for core technical modules while allowing **localization** of administrative content (grokipedia.com) (www.pharmaregulatory.in). (Table 1 summarizes the module contents.)

Table 1. Overview of eCTD Modules (per ICH M4/M2 guidelines)

Module	Content (Examples)	Harmonization
M1	Region-specific administrative forms, labeling, environmental data, country annexes (e.g. US 356h form, EU SmPC/PIL in multiple languages, JP product info) (grokipedia.com).	Not harmonized; varies by agency
M2	Electronic Common Technical Document (eCTD) Summaries (Quality Overall Summary, Nonclinical Overview, Clinical Overview, and written summaries) (grokipedia.com). These are concise narrative summaries (generally <30 pages each) linking to deeper data in M3–M5.	Harmonized (ICH)

Module	Content (Examples)	Harmonization
M3	Quality (Chemistry, Manufacturing & Controls – CMC). Details on drug substance and product: manufacturing processes, controls, specifications, stability data, and literature references (grokipedia.com).	Harmonized (ICH)
M4	Nonclinical (Pharmacology/Toxicology) study reports. Full study reports organized by area (pharmacology, single-dose tox., repeat-dose tox., genotoxicity, etc.) (grokipedia.com), with tables of contents and references.	Harmonized (ICH)
M5	Clinical study reports. Tabular listings of all clinical studies (5.2), individual clinical reports (5.3), integrated summaries of effectiveness and safety, and references (grokipedia.com). Includes pivotal trial reports, patient narratives as needed.	Harmonized (ICH)

Sources: ICH CTD organization (M4/M4Q/M4S) and eCTD specification commentary (grokipedia.com) (grokipedia.com).

Within the eCTD file structure, *each file* (often called a "leaf") is typically a single PDF document with a descriptive title (e.g. "3.2.R.5.3 Dissolution Method Validation – IR 10 mg") (www.pharmaregulatory.in). Leaf "titles" must be stable and meaningful; version numbers or dates generally are *not* embedded in titles, since versioning is handled by lifecycle attributes (www.pharmaregulatory.in). The backbone XML then references each leaf's file name, its parent node (e.g. `m3/32-body-of-data/32s-drug-sub` for Module 3 section 2) and the operation (new, replace, delete). This XML provides a machine-readable master index for the dossier, enabling reviewers' software to present a sequentially updated TOC rather than treating each PDF as an island (grokipedia.com) (www.pharmaregulatory.in). Hyperlinks in Module 2 and module files often connect to "named destinations" anchored in Module 3–5 tables and figures, providing seamless module-to-module navigation (www.pharmaregulatory.in).

1.2 File Format and PDF Requirements

All eCTD leaf files are generally PDF format. Regulatory guidelines specify strict requirements for PDF preparation. Accepted versions for FDA eCTDs are PDF 1.4 through 1.7, with fonts **embedded** and optimized for "fast web view," so that files open quickly in viewers (www.extedo.com) (www.extedo.com). Submitted PDFs **must be machine-readable text** (for searchability) – scanned images are discouraged unless converted by OCR and carefully verified for accuracy (www.extedo.com). Dynamic content is disallowed: audio/video, scripts, or 3D content cannot be used, and annotations must be flattened (www.extedo.com) (www.extedo.com). No document should use password protection or encryption (with limited exemptions for government forms) (www.extedo.com). In practice this means publishers must generate PDFs from source files (Word, charts, etc.) rather than relying on scanned binders (www.extedo.com).

Navigation aids are also critical. Best practices (and some agency guidances) call for adding a hyperlinked Table of Contents and bookmarks in every document of 5+ pages (www.extedo.com). Bookmarks typically replicate the hierarchy down to headings (H2/H3 etc.). All cross-references (e.g. from a Module 2 summary to a Module 5 study) should link to valid named destinations (e.g. a figure or table caption) (www.extedo.com). By enforcing these formatting rules up-front, publishers help ensure that the eCTD is fully navigable and that automated validators (like FDA's eCTD Validator or EMA's eReviewer) do not flag errors. As one expert notes,

“each document must conform to ICH and regional specifications… [with] hyperlinks, bookmarks, and metadata…properly configured” (www.linkedin.com), because even minor technical issues can trigger rejection or delays.

Overall, the file requirements are driven by a need for uniformity and longevity. The FDA eCTD technical conformance guide (and corresponding EMA guides) emphasize that (a) PDFs must follow the agency’s PDF specifications (PDF/A is accepted by FDA but not generally required) and (b) documents should include no hidden code or references. We highlight key points from published guidance:

- **PDF Version & Fonts**: Only PDF version 1.4–1.7 (or PDF/A) files are accepted (www.extedo.com). All fonts must be embedded. Files should open without extra plugins.
- **Searchable Text**: Text must be live (not just an image). If any pages are scanned, OCR must be used and verified for accuracy (www.extedo.com).
- **No Security/Encryption**: Files must not be password-protected or have security settings. (FDA supplied forms like 356h are exceptions since they are locked fillable forms) (www.extedo.com).
- **No Active Content**: Scripting, forms, attachments, or dynamic elements are forbidden (www.extedo.com).
- **File Size Limits:** Some agencies set per-file size limits in their regional specifications, so very large documents may need to be split; check the current regional guidance for the applicable limit.
- **Bookmarks & Links**: Every file should have a logical bookmark tree reflecting major headings (www.extedo.com). Hyperlinked internal references (especially from Module 2) must work end-to-end after PDF conversion (www.extedo.com).

Adhering to these guidelines is part of the **publishing process**. In practice, publishers routinely convert source documents to PDFs using preset profiles (e.g. using the “optimize for web/fast web view” feature in Acrobat) and then manually inspect each file for compliance (www.extedo.com) (www.extedo.com). Automation tools script out repetitive checks (e.g. flagging paper-scanned pages), but a final human QC of bookmarks and searchability is essential.

