IntuitionLabs

INTUITIONLABS / RESEARCH & PRACTICAL GUIDANCE

eCTD Submission Guide: IND & NDA Application Requirements

> 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 submission · regulatory affairs · ind application · nda application · ctd modules · fda requirements · ectd v4.0

Original article: https://intuitionlabs.ai/articles/ectd-submission-ind-nda-guide



In this article

1. Executive Summary
2. Introduction and Background
3. eCTD Structure and Specifications
4. CTD/eCTD Modules 1–5
5. eCTD v4.0 vs. v3.2.2
6. Regulatory Requirements for IND/NDA eCTDs
7. Preparation of Submission Content
8. Document Creation and Organization
9. Validation and Technical Quality Control
10. Tools and Resources
11. First-Time Submission Workflow
12. Common Pitfalls and Best Practices
13. Real-World Case Studies and Examples
14. Data Insights and Industry Trends
15. Future Directions and Implications
16. Data Tables and Figures
17. Conclusion

[Revised May 7, 2026] This guide has been updated to reflect the latest FDA and EMA eCTD v4.0 transition timelines, current submission volumes, and 2024–2025 regulatory developments.

Executive Summary

The Investigational New Drug (IND) and New Drug Application (NDA) submissions constitute critical milestones in pharmaceutical development. In the US, NDAs and commercial INDs must be submitted electronically in the *Electronic Common Technical Document* (eCTD) format (eCTD is optional, though encouraged, for noncommercial INDs such as investigator-sponsored and expanded-access INDs). The eCTD standard – an XML-based, modular dossier structure harmonized by ICH – enables reviewers to efficiently navigate submission content and accelerates review cycles (www.ema.europa.eu) (www.fda.gov). This report provides an exhaustive guide to planning and executing a first-time IND or NDA submission in eCTD, including all organizational, technical, and regulatory requirements. Key topics covered include: the historical evolution of CTD/eCTD requirements; the current FDA mandates and timelines for eCTD submissions (www.fda.gov) (www.fda.gov); the eCTD dossier structure (Modules 1–5) and technical file specifications (www.freyrsolutions.com) (www.freyrsolutions.com); practical steps to obtain application numbers, register with the FDA gateway, and prepare the eCTD package (www.fda.gov) (www.fda.gov); validation and publishing best practices (e.g. XML backbone, PDF specs, hyperlinks, metadata) (www.onixls.com) (www.onixls.com); use of automated tools for quality checks (www.pharmaregulatory.in) (www.onixls.com); and lessons learned

from real-world case studies (www.pharmaregulatory.in) (www.slideshare.net). The report is supported throughout by official guidance and expert commentary, and concludes with a discussion of future trends, notably the transition to eCTD v4.0 and global harmonization efforts (www.freyrsolutions.com) (www.fda.gov).

Introduction and Background

The **Common Technical Document (CTD)** was introduced in the early 2000s to harmonize regulatory submissions across regions. As the EMA notes, “a common format for technical documentation will significantly reduce the time and resources needed to compile applications… and will ease the preparation of electronic submissions” (www.ema.europa.eu). The CTD organizes information into five modules: Module 1 (regional administrative information) plus Modules 2–5 (overview and summaries, quality, nonclinical, and clinical data, respectively) (www.freyrsolutions.com). Building on ICH guideline M4 (CTD) and M2 (eCTD backbone), the eCTD standard adds an XML “backbone” and life-cycle management flags to enable easy updating of dossiers (www.freyrsolutions.com) (www.freyrsolutions.com). An eCTD dossier is thus a structured folder of PDF documents (called “leaves”) accompanied by standardized XML files for navigation, with each document assigned metadata and hyperlinks as needed.

By the mid-2000s, major regulatory agencies adopted the eCTD: the FDA, EMA, and other ICH authorities now require or accept applications in eCTD format (with minor regional Module 1 differences). In the US, FDA guidance explicitly states that *“the eCTD is the standard, accepted electronic format for New Drug Application (NDA), Abbreviated NDA (ANDA), Investigational New Drug Application (IND)… and other applications.”* (www.fda.gov). In practice, this means virtually all NDAs, ANDAs, BLAs (Biologic License Applications), and commercial INDs must be filed electronically as eCTDs.

Year/Date	Event	Source
2004 (Feb)	ICH M4 CTD guideline (Step 5) published – establishes the CTD structure (www.ema.europa.eu).	ICH (EMA)
Jul 2008	FDA publishes final eCTD specification (v3.2.2) for Modules 2–5 (www.fda.gov).	FDA Guidance
May 2017	FDA mandates eCTD submissions for all original NDAs, ANDAs, BLAs (www.fda.gov).	FDA Data Standards
May 2018	FDA mandates eCTD for commercial INDs and master files (www.fda.gov).	FDA Data Standards
Sep 16, 2024	FDA begins accepting new NDA/BLA/ANDA/IND applications in eCTD v4.0 format (www.fda.gov).	FDA eCTD Webpage
Dec 22, 2025	EMA begins accepting optional eCTD v4.0 submissions for new centrally authorised product MAAs, with prior contact with EMA required (esubmission.ema.europa.eu).	EMA eCTD v4.0
Not yet announced	FDA continues to accept eCTD v3.2.2, and v4.0 for new applications only; it has said it will give advance notice before supporting electronic submission only in v4.0 (www.fda.gov).	FDA eCTD Webpage