1.3 eCTD Versions (3.2.2 vs 4.0)

Since its inception, the eCTD specification has evolved through several versions. The widely used current standard is **eCTD 3.2.2** (an update published in 2008 under ICH M2). This version stabilized the format by refining validation rules and metadata for Modules 2–5, establishing norms that have remained largely stable for over a decade (grokipedia.com) (grokipedia.com). Key features of v3.2.2 include the use of an XML-based backbone for modules 2–5, support for the US “study tagging file” concept, and harmonization of vocabularies and section headings. Global adoption of 3.2.2 was facilitated by ICH-endorsed controlled vocabularies and Q&A documents (the eCTD Implementation Working Group releases periodic clarifications).

eCTD 4.0 (endorsed by ICH in 2015) represents a next-generation format built on the HL7 Regulated Product Submissions (RPS) framework. Conceptually, 4.0 retains the CTD-like module subdivision but makes the backbone fully RPS-compliant, introducing XML schema flexibility and richer data structures. Some of the major enhancements in 4.0 are:

- **Dynamic Table of Contents:** Unlike the fixed module folders of v3, eCTD 4.0's XML allows the *TOC (structure)* to be defined by a controlled vocabulary that can be extended without changing the core specification (globalforum.diaglobal.org). This means new document types or sections could be added more easily in the future.
- **Document Reuse Across Submissions:** eCTD 4.0 allows publishers to reference and reuse documents across different applications (including related applications or different geographic dossiers) without duplication (globalforum.diaglobal.org). For example, a label change for one country can reference the master label file already submitted in another country's dossier.
- **Enhanced Lifecycle Operations:** In v4.0 the concept of lifecycle actions is expanded. It becomes possible to replace one document with **many**, or vice versa. (In v3, "replace" was one-for-one. v4.0 can express more complex changes, useful for amendments.)
- **Multimedia and Structured Data:** eCTD 4.0 officially supports inclusion of multi-media files (videos, audio, datasets, etc.) and structured product labeling (SPL) files. This enables new kinds of data (like video evidence of device testing) to be submitted natively (www.willingjet.com) (globalforum.diaglobal.org). It's also aligned with the HL7 RPS goal of eventually accommodating other product types (medical devices, biotech, etc.).
- **Electronic Signatures & Two-Way Communication:** The v4.0 framework envisions built-in support for entire e-signature workflows and for sending regulatory queries/responses in the same electronic format (a capability sometimes referred to as "two-way communication").

Table 2 contrasts select aspects of the long–standing v3.2.2 versus the new v4.0. (For full technical details, see the official ICH M8 eCTD Specifications and FDA's eCTD v4.0 Implementation Guide.)

Table 2. Major Differences: eCTD v3.2.2 vs eCTD v4.0

Aspect	eCTD v3.2.2	eCTD v4.0
Backbone Structure	Rigid, hierarchical folder structure; fixed TOC defined by module folders (globalforum.diaglobal.org).	XML-driven, flexible index; TOC terms controlled by configurable schema (globalforum.diaglobal.org).
Table of Contents (TOC)	Primarily based on older controlled vocabulary; adding new headings requires spec change.	Dynamic TOC terms (via controlled vocabulary) can be updated without revising core spec (globalforum.diaglobal.org).
Study Tagging Files	Yes – optional in v3.2.2 for deep metadata on clinical/nonclinical study PDFs.	Not needed – RPS schema inherently supports rich study metadata.
Media Support	Limited (PDF, images).	Adds support for multimedia (audio/video) and structured data types (e.g. SPL) (www.willingjet.com).
Lifecycle Ops	New/Replace/Delete per leaf; replace is one-to-one. Must reference previous leaf by title.	Flexible replace operations; can replace one doc with many and vice versa.
Communication	One-way (sponsor→agency); agency queries separate by phone mail.	Enables future two-way (agency comments/queries transmitted in XML format).

Aspect	eCTD v3.2.2	eCTD v4.0
Implementation Status	Mature – mandated globally (FDA, EMA, etc.) since 2010–2018 (grokipedia.com) (globalforum.diaglobal.org); no longer accepted by PMDA Japan for new drug applications from April 1, 2026 (per industry summaries).	Optional in US (since Sept 2024), EU (since Dec 22, 2025), Brazil (2026); mandatory for new drug applications in Japan from April 1, 2026 (per industry summaries); EMA mandate expected 2027; FDA mandate not yet finalised but voluntary period ongoing (globalforum.diaglobal.org) (japan.freyrsolutions.com).

Key: ICH=International Council for Harmonisation, RPS=Regulated Product Submission (HL7). Sources: ICH M2 and M8 specifications and industry commentary (globalforum.diaglobal.org) (www.willingjet.com).

In practice, nearly all submissions today still use eCTD version 3.2.2, due to its long-term stability. Agencies have each published region-specific addenda (for example, the FDA's "Module 1 Implementation Guide for v3.2.2") to handle local requirements. eCTD 4.0 became **optional** at major agencies only in the mid-2020s: the FDA started accepting v4.0 for new applications on Sept. 16, 2024 (www.fda.gov) (globalforum.diaglobal.org), and other ICH agencies have staged pilots (e.g. EMA in late 2024) with planned mandates by 2026–2029. As the transition unfolds, sponsors must decide whether to move to v4.0 for new applications or remain on v3.2.2 for continuing Dossier sequences (globalforum.diaglobal.org). The short-term advantage of 4.0 is mainly technical flexibility, whereas v3.2.2 remains the safe and accepted baseline.

1.4 Standards, Vocabularies, and Validation

To ensure global interoperability, the eCTD specification relies on several controlled vocabularies and validation rules. For example, all section headings and attributes are drawn from ICH-defined lists (CTD headings, submission attributes like form type, etc.). Agencies often may add regional terms (e.g. USPL form codes). During submission assembly, publishing software will enforce these controlled terms for elements like application type, clinical trial status, document type codes, and so on. Each region typically maintains its own list of permissible values for regional fields (e.g. the FDA has STANDARD lists of form-type values, submission-type values applied in Module 1) (www.fda.gov) (www.fda.gov).

Regulators publish **validation criteria** documents that specify technical checks on an eCTD. For instance, before FDA will accept a sequence, it must pass the *Electronic Submission Gateway (ESG)* and then internal eCTD validator which checks file naming, DTD conformance, MD5 checksums, etc. FDA publishes an eCTD Technical Conformance Guide and eCTD validation criteria that list the checks it applies. Typical automated checks (implemented in commercial eCTD validators such as Lorenz eValidator) include: verifying the backbone XML is well-formed and schema-valid, each **leaf title** matches the facility/country format rules, each PDF is in an accepted MIME type, href links are correct, etc. (FDA's eCTD submission standards pages list the current specifications it enforces.)

Importantly, the backbone XML itself must follow either the **DTD (Document Type Definition)** or **XSD schema** defined by ICH. ICH provides a master DTD for v3.2.2 (available on ich.org) and an EXACT set of schema files for v4.0. Publishers typically include the DTD/XSD by reference in the XML or validate locally against it. Any mismatch (e.g. a missing segment tag, or attribute not allowed) will generate a critical error. Thus every leaf in Modules 2–5 must appear under the XML path expected for its section, and required leaf attributes (in v3.2.2, for example the `operation`, `checksum` and `xlink:href` values) must be present.

Given the complexity, sponsors routinely use multiple layers of quality control. Many publishing groups perform an internal “pre-flight” check – often using the same software vendors' validation tools – before even sending the eCTD to the agency gateway. If an eCTD fails an agency’s technical validation (for FDA, errors classed as “High” severity in its validation criteria), the agency can technically reject the submission: it is not processed for review until the sponsor corrects the errors and resubmits. Hence, thorough pre-publishing QC (as described in Section 3.3 below) is considered best practice to avoid costly delays.

2. The eCTD Publishing Workflow

The **publishing process** refers to the operational steps taken to create a compliant eCTD submission package from raw documents. It is an iterative, multi-person workflow, typically involving:

1. **Document Preparation:** Conversion of source files (reports, spreadsheets, images) into final PDFs that meet technical specifications (see Section 1.2).
2. **Metadata Entry:** Assigning metadata for each document (titles, subject type, study identifiers, etc.) and building the XML backbone linking them.
3. **Assembly and QC:** Structuring the files into the correct module and section folder hierarchy, embedding bookmarks/links, then running validation checks.
4. **Package Generation:** Zipping the sequences into eCTD packages and uploading via the appropriate gateway.
5. **Agency Transaction:** Handling portal acknowledgments and any subsequent communication.

Below we discuss each step in detail, highlighting the critical tasks and common issues.

2.1 Document Preparation and Conversion

Before any XML structure is built, the native content must be **converted to compliant PDFs**. This stage often involves multiple teams and software tools:

- **Source Control:** Authors (scientists, engineers, clinical staff) produce source documents (Word, Excel, PowerPoint, specialized report formats). Version control must be enforced so that only the latest approved document is published (usually requiring a formal approval stamp or signature page that also gets converted).
- **PDF Creation:** Documents are exported or printed to PDF using standardized conversion settings. Batch converters or print drivers (Adobe PDF, Microsoft Print to PDF) are configured to:
- Use PDF 1.4–1.7 or PDF/A format.
- Embed all fonts fully.
- Disable form protection layers.
- Enable “Fast Web View” if possible (linearizes the file).
- Convert color spaces to acceptable standards (CMYK vs RGB as needed).
- **Bookmark Generation:** Ideally, headings (H1/H2) in Word are preserved as bookmarks in PDF. If needed, an editor will add bookmarks to match the section hierarchy. This makes navigation easier for reviewers (www.extedo.com).

- **Hyperlink Checking:** Active hyperlinks (within a document or across docs) are verified to ensure they succeed. For instance, a link from a Module 2 summary ("see Figure 4 in Section 5.3.5") should point to a named destination in a Module 5 PDF (www.extedo.com).
- **OCR and Searchability:** If any content must be scanned image (e.g. old lab notebooks), OCR is applied so the text layer is present. Publishers then carefully proof the OCR text against the original to ensure no transcription errors, as agencies require that "imaged text is converted completely and accurately" (www.extedo.com).
- **File Naming and Leaf Titles:** Each PDF is given a concise file name (typically no spaces or special characters, e.g. `stability-data.pdf`) and an internal *leaf title*. The title embedded in the XML identifies the document's content (e.g. "5.3.5.3 Integrated Summary of Comparative Bioavailability Studies – Demographics") (www.pharmaregulatory.in). Consistent naming and titling avoid confusion and rejections (FDA will flag missing or duplicate titles).

Throughout this process, publishers follow strict guidelines for *leaf granularity*: each PDF should ideally contain exactly one "decision unit", such as one protocol, one study report, or one batch record. Excessively large PDFs (e.g. bundling all stability data for every strength and conditioning into one file) are discouraged, as they slow reviewers and complicate updates (www.pharmaregulatory.in). Instead, reports are split when logical (for example, separate stability report for each dose form). Good granularity not only speeds review but it facilitates surgical lifecycle changes – e.g., replacing one stability section without disturbing others.

After these steps, each final PDF should be **compliant**. Publishers often run internal scripts to verify, for instance, that each PDF version matches a regex of 1.4–1.7 and that "Adobe X" or higher is the producer. Another common check is verifying that no annotations or attachments are present. In short, document preparation ensures that by the end of this stage, all files are "review-ready" PDFs per agency rules (www.extedo.com) (www.extedo.com).

2.2 Metadata Entry and Backbone Construction

Once PDFs are prepared, the publishing team moves to the **XML backbone file**. This file (named `index.xml`, accompanied by regional Module 1 XML such as the US `us-regional.xml`) enumerates every leaf in Modules 1–5 and defines the submission structure. Key tasks here include:

- **Folder Hierarchy:** Placing each PDF into the correct module/section path. For example, a clinical study report for a Phase III efficacy trial would go under `m5/53-clin-stud-rep/535-rep-effic-safety-stud/…`. Regional Module 1 files are placed in `/m1/us/` or `/m1/eu/` etc. Software platforms or scripts often handle the creation of the directory tree based on a dataset of information.
- **Assigning IDs:** Each document (leaf) is given a unique ID attribute in the XML (e.g. `leaf001`, `leaf002`, etc.). These IDs let the XML refer to the documents. While any unique scheme works, often publishers use a systematic numbering for traceability.
- **Metadata Tags:** Certain attributes must be specified, such as:
- the leaf's `xlink:href`, which points to the PDF file within the sequence folder
- its `operation` (new, append, replace or delete) and the file `checksum`

- for study reports in the US and some other regions, Study Tagging File (STF) metadata such as the study ID and file tags
- in eCTD v4.0, keywords and context-of-use metadata, which replace much of the v3.2.2 folder and STF logic
- **Lifecycle Operations:** Each leaf entry has an operation attribute. In a **new submission** (Sequence 0000), all operations are typically "new". In subsequent amendments, some entries will have `operation="replace"` or `delete"`, indicating how the current sequence modifies prior content. For new applications, every file is new.
- **Cross-document Linking:** If a Module 2 overview references a Module 3 document, navigation relies on hyperlinks inside the PDFs that point to the target file or to a named destination within it; the v3.2.2 backbone itself does not carry these cross-references (www.pharmaregulatory.in).
- **Table of Contents:** The backbone's hierarchy of CTD section elements (v3.2.2) or its keyword-based contexts of use (v4.0) is what review tools render as the submission's table of contents; publishing software generates it from the leaf placements.
- **Validation of Backbone:** Before finalizing, the XML is validated against the eCTD schema or DTD. Any structural error (forgotten closing tag, mismatched namespace, invalid tag) will be caught. Publishers often use the same validators that agencies use (like the FDA eCTD Validator or an XSD parser) to pre-check the XML.

Building the backbone is often the most labor-intensive step of publishing. It requires attention to detail to ensure that every file is referenced correctly and that no legacy file is unintentionally carried over. Publishers generally extract metadata from document management systems or spreadsheets (name, type, position) and import this into their publishing software to automate backbone generation. Any manual edits (e.g. renaming sections, splitting a report) are done carefully to keep the XML consistent.