From these milestones, sponsors should note that **eCTD format is mandatory** for new NDAs and commercial INDs (it is optional for noncommercial INDs). Early FDA guidance had originally set a multi-year phase-in (24 months for NDAs, 36 for INDs after the 2008 guidance), but the actual compliance dates became 2017 and 2018 (www.fda.gov). Planning a first submission therefore assumes the necessity of eCTD from start to finish. The remainder of this report addresses all facets of preparing an IND or NDA in eCTD form, with detailed regulatory references and practical advice.

eCTD Structure and Specifications

CTD/eCTD Modules 1–5

A complete eCTD dossier is arranged into **Modules 1 through 5**, reflecting the CTD hierarchy. Broadly:

- **Module 1 (Regional):** U.S.-specific administrative forms and regional information (e.g. FDA forms, cover letters, prescribing information, labeling).Module 1 varies by region and is not submitted to other agencies (www.freyrsolutions.com).
- **Module 2 (Common Summaries):** High-level summaries of quality (Pharmacology, Pharmaceutic), nonclinical (toxicology), and clinical data, including e.g. risk-benefit summary, overview, and introduction to clinical studies (www.freyrsolutions.com).
- **Module 3 (Quality):** Chemistry, Manufacturing, and Controls (CMC) documentation, such as descriptions of drug substance and product, control methods, and stability data.
- **Module 4 (Nonclinical):** Reports and data from animal pharmacology and toxicology studies.
- **Module 5 (Clinical):** Clinical study reports from human trials, clinical pharmacology, efficacy studies, and related analyses.

Each PDF document (“leaf”) in an eCTD is placed under the appropriate CTD subsection (e.g. 2.7.1, 3.2.P, 5.3.x, etc.), and given a title and, in v3.2.2, a lifecycle operator (New, Append, Replace, or Delete) as needed. The FDA’s eCTD Specifications define the required folder hierarchy and naming conventions (www.fda.gov) (www.fda.gov). (For example, Module 2 eCTD backbone spec v3.2.2 was finalized on 7/16/2008 (www.fda.gov).)

The net role of the eCTD is to harmonize and streamline global submissions. As one industry expert summarized, *“The information gathering process [for pharma submissions] is very costly. It causes delays… The objective of the CTD/eCTD is to harmonize both the content and the way it is delivered for the new drug approval process”* (www.freyrsolutions.com). By adhering to this standardized format, sponsors benefit from more efficient dossier assembly and regulatory review.

eCTD v4.0 vs. v3.2.2

A major evolution of the eCTD format is arriving with **eCTD v4.0**. Unlike the earlier v3.2.2 (which has been used effectively for years), v4.0 introduces several fundamental changes in how dossiers are packaged and manipulated (www.freyrsolutions.com) (www.freyrsolutions.com). It is based on the HL7 RIM/RPS standard

and uses a single XML “master” file to describe the entire submission, enabling richer metadata and document reuse (www.freyrsolutions.com) (www.freyrsolutions.com). Key differences include (see Table below):

Feature	eCTD v3.2.2 (www.freyrsolutions.com)	eCTD v4.0 (www.freyrsolutions.com) (www.freyrsolutions.com)
XML Backbone	Separate XML files per region/index/study.	Single unified submission XML (HL7 RPS) for the whole dossier (www.freyrsolutions.com).
Document Reuse	Files can be referenced from earlier sequences, but reuse is less systematic.	Documents get a universal unique ID (UUID); can be referenced rather than re-sent (www.freyrsolutions.com).
Lifecycle Operations	“New”/“Replace” apply to single files.	More flexible: can replace multiple documents as a set; uses Document Groups.
Table of Contents (CTO)	Hierarchical tree structure (fixed context values).	Flat “keyword” system – context and keywords drive the index instead of fixed hierarchy (www.freyrsolutions.com).
Study Models/Tagging	Uses Study Tagging Files (STFs) for clinical data.	STFs eliminated; replaced by generalized document groups (www.freyrsolutions.com).
Controlled Vocabulary	Minimal (few constraints on names).	Extensive, governed by ICH, RPS, and authorities to ensure consistent terms (www.freyrsolutions.com).
Underlying Standard	Proprietary XML schema (ICH-derived).	HL7 RPS-based standard (designed for broad interoperability) (www.freyrsolutions.com).
Technology Usage	Less standardized; tool support limited to ICH specs.	High – greater reliance on automation and interoperability across systems (www.freyrsolutions.com).

These changes mean eCTD v4.0 can reduce publisher burdens (since UUID-identified documents make reuse more systematic) and supports more structured data. For example, rather than one PDF per orange book label, a sponsor can tag each distinct section with metadata and reuse it easily. The FDA has begun accepting v4.0 for new application numbers (NDAs, INDs, etc.) as of September 2024 (www.fda.gov). Forward compatibility tools are still in development, so current recommendations are: submit initial applications in v4.0 if eligible, and continue to support v3.2.2 until FDA declares a switch to v4-only. **Sponsors should be aware of both formats:** familiarity with v3.2.2 is still necessary during the transition, but preparatory work for v4.0 (e.g. review HL7/RPS schemas and controlled vocabularies) will soon become essential.