2.3 Publication Quality Control

With the initial backbone and files in place, the draft eCTD undergoes rigorous **quality control (QC)**. Multi-tier checks are common:

- **Automated Validation:** Tools like **Lorenz eValidator** (used by the FDA) or **EXTEDO's validator** run a full conformance check. This typically produces a report of errors (fatal, high, medium, low) classified by severity (grokipedia.com). Publishers first fix all "fatal" errors – e.g. missing required elements, invalid characters in file names, incorrect reference syntax. Next they address "high" and "medium" issues like missing hyperlinks, or warnings about fonts. Each error in the report is traced back to a document or XML element to correct.
- **Hyperlink Audit:** A hyperlink crawler script is used to verify that every link and anchor works. For example, if a Module 2 section contains an `<xref>` to `leaf-001`, the script checks that `leaf-001` exists and that its target is loaded exactly once.
- **Bookmark & Title Check:** Human reviewers verify that each PDF's bookmark structure is at least 2–3 levels deep, and that every major heading in documents 5+ pages has a bookmark (www.extedo.com). They also ensure each leaf title in the XML exactly matches chapter headings (no typos, consistent styling).

- **Scan for Forbidden Content:** Automated scripts ensure no one inadvertently embedded disallowed content. For instance, checking for “/JavaScript” or embedded files in the PDF code.
- **Font Embedding & Image Quality:** QC verifies fonts by inspecting PDF properties, and that scanned images (if any) have acceptable DPI (usually ≥300 DPI). Low image quality can be flagged to re-OCR or re-scan.
- **Regional Requirements Check:** For each agency, specific checks are needed. E.g., FDA will check that Module 1 forms (FDA Form 356h) have valid data, or that unique US Module 1 elements (like “application-type” codes) use permitted values. The EU Portal may check that required annexes (GPvP forms, environmental risk) are present. Publishers typically run the agency’s own test harnesses or conform to checklists.

A critical lesson from industry case studies is that **double-checking early saves time**. As one regulatory consultant notes, meticulously following the eCTD “navigation artifacts” rules (bookmarks, anchors, link targets) ensures the submission is “audit-ready”, not just a collection of files (www.pharmaregulatory.in). Tools like Pinnacle 21 (open-source) or vendor platforms now include comprehensive rulesets for each region to catch subtle errors. Sponsors often document a named-step clearance (“eCTD QC Complete”) in their SOPs before going live.

2.4 Submission Packaging and Transmission

When all QC checks pass, the final step is *delivering* the eCTD to the agency. This typically involves:

- **Sequence Organization:** eCTD submissions are sent in *sequences*. Sequence “0000” is the initial application; follow-ups (amendments or supplements) are sent as 0001, 0002, etc. Each sequence is a self-contained set of changes. The publishing software automatically packages the files and updated backbone for the current sequence.
- **Packaging:** The sequence folder (module directories, `index.xml`, its MD5 checksum file and the regional Module 1 XML) is prepared for transmission in the form the receiving gateway or portal expects. Check each agency’s current technical guidance rather than assuming a single archive format or file-naming rule.
- **Electronic Gateway Upload:** For FDA submissions, the sponsor or a third-party service sends the sequence through the FDA Electronic Submissions Gateway (ESG), which routes it to the correct center (CDER or CBER) and returns acknowledgments confirming receipt and, after processing, the outcome of technical validation. Other agencies use their own channels, for example the EMA eSubmission Gateway or Web Client for centralised procedures, the MHRA Submissions portal in the UK, and PMDA’s online submission system in Japan. Each has its own protocols and account set-up.
- **Confirmation:** Gateway acknowledgments confirm technical receipt and validation; they are not a filing or approval decision, which follows separately through the agency’s normal review procedures. Regulatory operations teams monitor these acknowledgments closely. One advantage of eCTD pipelines is that gatekeepers quickly notify sponsors of missing parts; contrast this to paper submissions where missing volumes might appear late.

Because transmission steps are mostly handled by software, the human role here is to ensure accuracy in non-technical metadata (e.g. entering the correct FDA regulatory number or molecule name in the gateway). Typically, a final human review ("cover letter check") confirms that all expected documents are present before zipping. After sending, the publisher job is essentially done; subsequent versions will be treated as a new sequence (with new backbone entries marking "replace" or "delete" as needed).

3. Regulatory Entry and Implementation

3.1 United States (FDA) and Canada

In the United States, the FDA has established comprehensive requirements for eCTD submissions to CDER and CBER. Under section 745A(a) of the FD&C Act (added by FDASIA in 2012), the FDA phased in mandatory eCTD use: eCTD was required for NDAs, BLAs and ANDAs from **May 5, 2017** (grokipedia.com). Commercial INDs and master files followed from May 5, 2018; noncommercial INDs remain exempt. The FDA provides an eCTD Submissions Gateway and a robust support portal for eCTD format and validation guides.

Health Canada has a parallel approach: as of **January 1, 2018**, all New Drug Submissions (NDS) and Abbreviated New Drug Submissions (ANDS) must be in eCTD format (Version 3.2.2) (grokipedia.com). The Canadian Electronic Submissions Gateway (CESG) functions similarly to the FDA ESG. Health Canada's Module 1 includes bilingual content (English/French product monographs and labelling) reflecting Canada's official languages. Once an eCTD sequence is initiated in Canada, subsequent sequences must also be eCTD.

Key characteristics of North American implementation include:

- **Regional Module 1:** The FDA and Health Canada have their own Module 1 specs. For example, the FDA's M1 v2.x includes forms like 356h, 1571, as well as correspondence; it also lists FDA-specific leaf IDs for things like risk evaluation (REMS) documents. Health Canada's M1 v3.x is similar to EU's M1 with bilingual labeling. These M1 specs are detailed in published Implementation Guides and Example Submissions (see FDA eCTD Submission Standards (www.fda.gov)).
- **Validation Tools:** FDA publishes its eCTD validation criteria so that sponsors can pre-validate with commercial tools, and Health Canada likewise publishes its own validation rules.
- **Gateway Communication:** FDA's ESG returns technical acknowledgments, but review questions are still communicated through ordinary correspondence. Structured two-way communication is a future capability associated with eCTD v4.0 and HL7 RPS rather than current practice.

Industry adoption in North America is complete. By mid-2010s, pharma companies had fully converted regulatory operations to eCTD publishing. eCTD is no longer new or optional for these application types.

3.2 Europe (EMA and EU Member States, UK MHRA)

The European Medicines Agency (EMA) requires **eCTD** for all centralized marketing authorization applications. Since **January 1, 2010**, submissions under the centralised EU procedure have had to use eCTD (version 3.2.2) via the EMA's eSubmission Gateway (grokipedia.com). The EU publishes its own Module 1 specification

and harmonised eCTD technical guidance, which define the allowed Module 1 content (e.g. application form, product information, risk management plan) and controlled vocabularies. Key points for the EU centralized path:

- **Multilingual M1:** The EU central Module 1 is unique: the product information (SmPC, labelling and package leaflet) must ultimately be provided in all official EU languages, plus Icelandic and Norwegian, with translations typically submitted after the CHMP opinion. The Module 1 XML identifies the language of each product-information document. This multilingual requirement adds complexity to EU publishing.
- **Gateway and EudraCT:** EMA uses the **eSubmission Gateway + eAF** (e-Application Form) for new applications. Applicants must first register on the EMA portal and complete a web-based application form (eAF) with disease/indication data, which then generates part of Module 1. The rest of Module 1 (digital copies of forms, labeling, etc.) is uploaded with Modules 2–5 as eCTD.
- **Post-Approval and National Procedures:** Centralised procedure submissions, including variations and renewals, have been eCTD since 2010. For decentralised, mutual-recognition and purely national procedures, EU authorities phased in mandatory eCTD over the following years. Separately, EMA's XEVMPD and SPOR services are moving product and substance data toward centralized electronic records.

The UK's Medicines and Healthcare products Regulatory Agency (MHRA) followed EMA's lead pre-Brexit. Under the EU framework, MHRA accepted eCTD for UK marketing authorisation applications (grokipedia.com). After Brexit (2020), the MHRA continued this policy independently. Key UK points:

- **MHRA Submissions portal:** UK applicants submit eCTDs through the MHRA Submissions portal using any compliant publishing tool. The UK has its own Module 1 specification, broadly derived from the EU Module 1 without the multilingual requirement.
- **English Only:** Post-Brexit, MHRA only needs English language documents, which simplifies the M1 label requirements compared to the 24-EU language scope.
- **EMA Divergence:** In cases of EU mutual recognition or decentralized procedures, applicants currently must produce separate eCTDs for the UK and EU dossiers (though content 2–5 can be reused, M1 is different). MHRA validation criteria closely mirror the EU's, focusing on dossier completeness.

Overall, the EU and UK share much of the same eCTD 3.2.2 standard, but require applicants to be mindful of each region's Module 1 specifics (e.g. different form codes, product information wording). Importantly, EMA has moved beyond the pilot phase: **optional eCTD v4.0 acceptance for Centralised Procedure Marketing Authorisation Applications went live on December 22, 2025**, with pilot learnings published in March 2026 and a complex-scenario pilot continuing through Q2 2026. Mandatory v4.0 use for centralised applications is still foreseen for 2027 (globalforum.diaglobal.org) (ema.europa.eu). Companies should thus prepare for dual-version compatibility in their submission planning.

3.3 Asia-Pacific (Japan, China, India, Australia, etc.)

Asia-Pacific regulators have also been transitioning from paper/NeeS to eCTD:

- **Japan (PMDA):** Japan's PMDA has accepted eCTD for many years. In 2022 PMDA began accepting eCTD v4.0 (globalforum.diaglobal.org), and industry summaries report that **from April 1, 2026 PMDA requires eCTD v4.0 for new drug applications**, making it the first major agency to mandate v4.0 (japan.freyrsolutions.com). Sponsors filing in Japan therefore need v4.0-capable publishing tools and trained staff; transition rules for products with existing v3.2.2 sequences should be confirmed in PMDA's own notices. (Japan's Module 1 is region-specific, and Module 2 summaries are provided in Japanese.)
- **China (NMPA):** The Chinese regulator NMPA (formerly CFDA) has been gradually moving to eCTD. In 2021 NMPA published eCTD technical specifications and began *accepting* voluntary eCTD submissions for certain application types. A major milestone came in late 2022 when NMPA announced that **all drug registration applications** must be submitted electronically from December 1, 2022 (www.pharmalex.com). Note that a requirement for electronic dossiers is not the same as an eCTD mandate: eCTD in China has been phased in separately. Sponsors in China now should prepare full eCTD-compliant files, but they will note that Chinese guidance is still under development (English translations of tech specs are not fully available) (www.pharmalex.com) (www.pharmalex.com). In practice, many Chinese pharma companies now maintain eCTD publishing capability, especially for products being filed internationally. It is expected that within a few years NMPA will fully align with global eCTD norms (and may in future require eCTD v4.0), but the 2022 announcement was the first firm timeline.
- **India (CDSCO):** The Central Drugs Standard Control Organization (CDSCO) in India is **planning** a phased rollout of mandatory eCTD submissions. Historically, India used CTD-format paper or non-eCTD electronic dossiers. Industry commentary describes a transition toward mandatory eCTD submissions around 2026 (www.freyrsolutions.com). This move is intended to align India with ICH regions and digitize approvals. In the interim, Indian companies are advised to adopt eCTD processes for new products; training and investment in regulatory publishing tools is already underway. (Check CDSCO's official notices for the current status; a firm mandate date should not be assumed.)
- **Australia (Therapeutic Goods Administration, TGA):** After a staged transition that completed in 2023, the TGA requires all prescription medicine applications, including master files, to be submitted in eCTD format (www.tga.gov.au). Australia has its own regional Module 1, and eCTD v4.0 is expected to follow under the ICH framework.
- **Other Regions:** South Korea, Switzerland (Swissmedic), and the Gulf Cooperation Council countries have adopted eCTD v3.2.2 for major submissions; many are participating in international pilots for eCTD v4. For instance, Swissmedic published a draft eCTD v4.0 implementation guide and plans a 2026 pilot (globalforum.diaglobal.org).

Across Asia-Pacific, a common pattern emerges: countries initially allowed some mix of paper or older electronic formats, then mandated eCTD format (often first for NDAs) usually between 2010–2020, and are now gearing up for version 4.0. Interoperability challenges remain—for example, Japan's eCTD Module 1 differs from Korea's—but the technical infrastructure is converging. Notably, efforts like ICH's SPOR (Data Standards Management) and RPS frameworks aim to further harmonize these submissions across borders (see Section 4.4).

3.4 Latin America and Other Markets

In Latin America, eCTD adoption is at an intermediate stage. Brazil's ANVISA has recently committed to eCTD: in 2023 it signed contracts for an eCTD platform and announced plans for implementation (www.freyrsolutions.com). Through its partnership with Certara to deploy the GlobalSubmit™ platform, ANVISA is moving directly to eCTD v4.0, and **began accepting v4.0 dossiers for drug applications in 2026** (www.certara.com). Brazil thus skips the v3.2.2 stage that other regions traversed. Mexico's COFEPRIS and regional authorities in the Americas generally accept eCTD (for example via the Common Electronic Submissions Gateway), but mandates vary.

Other countries (e.g. South Africa, Turkey, Taiwan, Gulf states) have introduced eCTD requirements or are transitioning from paper. Many of these agencies accept eCTD v3.2.2 or allow mixed formats. The number of agencies using or piloting eCTD continues to grow, reflecting a global shift.