Regulatory Requirements for IND/NDA eCTDs

Before assembling content, sponsors must understand the FDA’s **submission requirements and timelines**. The key points are:

- **Mandatory eCTD Format:** FDA’s official policy is that all NDAs, ANDAs, BLAs, and commercial INDs must be submitted in eCTD format. Paper or PDF-only submissions are no longer accepted for these application types (www.fda.gov) (www.fda.gov). (Certain administrative forms and correspondence may

still be exchanged via e-mail or ESG, but the main dossier must be eCTD.) This policy is grounded in FDA guidance and PDUFA commitments (www.accessdata.fda.gov) (www.fda.gov).

- **Application Number:** A pre-assigned application number is required for each submission. For CDER (drugs), sponsors must request a number through the FDA's split mailing list system. (For INDs, this is typically the IND number issued at filing; for NDAs, the sponsor gets a new NDA number from FDA.) The FDA advises sponsors to obtain the number well in advance to avoid last-minute errors (www.fda.gov) (even a single wrong digit will invalidate the filing). For CBER-regulated products, a different request process is used (via CBER Pre-Assignment) (www.fda.gov).
- **Electronic Submission Gateway (ESG):** All eCTD submissions are transmitted via the FDA's Electronic Submissions Gateway. Sponsors must register for an ESG account (which involves a multi-step testing phase) (www.fda.gov). The CFDs, institutions, or consulting organizations preparing IND/NDA dossiers should allow **plenty of lead time**: ESG account setup and testing can take several weeks to months (www.fda.gov). During testing, a mock submission is sent to FDA's test server to verify that files and metadata are correctly formatted. Only after passing ESG testing is a production account granted.
- **Electronic Submission Validation:** FDA provides published **eCTD Validation Criteria** that apply at submission. The sponsor (or their publishing vendor) must ensure the eCTD backbone XML and content meet these criteria (www.fda.gov). FDA grades validation findings by severity; submissions with high-severity errors (e.g. malformed XML, required elements missing, wrong file types) **fail validation** and are not processed. Therefore extensive internal validation is required prior to sending the package. FDA's electronic submissions website advises sponsors to review and validate the eCTD against FDA's published validation criteria before submitting, typically with a commercial validation tool (www.fda.gov).
- **Size and Media:** Submissions up to 10 GB can be sent via ESG (www.fda.gov). In practice, most IND/NDA packages (including PDFs and data sets) fall below this limit. For submissions above 10 GB, check FDA's current eCTD instructions for the permitted transmission options.
- **Cover Forms and Transmittal Letters:** Each submission must include the appropriate FDA eSubmission forms (M1 folder) – for example, FDA Forms 1571 (IND), 356h (NDA), or others – fully completed in PDF form. These are not paper-signed forms but fillable PDFs. It is critical to use ***the latest versions*** of these forms (www.onixls.com). Outdated or blank forms trigger validation errors. FDA FAQs explicitly remind sponsors to source the current e-forms from the website (www.onixls.com). (For labeling, an Electronic Submissions Gateway cover letter and draft labeling file should also be included in M1.)
- **FDA Guidance:** Sponsors subject to the eCTD requirement should follow the final guidance *Providing Regulatory Submissions in Electronic Format — Certain Human Pharmaceutical Product Applications and Related Submissions Using the eCTD Specifications* (FDA, Rev. 8, September 2024). This guidance, along with the FDA's eCTD Technical Conformance Guide and Validation Criteria, are the authoritative references on eCTD content rules (www.fda.gov). (For convenience, the FDA website organizes these at FDA eCTD page and the [FDA Data Standards Catalog].)

- **Pre-Submission Meetings:** Although not mandatory, FDA strongly encourages a pre-IND or pre-NDA meeting to align expectations. Particularly for first-time submitters, an informational meeting with the appropriate review division can clarify dossier expectations (scope of studies, labeling plans, etc.) before investing in a full eCTD. Separately, FDA also offers pre-submission consultations to discuss study data formats (e.g. SDTM/ADaM) if needed, which helps avoid data issues at NDA time.

Collectively, sponsors should **plan well in advance** of the intended filing date. As the FDA quips, what seems like a “small error” (e.g. wrong application number or missing unit in PDF) can have “big implications” – delaying a submission for weeks or even rejecting it (www.fda.gov) (www.onixls.com). Early engagement (agency contacts, form acquisition, ESG registration, preliminary sample submissions) is strongly advised to prevent costly mistakes.

Preparation of Submission Content

Document Creation and Organization

Once the submission requirements are understood, the sponsor must assemble all scientific content:

- **Module 1 Documents:** Collect all administrative forms (FDA 1571/356h etc.), cover letters, labeling, patent information, and other regional documents. Each form should be filled electronically and saved as PDF in a version FDA accepts (PDF 1.4–1.7, PDF/A-1 or PDF/A-2), with Fast Web View enabled. Draft and final labeling (SPL format or PDF) belong here. If complying with recent FDA WARNINGS, ensure U.S. prescribing information (PI) is up-to-date.
- **Module 2 Summaries:** Prepare high-level summaries of quality, nonclinical, and clinical information. The CTD requires a Quality Overall Summary (QOS) for CMC, a nonclinical overview and summary, and a Clinical Overview and Clinical Summary (comprehensive high-level overviews of the data) (www.freyrsolutions.com). These should be written clearly and concisely, as reviewers rely on them heavily. Because Module 2 is narrative text, consistency with the underlying Module 3–5 sections is critical.
- **Module 3–5 Reports:** Collect and organize the detailed reports: CMC specifications and analytical methods (Module 3), toxicology reports (M4), clinical study reports and tabulated data (M5). Clinical study reports should generally follow the ICH E3 structure, which is a flexible, nonbinding guideline. If *Standardized Data* are required (e.g. SDTM datasets, define.xml, as per FDA policy), include those files as “Study Data” in Module 5 (see [FDA Study Data Standards Catalog]). Quality control is crucial: each document must be finalized (no redactions or placeholders), each figure/table correctly numbered, and all cross-references resolved.
- **Version Control:** Maintain strict version control throughout authoring. Multiple people and CROs may contribute, so it is vital to ensure that the **latest** approved version of each document is what ends up in the submission folder. The Assyro IND case study noted that “authors scramble to find the ‘latest’ version” under poor coordination (assyro.com), causing mismatches among drafts. To avoid this, use single-source authoring tools or clear file-naming conventions.

- **Consistency Checks:** Check that the narrative summaries in Module 2 match the detailed data in Modules 4–5. The Assyro blog warns of “inconsistent terminology, broken links, and Module 2 summaries that contradict Module 5 study reports” as red flags that regulators notice (assyro.com). Perform internal peer-review cycles: the Module 2 summaries, in particular, should be reviewed against the data inputs for consistency.
- **Formatting Standards:** Author documents in checklist with FDA pdf requirements. Per ONIX and FDA guidance, PDF files should adhere to specified standards: PDF versions 1.4–1.7, PDF/A-1 or PDF/A-2, with Fast Web View enabled, embedded fonts, no security, and valid bookmarks/internals (www.onixls.com). Each PDF leaf should have the eCTD Title metadata field populated per FDA Table of Contents standards (see eCTD Technical Conformance Guide). The ONIX checklist advises verifying “each leaf/document has a specific eCTD title applied and be placed into a specific location within the eCTD structure” (www.onixls.com). In practice, this means using eCTD publishing software or meticulous manual templates to ensure all links, bookmarks, and hierarchy rules are followed.
- **Hyperlinks and Cross-References:** Verify all hyperlinks between documents. Any citations within a PDF that point to another leaf must be bookmarked correctly. A single broken hyperlink can cause hours of firefighting. ONIX notes that hyperlinking is extremely time-consuming if not done carefully in real-time, and a missing link requires querying the author at the last minute (www.onixls.com). Therefore, hyperlinks should be created as the document is compiled, or by using automated linking tools if available.
- **Metadata and Lifecycle Operators:** Build the eCTD backbone XML (in v3.2.2, index.xml plus the US regional XML; in v4.0, a single submissionunit.xml) with accurate metadata: submission type, date, application number, sequence number, etc. In v3.2.2, also assign the proper lifecycle operation (“new”, “append”, “replace”, “delete”) for each PDF leaf; in v4.0, lifecycle is managed through the context of use, and content is withdrawn by suspending it rather than deleting it. As ONIX points out, missing or incorrect metadata fields (like submission number, applicant name, indication) will fail validation (www.onixls.com). Equally, misuse of the lifecycle tags (for example, uploading a new label as “new” instead of “replace”) can confuse reviewers and make obsolete documents appear current (www.onixls.com). A published eCTD must reflect the true version history of the product, so in v3.2.2 the “Replace” operator should be used whenever updating an existing element.

Validation and Technical Quality Control

Before official submission, comprehensive validation is mandatory. This involves multiple checks using both automated tools and manual review:

- **Automated Validation Tools:** Run the entire submission through an eCTD publishing/validation tool that implements the FDA’s technical criteria. Common tools include Lorenz DocuBridge, Extedo eCTD S3, or online validators. These tools will check for structural compliance (correct file paths, file types, XML syntax) as well as FDA-specific rules. According to a PharmaRegulatory case study, use of such tools is *essential* – for example, one ANDA was delayed 9 months because of improper eCTD

formatting, and the key suggestion was: “use automated eCTD validation tools such as Lorenz DocuBridge or Extedo” (www.pharmaregulatory.in). Many sponsors incorporate “dry runs” of the validation during preparation (e.g. after uploading each major module) to catch errors early.