4. Data Analysis and Evidence

4.1 Adoption Data and Trends

Since eCTD became mandatory in major regions, usage has skyrocketed. An industry survey cited by the DIA notes that **94% of FDA-regulated submissions were eCTD as of 2022** (globalforum.diaglobal.org). This implies that only a small fraction of submissions (mostly investigator submissions, rare exemptions) remain in older formats. Similarly, EMA indicated that by 2020 nearly all centralized applications were received electronically; even "Variations" (post-approval changes) have largely shifted to eCTD or electronic forms. In emerging markets (China, India, Latin America), adoption is rising as mandates phase in. (Unfortunately, official counts are scarce for all regions, but the consensus in regulatory conferences is unmistakable: eCTD is the default global submission mode.)

Another key metric is submission turnaround. Agencies claim that standardized eCTD formats lead to faster review initiation. Definitive peer-reviewed studies on review timelines are limited; the main claimed benefit is that reviewers spend far less time locating and cataloging materials. Moreover, eCTD's ability to submit only changes (instead of full dossiers) for supplements means sponsors can file more frequent updates. In the EU, worksharing and grouped variation procedures also benefit from eCTD's structured lifecycle tracking.

Environmental and cost impacts, while secondary to regulatory concerns, are also noteworthy. A single NDA submission in paper can consist of 10+ binders (hundreds of pages). Migrating to eCTD has eliminated most paper, reducing printing and shipping costs (often thousands of dollars saved per submission). Regulatory agencies also save space and labor by archiving digital instead of physical files.

4.2 Performance Metrics

Some quantitative indicators reinforce eCTD's benefits and challenges. For example:

- **Validation Rejections:** Technical validation failures (bad backbone, format errors) were a common cause of rejection when eCTD was new; reliable public rejection rates are scarce, so no figure is quoted here. The major causes of rejections remain technical (poor PDF compliance, missing Module 1 items) rather than substantive. The ANDA case above (www.pharmaregulatory.in) exemplifies how such errors directly translate to delays.
- **First-Cycle Success Rates:** No reliable public study isolates the effect of eCTD format quality on first-cycle approval rates; any benefit is likely indirect, through fewer administrative queries and resubmissions.
- **Submission Volume Growth:** Over the 2010–2020 decade, worldwide regulatory workload has grown significantly (more applications and variations). Anecdotally, regulators attribute their ability to keep review times stable to eCTD: forcing all information into a single standard format reduces overhead even as the number of applications grows.
- **Industry Costs:** Establishing eCTD publishing capability has upfront cost, but long-term savings are realized in process efficiency. The return depends on submission volume; independently verified figures are scarce.

4.3 Case Study: eCTD Quality Failure

A concrete example illustrates the risks of poor publishing. In a published case study (www.pharmaregulatory.in), a generic drug applicant prepared an Abbreviated New Drug Application (ANDA) using the required eCTD v3.2.2 format. However, insufficient attention to detail led to multiple eCTD errors: the Module 3 folder hierarchy was incorrect (certain subfolders were in the wrong parent directory), several leaf titles/bookmarks were missing, and several PDF files were not PDF/A compliant. When submitted, the FDA issued a Technical Refusal to File letter, and the company had to serve a **9-month** delay before corrections were made and resubmitted (www.pharmaregulatory.in). This case underlines that even minor deviations from eCTD norms can stall an entire review. The consultants analyzing the case recommended strict adherence to automated QC: they specifically advised using tools like *Lorenz DocuBridge* or *EXTEDO Validator* pre-submission and instituting a rigorous internal audit of bookmarks and file names (www.pharmaregulatory.in).

4.4 Case Study: Regulatory Efficiency Gains

On the positive side, sponsors report eCTD packages greatly facilitate cross-regional submissions. Because Modules 2–5 are harmonized, companies can largely reuse them across regions, localizing mainly Module 1 in each dossier (www.pharmaregulatory.in) (globalforum.diaglobal.org). In practice, this means that when a drug is submitted to the FDA, EMA, PMDA, etc., the CORE data (quality, nonclinical, clinical) can be authored once, then repackaged per region with different form sets. This reduces redundancy and harmonizes messaging to regulators. Reviewing an eCTD with modern review software is generally regarded as much faster than working through paper, which helps keep queries more focused on science rather than “where is that file?” (grokipedia.com) (www.linkedin.com).

One published analysis noted that eCTD allows “assessors to verify claims in two clicks” due to hyperlinked cross-references (www.pharmaregulatory.in). In complex dossiers (e.g. oncology or advanced therapies), reviewers especially appreciate the metadata and search functions. Agency review tools index eCTDs so that reviewers can instantly locate all references to a given compound or study across the dossier. This kind of capability is essentially impossible with paper or NeeS. Although formal literature is sparse, collective experience indicates eCTD is associated with noticeable acceleration of the review lifecycle by regulatory authorities and a higher quality of initial application.

5. Best Practices and Common Pitfalls

Drawing on industry guidelines and case histories, several **best practices** emerge for eCTD publishing:

- **Early Planning and Training:** Organizations should start eCTD planning well before first submission. Regulatory affairs teams need training in the ever- evolving eCTD requirements. It is crucial to involve publishing specialists early (e.g. during drafting of core CMC or clinical documents) so that document styles and formats already align with expected electronic outputs. A reactive approach (“convert everything to eCTD at the last minute”) often leads to errors (www.pharmaregulatory.in) (www.freyrsolutions.com).
- **Master Document Management:** Maintain a controlled document repository with final-approved versions only. Implement naming conventions that match leaf titles. Use Document Management Systems (DMS) that can integrate with publishing tools (e.g., Veeva Vault, MasterControl) to tag metadata. Track all changes meticulously; keep clear audit trails if something is replaced or deleted between sequences.
- **Consistent Formatting:** Create and use *templates* for repetitive submissions. For example, maintain a folder structure (Modules 1–5) with placeholders. Use style guides so that paragraph numbering in reports (which often become bookmarks) is consistent. Avoid minor differences (like two- vs three-letter abbreviations) which can confuse automated checks.
- **Double- and Triple-Check:** A multi-person QC process is advised. One team should do an initial assembly and automated validation. A separate reviewer should then do a manual cross-check against a checklist: verify all Module 1 forms, count the number of studies reported vs listed, cross-check module cross-references, etc. Many companies do both a “regulatory reviewer QC” (subject-matter check: is everything scientifically present?) and “publishing QC” (technical correctness).
- **Use of Validation Tools:** The referenced rejection case (www.pharmaregulatory.in) highlights the value of vendor software. Most regulatory affairs groups now run eCTDs through a validation tool *before* final zip. Tools like Lorenz DocuBridge or EXTEDO eValidator can be integrated into the workflow. FDA itself recommends sponsors test their submissions with the same rules the agency will use (www.pharmaregulatory.in). (Organizations can even set up their own ESG test accounts to do a trial run submits and receive system feedback without penalty.)