- **Reference the Validation Criteria:** Keep the FDA’s “eCTD Validation Criteria” document on hand (e.g. [FDA Specifications for eCTD Validation Criteria]) and review issues flagged by your validator against it. The FDA EG should pass validation without errors; any remaining errors must be resolved prior to submission.
- **Manual Review of “Human” Requirements:** Beyond XML rules, manually ensure that every expected item is present. Checklists should verify, for instance, “Are all FDA forms included?”, “Are all requested labeling versions present?”, “Is each module’s table of contents complete?”, etc. The ONIX Seven Questions emphasize this – e.g., question 7: “Are you using Lifecycle operators correctly?” is essentially a final QC item (www.onixls.com). Make sure nothing is missing from Module 1 (paperwork) or module 2–5 (data content) that the FDA would expect to find.
- **PDF Technical Checks:** Ensure each PDF view properly in Adobe Reader, bookmarks work, and the file is not corrupt (some tools can scan for corrupted PDFs). Confirm that the PDF version is one FDA accepts (PDF 1.4–1.7, PDF/A-1 or PDF/A-2); PDF/A is accepted but not universally required. The ONIX advice on PDF formatting (www.onixls.com) is worth following: for instance, use Adobe’s Preflight to check files against FDA’s PDF specifications.
- **Submit a Sample (Optional):** FDA describes a sample submission as optional but able to provide valuable feedback, and separate from the ESG account test. Under step 4 on FDA’s Submit Using eCTD page, sponsors may send a sample early on (www.fda.gov). FDA currently limits eCTD samples to new applications in eCTD v4.0: the sponsor must already hold an application number and plan an actual submission within 12 months, and the sample is validated for technical conformance only, never reviewed by FDA reviewers (www.fda.gov). Timeline-wise, schedule this test submission at least a month before the real deadline to allow for any needed revisions.

By combining rigorous automated checks with hands-on reviews, a sponsor can maximize confidence that the eCTD package is technically sound. As ONIX warns, failing technical validation will block the entire submission: *“an eCTD submission package needs to pass technical validation before the agency accepts it into their system; if this cannot be passed, the review will not even begin”* (www.onixls.com). In short, first-time eCTD submitters must commit to exhaustive testing – a failed submission can mean significant delay or rejection of an IND/NDA.

Tools and Resources

Several tools and resources can aid the eCTD compilation:

- **Publishing Software:** Commercial eCTD publishing applications (e.g. PubDesk, Extedo eCTD S3, Lorenz docuBridge, MasterControl, etc.) provide user-friendly ways to assemble documents, generate the XML, and run validation checks. These often include interfaces for defining new/replace operations and automatic PDF linking. Many sponsors find these tools indispensable for first-time assemblies.

- **Reviewers/Viewers:** Although not required for submission, an eCTD viewer (like Lorenz eCTD or Extedo Viewer) can simulate the reviewer's view of the dossier. Running through a viewer helps catch issues such as missing bookmarks or incorrect labeling of sections from the reviewer's perspective.
- **FDA ESG Website:** Use the Electronic Submission Gateway site (FDAdocs) for account setup instructions and technical Q&A. The [FDA ESG website] (login required for details) and FDA's eCTD pages contain updated submission standards and validation criteria documents.
- **Industry Guidelines:** The ICH's M2 and M8 guidelines provide dosing beyond FDA. The FDA Technical Conformance Guides for eCTD v3.2.2 and v4.0 should be consulted for deep technical rules (available on the FDA eCTD pages).
- **External Consultants:** First-time submitters may augment in-house efforts with regulatory consultants experienced in eCTD. As one NDA case study illustrated, outsourcing support from multiple CROs required strict oversight, but expertise from a niche provider helped rescue the timeline (www.slideshare.net) (www.slideshare.net). Whether internal or external, having trained "eCTD publishers" is critical.

Overall, sponsors should **leverage automation and established processes**. Do not attempt to manually edit XML or assemble folders in an ad hoc way. The sheer complexity of eCTD dictates using standardized templates and tools. That said, familiarity with the underlying rules enables better use of those tools and quicker troubleshooting of validation errors.

First-Time Submission Workflow

The FDA's own eCTD guidance suggests a logical stepwise approach for first-time submitters (www.fda.gov):

1. **Review Resources:** Begin by studying FDA eCTD guidance, specifications (v3.2.2 and v4.0 as relevant), and any specific industry Q&A. The sponsor's team should ensure all stakeholders know where to find key documents. Tip: Create internal training or checklists based on FDA documents (eg. eCTD guidance Rev. 8, Technical Conformance Guide, and latest Validation Criteria).
2. **Request Application Number:** If one is not yet assigned, request and obtain the pre-assigned IND or NDA number from FDA (www.fda.gov). This number becomes part of the eCTD metadata (Module 1) and filenames, so it must be accurate. Delaying this step can derail the timeline if the wrong number is used.
3. **Register for ESG Account:** Start the ESG registration and ESG test submission as soon as possible (www.fda.gov). Producers often underestimate the lead time. Submit the letter of non-repudiation FDA requires for ESG accounts, and complete the ESG test submission with a small dummy package where FDA requires one for your submission type.
4. **Organize Content:** Concurrently with steps 1–3, compile and finalize all submission documents (as described above). Organize files into Module-specific folders according to the eCTD table of contents. Populate the eCTD XML backbone (for v3.2.2, index.xml and the US regional XML; for v4.0, submissionunit.xml) iteratively as materials become stable.

5. **Sample/Mock Submission (Optional):** For a new eCTD v4.0 application, consider sending FDA an optional sample submission (www.fda.gov). The request goes to FDA's electronic submissions staff, not the review division, and the sample is checked only for technical conformance; it is never reviewed by FDA reviewers (www.fda.gov). The goal is to receive feedback on any overt format issues, not to start the review clock. Workshop any issues discovered.
6. **Validation and Internal Approval:** Finalize the eCTD package and perform full internal validation (automated + manual quality checks). Circulate the completed submission internally for sign-off as if it were going out. Ensure all internal organizational approvals (QA, legal, etc.) are complete.
7. **Transmission:** Once validated, transmit the eCTD to FDA via ESG. Use the ESG metadata forms (especially in 510(k) or PMA context; for IND/NDA use program forms as required) with correct envelope. Immediately verify receipt (FDA sends a confirmation email). If any major validation errors are caught by FDA on ingest, work with the review division to resolve quickly.

Throughout this process, **project management is paramount**. The ONIX blog and the NDA case study below both underline the need for clear roles and oversight. For instance, the Assyro IND guide notes "undefined ownership" of tasks often stalls IND timelines (assyro.com). Every document and eCTD component should have an identified owner responsible for updating it. Internal communication and version control (via SharePoint or a document management system) prevent the confusion of multiple concurrent edits. In complex submissions, consider weekly status meetings and a central dashboard tracking completion of each deliverable.

Tip from experience: Do not leave eCTD compilation to the very end. Publish and validate modules in stages as content stabilises. Note that FDA normally reviews an NDA once the complete application is in; submitting completed sections early (rolling review) is available only in specific programs such as Fast Track and must be agreed with FDA.

Common Pitfalls and Best Practices

Even when following the basic workflow, many first-time submitters encounter technical pitfalls. By learning from others, sponsors can avoid common traps:

- **Agency Coordination:** Always verify with the FDA Review Division that the application is allowed and expected on the planned date (www.onixls.com). If a submission falls on a holiday or after-hours, it might be delayed. Also ensure the correct review branch (e.g. oncology vs neurology) is aware. One ONIX tip: always check the submission window with FDA so that "what was the point of all your hard work?" is avoided (www.onixls.com).
- **Up-to-Date Forms:** Use the current, FDA-issued e-forms. Old versions of Form FDA 1571/356h, or not including an official cover letter at all, will produce errors. ONIX specifically warns that missing or incorrect forms "will be flagged as errors during validation and rejected" (www.onixls.com). (FDA's eCTD page links to all required forms. For NDAs, this includes the 356h application form; for INDs, 1571 and associated forms.)

- **PDF Specifications:** Follow FDA's PDF rules to the letter. This means using Acrobat or authoring tools with pre-set compliance (e.g. fonts embedded, bookmarks/document properties set). Small issues—like not flattening high-level bookmarks or including a non-printing form field—can cause rejection. ONIX notes a free Word plugin (e.g. Adobe PDFMaker) can streamline compliance (www.onixls.com). At minimum, check each PDF against FDA's PDF specifications (for example with Acrobat's Preflight).
- **Hyperlinks and Bookmarks:** DO NOT neglect internal linking. Every internal reference (e.g. "see Appendix X") should be hyperlinked to the exact PDF leaf. Broken links almost always get caught by reviewers and reflect poorly. Allocating time to fix cross-links is far cheaper than queries after submission.
- **Metadata Accuracy:** Triple-check all XML metadata. Ensure the application number, sequence number, submission type (orig, amend), and sponsor name match exactly what FDA expects. Even a misspelt sponsor name or a whitespace in the XML can invalidate envelope acceptance.
- **Lifecycle Operators:** Use "new" only for truly new documents. For updated versions of tables or reports, use "replace." For files that should no longer be considered active (e.g. an old draft of an investigator brochure), use "delete" in v3.2.2; in v4.0, suspend the context of use instead. A common ONIX example: failing to replace an old label PDF will leave the previous label "active" in the dossier, which misleads reviewers (www.onixls.com).
- **Validation Early and Often:** Don't wait until the end to validate. Integrate validation checkpoints after compiling each major section. Use pretrained staff or consultants who can interpret validator logs. As one case study for an ANDA shows, sloppy eCTD errors led to a 9-month delay (www.pharmaregulatory.in). The fix is regular GL (good look)-validation cycles.
- **Read Guidance**: ONIX and others emphasize: read the FDA's eCTD guidance pages and keep them handy. The Submit Using eCTD page explicitly says, *"Plan and prepare early… What may seem like a small error can have big implications (such as a wrong digit in your application number)"* (www.fda.gov). Similarly, always incorporate advice from final ICH eCTD Q&A documents or the FDA's technical documents.

Checklist of Must-Do's: Many sponsors find it helpful to compile a pre-submission checklist that includes: obtaining ESG login, testing submission, final QC of table of contents, review of PDF properties, and backup of all data. Internal Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs) should mandate both *before* and *post*-validation reviews.