- **Accept and Manage Updates:** After initial submission, expect follow-up submissions (responses, amendments). The eCTD format is designed for incremental updates: Sequence 0001 can replace or add specific leaves, not resubmit the whole dossier. To leverage this, companies should plan updates: for example, when one critical study finishes, prepare to append only that study's report in the next sequence. Maintain a current in-house index of all published leaves and their statuses.

Common pitfall pitfalls are just the reverse: lax naming ("filea.pdf, fileb.pdf"), mismatched bookmarks, incomplete Module 1, missing signatures on forms, or using wrong controlled vocabulary terms (e.g. the wrong submission type code). Even minor oversights (like forgetting to delete an outdated consent form from the workbook) can trigger an RTF. Close coordination between scientific writers and publishers is essential to avoid these.

6. Case Studies

6.1 Technical Rejection Due to eCTD Format Errors

The previously mentioned **ANDA rejection case** (www.pharmaregulatory.in) provides a cautionary tale. The sponsor had completed all requisite studies and assembled the answers, but did not deeply understand the format rules. As a result, simple publishing oversights (missing bookmarks, slight folder misplacement) caused the FDA to stop processing. Lessons from this case include:

- Early use of eCTD validation software.
- Having an internal "pilot sequence" reviewed by a third-party seasoned publisher before the actual submit.
- Emphasizing publishing accuracy in SOPs; this case specifically recommends making QC against FDA's Electronic Submissions Gateway (ESG) specifications routine (www.pharmaregulatory.in).

6.2 Cross-Region Submission Efficiency

Illustrative scenario (not a documented company case): a sponsor that prepares separate dossiers for EU (centralised), US (FDA) and Japan (PMDA) submissions, with significant duplication in Modules 2–5, can adopt a "global dossier" approach: upstream content (e.g. a final Clinical Study Report) is authored once, and the publishing team repurposes it for each region. Treating Modules 2–5 as **region-neutral**, as the CTD intends (www.pharmaregulatory.in), reduces duplication between submissions, while Module 1 is tailored per market (forms, local-language labelling). The same approach makes lifecycle maintenance easier, because scientific content is updated in one place and then re-published into each regional eCTD.

6.3 Emerging Market Transition

India's Regulatory Shift: Indian sponsors preparing for mandatory eCTD face a familiar set of challenges: staff need training not just in software but in eCTD concepts (e.g. not treating the eCTD as a simple PDF bundle), and document systems must be adapted to leaf granularity and lifecycle rules. As India moves toward

the expected eCTD mandate (www.freyrsolutions.com), eCTD training is likely to become routine for regulatory teams and CROs.

6.4 Brazil's Digital Initiative

ANVISA eCTD Transition: Brazil's move to eCTD brings practical considerations for sponsors, such as Portuguese-language labelling in Module 1, while allowing heavy reuse of Modules 2–5 prepared for FDA/EMA submissions. ANVISA's decision to contract an eCTD platform (www.freyrsolutions.com) (www.certara.com) is expected to standardize procedures, and its eCTD v4.0 deployment on the GlobalSubmit™ platform promises more automation (the press release cites automated workflow and better integrity) (www.certara.com).

7. Implications and Future Directions

The eCTD publishing paradigm is poised for continued evolution:

- **eCTD v4.0 Adoption:** As many agencies phase in version 4.0, industry must plan dual-format readiness. Sponsors should ensure their publishing systems and SOPs can handle v4.0 structures. The pace of adoption accelerated through 2025–2026: FDA voluntary acceptance opened Sept 2024 (www.fda.gov); EMA optional acceptance for Centralised Procedure MAAs began **December 22, 2025**; **PMDA mandated v4.0 from April 1, 2026** (japan.freyrsolutions.com); ANVISA Brazil began accepting v4.0 dossiers in 2026; the EU mandate is foreseen for 2027 (globalforum.diaglobal.org); FDA forward-compatibility (v3.2.2 ↔ v4.0) is targeted for Fall 2026, with no final FDA mandate date yet announced. The success of 4.0 hinges on industry embracing the new capabilities: e.g. designing documents to exploit one-to-many replacements and ensuring IT teams understand HL7 messaging.
- **Lifecycle Management & Data Integration:** eCTD enables advanced lifecycle practices that were difficult before. For example, eCTD 4.0's tagging of country applicability could revolutionize Europe's decentralized procedures: a single submission could indicate which annexes apply to which member states, simplifying MRPs. Similarly, global safety reporting can be streamlined by eCTD's meta-data: one pharmacovigilance PDF can be reused with an updated Pacific labeling. Integration with **IDMP/SPOR** standards is also on the horizon: agencies aim to link parts of the eCTD (like substance IDs, product names) to central dictionaries. This would reduce duplication (e.g. avoids retyping chemical names) and improve data quality. Achieving this will require sponsors to maintain controlled vocabulary consistency and use SPOR identifiers within Module 1 packages (globalforum.diaglobal.org).
- **Regulatory Communication:** The eventual goal of eCTD frameworks is to enable electronic *two-way* communication between regulators and industry. The HL7 RPS standard underlying eCTD 4.0 already includes a channel for agencies to send XML messages (e.g. review questions, deficiencies) back to the submitter. If realized, this would fully close the loop: sponsors could receive agency inquiries in a structured format, tracking them within their regulatory databases. This vision aligns with broader industry digital desires and is an area of active development.

- **Digital Archiving and AI:** In the long term, eCTD submissions are creating a vast corpus of structured regulatory data. Companies and agencies may start to apply AI tools (e.g. natural language processing) to assist in QC and analysis. For instance, machine learning could flag inconsistent data across modules (e.g. if a drug indication is described differently in Module 1 vs M2). Similarly, eCTD content could be mined for clues on class-wide trends. Such innovation requires high-quality, correct eCTD archives as input.
- **Harmonization of Regional Variations:** Module 1 differences remain a pain point. Several groups (DIA, RAPS, ICH) advocate for explicit harmonization or standardized XML forms approach. For example, EMA's SPOR project is one way to unify sponsor contact and product data across Member States, indirectly easing Module 1 tasks (globalforum.diaglobal.org). Continued dialogue between agencies and industry is likely to improve consistent eCTD submission requirements (e.g. fully defining M1 tag libraries to avoid confusion).

To summarize, eCTD has laid the technical groundwork for a fully digital regulatory landscape (www.freyrsolutions.com) (globalforum.diaglobal.org). The 2020s will see refinement of the system (v4.0 and beyond), and deeper integration with global standards. Prepared sponsors who have invested in robust publishing practices stand to gain from faster approvals and clearer regulator interactions. Regulators likewise benefit by using standardized submissions to streamline reviews. The ongoing evolution reflects a consensus: harmonized e-submissions are the fabric of modern regulatory science, enabling both innovation and protection of public health.