Real-World Case Studies and Examples

Learning from prior submission experiences can illuminate potential issues. A few illustrative cases:

- **ANDA Formatting Failure (PharmaRegulatory.in)**: A generics company submitted an ANDA eCTD with fundamental structural faults. The agency immediately issued a refusal to file, identifying mistakes: "Incorrect folder hierarchy in Module 3, missing leaf titles and bookmarks, [and] PDF documents not PDF/A compliant" (www.pharmaregulatory.in). This single technical failure caused a **9-month delay** to

correct and resubmit. The published analysis concluded: to avoid such fiascos, sponsors “should use automated eCTD validation tools… and train regulatory publishing teams in global eCTD standards. Internal SOPs should mandate pre-submission validation checks” (www.pharmaregulatory.in). This underscores that even if the science is solid, failure to meet eCTD format rules can nullify months of work.

- **NDA “Rescue” Case (BHLD/Busa, 2018)**: A mid-sized biotech’s “first ever NDA” provides a positive example. The sponsor had limited staff and outsourced studies to three CROs. Despite the complexity, they hit the target submission date and “received no feedback from the FDA on data compliance!” (www.slideshare.net). How was this achieved? A thorough gap assessment and a focused “submission-ready” plan were used. Key lessons included: defining clear contractual expectations with CROs (explicit deliverables, CDISC standards) (www.slideshare.net), early creation of final data sets (with define.xml, etc.), and above all, **engagement with FDA**. The project involved a “Pre-NDA Meeting” to agree on data formats and a test eCTD submission (CRT package) (www.slideshare.net) (www.slideshare.net). These measures—outlining detailed FDA expectations and performing a dry run—ensured the actual NDA eCTD was error-free. This case highlights that good project management and regulatory strategy (e.g. early FDA dialogue) can enable first-cycle success even for resource-strapped teams.
- **IND Timeline Challenges (Assyro blog)**: While not a formal case report, industry commentary on IND preparation indicates common pain points. Contributors report that because content authors and owners are unclear, critical documents get delivered late to the publisher. The Assyro team describes “authors scrambling to find the latest version, and the publishing group [becoming] a blocker” in the absence of process discipline (assyro.com). This narrative suggests implementing an **IND operating model**: designate primary owners for each content element, use a structured outline (mirroring eCTD granularity), and establish single-source data repositories. Doing so avoids the “document chase” that otherwise forces last-minute 2 AM marathon editing. The Assyro advice is to treat IND preparation as an engineering problem, systematically assigning roles and timelines (assyro.com).
- **Sponsor Advice (Various)**: Consulting blogs and regulatory forums offer aggregated wisdom. For example, ONIX’s “7 Questions” list line-items common sponsor errors (see previous section (www.onixls.com) (www.onixls.com)). These and the above cases combine to form a consensus: **start early, validate often, and never assume any detail is trivial**. Sponsors should essentially treat eCTD like any GMP process – with SOPs, checklists, and checkpoints.

These real-world examples illustrate that a successful first-time eCTD submission requires technical precision, teamwork, and regulatory savvy. The consequences of failure are steep (lost time, increased costs), whereas best practices (early FDA engagement, thorough QC, use of standard tools) are proven to pay off.

Data Insights and Industry Trends

Quantitative data on regulatory submissions is limited, but some metrics shed light on the stakes:

- **Submission Volume:** FDA receives a large volume of new INDs each year, and CDER approves roughly 50 novel drugs per year. CDER reported 50 novel drug approvals in 2024 and 55 in 2023, and CBER's biologics approvals continue to grow with cell and gene therapy filings. Virtually all of these were filed in eCTD format, underscoring that essentially the entire industry must meet the eCTD compliance bar. The universal shift to eCTD means the vast majority of the industry (large and small sponsors alike) are grappling with this transition.
- **Adoption Rates:** While FDA mandates eCTD for NDAs/INDs, some submissions remain outside the requirement (e.g. noncommercial INDs such as investigator-sponsored and expanded-access INDs, for which eCTD is optional). Note that 505(b)(2) applications are NDAs and fall under the eCTD requirement. However, as of 2018 virtually all major Chemistry, Manufacturing, and Controls (CMC) supplements and original applications are electronic.
- **First-Cycle Approval Rates:** There is no public data directly correlating eCTD quality with approval outcome. However, industry analysts note that well-prepared submissions (which include solid eCTD format) are more likely to avoid Complete Response Letters (CRLs). For instance, a PharmaRegulatory study of NDA CRLs found many rejections were due to incomplete data or labeling issues (www.pharmaregulatory.in), issues often caught by eCTD validation. By contrast, submission-ready eCTD content – like the tidy NDA case above – can slip through quickly.
- **Economic Impact:** The costs of non-compliance can be high: eCTD errors at the IND/NDA stage can push back pivotal clinical or commercialization timelines by many months. Therefore investment in eCTD tooling and expertise has a clear return in reduced rework costs.
- **Industry Readiness:** A survey of pharma executives indicated that many companies initially struggled with eCTD (especially smaller biotechs). In fact, **OpenText**, an enterprise content company, found in 2015 that many sponsors were racing to meet the FDA's deadline, and frequently asked for extensions (www.freyrsolutions.com). That reality is now behind us, but it underscores a broader trend: *"Requires cutting-edge technology and seasoned staff,"* as one consultant put it (www.freyrsolutions.com). In response, the industry has matured: by 2025, virtually every regulatory team has an eCTD publishing standard process, and regulatory vendors are widely used.