Conclusion

The eCTD publishing process is now an indispensable element of pharmaceutical regulation. From its ICH-sanctioned inception in 2002 through its universal adoption in the 2010s, eCTD has transformed how drug data are shared worldwide. This report has provided a detailed examination of **how** eCTD submissions are prepared and **why** each step matters, from technical formatting to global policy mandates. We have shown that strict adherence to eCTD specifications – including precise file formats, metadata, and lifecycle management – is crucial for avoiding delays (www.extedo.com) (www.pharmaregulatory.in). Conversely, the benefits of a well-executed eCTD are clear: accelerated reviews, improved data consistency, and lower costs of submission processing (globalforum.diaglobal.org) (grokipedia.com).

Looking forward, the emergence of eCTD version 4.0 marks the next chapter in this evolution; initial industry experience and regulatory pilots suggest **significant promise**. The enhancements of v4.0 (flexible TOC, rich metadata, two-way communication, and multimedia support) are expected to further boost efficiency, albeit with another learning curve (globalforum.diaglobal.org) (globalforum.diaglobal.org). Global synchronization – with major agencies moving in step and smaller markets catching up – will continue to shape the publishing landscape. One can foresee a time when the entire lifecycle of a product (from IND to BLA to postmarket updates) is managed by interconnected eCTDs, interoperating with regulatory databases and digital tools.

In conclusion, mastering the eCTD publishing process is not merely a regulatory compliance task – it is fundamental to modern drug development strategy. As regulators across the globe rely more heavily on electronic submissions, the capabilities and discipline of publishing teams directly affect trial timelines and

market access. This comprehensive review has highlighted the technical foundations, workflows, and strategic considerations of eCTD publishing. All stakeholders – companies, regulators, and software providers – must continue to invest in this shared infrastructure to realize the full benefits of electronic regulatory submission. As one industry expert aptly summarized, eCTD "redefines how regulatory information is structured, presented, and maintained" for the better (www.freyrsolutions.com), heralding a more efficient and data-driven future for regulatory affairs.

Acknowledgments: This report draws on numerous published guidelines, industry analyses, and regulatory communications to ensure accuracy and comprehensiveness. Sources are cited throughout in accordance with guideline requirements.

Source links

Links cited in this article, in order of first appearance. Full addresses are provided for readers using extracted text.

1. https://grokipedia.com/page/Electronic_common_technical_document
2. https://globalforum.diaglobal.org/issue/may-2025/ectd-v4-0-a-look-at-2025-and-beyond/
3. https://globalforum.diaglobal.org/issue/july-2024/how-did-we-get-here-a-history-of-ectd-and-prospects-for-ectd-4-0/
4. https://www.freyrsolutions.com/blog/indias-transition-toward-mandatory-ectd-submissions-what-pharma-manufacturers-must-prepare-for-in-2026
5. https://www.freyrsolutions.com/anvisa-takes-a-key-step-toward-ectd-implementation-in-brazil-a-milestone-in-regulatory-digitalization
6. https://www.fda.gov/drugs/electronic-regulatory-submission-and-review/ectd-submission-standards-ectd-v40-and-regional-m1
7. https://www.pharmaregulatory.in/regulatory-publishing-101-concepts-roles-outputs-for-high-quality-ectd-submissions/
8. https://www.extedo.com/blog/pdf-requirements-for-us-fda-ectd-submissions
9. https://www.certara.com/announcement/certara-joins-veeva-ai-partner-program-to-simplify-and-expedite-regulatory-submissions-for-life-sciences/
10. https://www.pharmaregulatory.in/regulatory-case-studies-and-best-practices/
11. https://www.pharmalex.com/thought-leadership/blogs/chinas-nmpa-announces-plan-to-require-electronic-submissions-from-december-1/
12. https://www.certara.com/announcement/certara-and-anvisa-partner-to-launch-ectd-4-0-submissions-of-drug-applications-in-brazil-through-globalsubmit-software/
13. https://www.linkedin.com/pulse/how-regulatory-publishing-services-accelerate-ectd-approvals-sahoo-5tmtc
14. https://www.willingjet.com/navigating-the-evolution-of-ectd-a-comparative-analysis-of-versions-and-global-implementation.html
15. https://japan.freyrsolutions.com/blogs/ectd-v4-0-in-japan-navigating-the-2026-regulatory-transformation
16. https://www.fda.gov/drugs/electronic-regulatory-submission-and-review/ectd-submission-standards-ectd-v322-and-regional-m1
17. https://www.ema.europa.eu/en/human-regulatory-overview/research-development/data-medicines-iso-idmp-standards/electronic-application-form-eaf-electronic-common-technical-document-ectd
18. https://www.tga.gov.au/products/medicines/prescription-medicines/application-and-market-authorisation/supply-prescription-medicine/submit-evaluation-information-us-electronically/submit-data-electronic-common-technical-document-ectd-format

THE PUBLISHER

About IntuitionLabs

IntuitionLabs is an AI consulting, custom software development and data engineering firm serving pharmaceutical, biotechnology, medical-device and other life-science organizations. We work with clinical, regulatory, medical-affairs, commercial, quality and IT teams to connect technology decisions with the work people need to accomplish.

AI consulting and adoption

Our AI enablement services cover readiness assessments, use-case selection, governance and policies, team workshops, adoption measurement and ongoing advisory support. We help organizations structure the information layer behind AI: source material, context, permissions and maintained knowledge that make generated answers useful and reviewable. Private LLM inference and hosted AI options support teams evaluating how to operate AI with appropriate control over their data and infrastructure.

Software, data and life-science workflows

IntuitionLabs develops custom software for pharma and biotech, integrates enterprise systems, and builds data engineering and business intelligence solutions. Areas of focus include AI agents, regulatory research, medical writing, medical affairs, CMC information, competitive intelligence and clinical-document workflows. Our eTMF intelligence work includes cross-system reconciliation and inspection-readiness support.

Enterprise platforms and regulated delivery

We provide Veeva services, application support, managed services, integrations and custom applications, alongside enterprise content work involving platforms such as Egnyte. For regulated workflows, our services include GxP enablement, computer-system validation and software development addressing 21 CFR Part 11 requirements. The applicable controls, validation responsibilities and acceptance criteria are defined for each engagement.

Work with IntuitionLabs

Explore AI enablement, pharma and biotech software development, data engineering and BI, and Veeva services. Contact IntuitionLabs to discuss your workflow, information sources and implementation needs.

IntuitionLabs publishes educational research to help life-science teams make informed technology decisions. Coverage of a product or organization does not imply a client relationship, endorsement or partnership.

Website: https://intuitionlabs.ai

This article is educational. Verify consequential medical, legal, financial, regulatory and technical decisions with appropriate professionals and the cited primary sources. Company services are described separately from the article's research findings.