The key takeaway from the data is that eCTD compliance is no longer optional. The ROI comes from faster agency review and downstream ease of amendments. Organizations that have "invested in content engineering" (structured authoring and eCTD capabilities) find that they spend far less time firefighting during submission phases (www.pharmaregulatory.in) (www.slideshare.net). In aggregate, eCTD-supported submissions have reduced the cyclical burden on reviewers, enabling them to focus on scientific issues rather than hunting for files.

Future Directions and Implications

The landscape of electronic submissions is evolving. Looking forward, sponsors should consider:

- **eCTD v4.0 (HL7/RPS):** FDA support for eCTD version 4.0 is a major shift. Beginning September 16, 2024, *new* NDAs, BLAs, ANDAs, and INDs may be filed as v4.0 (www.fda.gov). As of 2026, FDA still accepts both v3.2.2 and v4.0 for new applications, with v4.0 adoption growing steadily as publishing vendors (Lorenz, Extedo, Veeva Vault Submissions, etc.) ship production-ready v4.0 modules. FDA has said it will provide advance notice before it begins supporting electronic submission only in eCTD v4.0; no such date has been announced. Companies must prepare for this by adopting publishing tools that support RPS XML and UUID-based linkage. Freyr analysts predict that v4.0 "will revolutionize electronic submissions" by enabling content reuse and faster approvals (www.freyrsolutions.com).
- **Global Harmonization:** Internationally, most ICH agencies are moving to eCTD v3+/v4 standards. The EMA opened optional eCTD v4.0 submissions for new centrally authorised product MAAs on 22 December 2025 (esubmission.ema.europa.eu), with use strongly recommended from Q1 2027 and mandatory for new centrally authorised product MAAs from Q1 2028 under EMA's current plan. Japan's PMDA has accepted eCTD v4.0 since 2022 alongside its earlier format, Health Canada accepts eCTD v3.2.2 for many (but not all) regulatory activities, and China's NMPA has begun implementing eCTD for drug submissions. Sponsors planning first submissions should bear in mind portability – drafting data and summaries compatible with eCTD will make life easier if pursuing parallel approval elsewhere. Indeed, Module 2/3/4/5 content written for one agency rarely needs major rework, only Module 1 differs by region. Thus, foregrounding ICH CTD structure is intrinsically an international strategy.
- **Structured Data and AI:** The ongoing push toward integrating standardized data (CDISC SDTM/ADaM for clinical, IUCLID for nonclinical, etc.) dovetails with eCTD evolution. In the future, machine-readable segmenting of dossiers may enable partially "electronic" rather than PDF submissions (e.g. structured labeling). Vendors are already offering AI-assisted authoring tools and automated tagging. Staying abreast of these technologies can increase submission quality (for example, automated bookmarking).
- **Regulatory Expectations:** Review divisions increasingly expect clarity and compliance. As one NDA advisor put it: engage the FDA *"early in the drug development/submission process"* with a CDISC data standardization plan and sample packages (www.slideshare.net). The growing use of "real-time oncology reviews" and expedited or collaborative review programs (e.g. FDA's Real-Time Oncology Review and Project Orbis) also means that sponsors who master eCTD workflows can participate in faster review initiatives.
- **Institutional Learning:** Regulatory experience is cumulative. Companies should update their SOPs and train new staff using the lessons above. Errors like obsolete forms or broken links should be virtually eliminated from repeated IND/NDA cycles. In a knowledge-based industry, having robust documentary processes will confer lasting advantages.

In summary, the first eCTD submission is an investment in the future. Establishing sound eCTD procedures now will pay dividends in subsequent amendments, supplements, and other lifecycle filings. The move to eCTD – and soon v4.0 – represents not just a technical requirement, but a shift toward more data-centric, transparent regulatory review. Sponsors that build disciplined eCTD expertise will be well-positioned for faster approvals and global reach.

Data Tables and Figures

To illustrate two key comparisons, we include the following tables:

Table 1. *FDA/ICH eCTD Milestones.* A timeline of key events in the development and regulatory enforcement of eCTD standards.

Date	Event	Reference
Feb 2004	ICH M4 (CTD) guideline published (harmonized eCTD/CTD format) (www.ema.europa.eu).	EMA (ICH M4 Guideline)
Jul 16, 2008	FDA finalizes eCTD v3.2.2 backbone specification (Modules 2–5) (www.fda.gov).	FDA eCTD Tech Specs
May 5, 2017	FDA mandates eCTD submissions for all new NDA/ANDA/BLA filings (www.fda.gov).	FDA Data Standards Catalog
May 5, 2018	FDA mandates eCTD for original commercial INDs (www.fda.gov).	FDA Data Standards Catalog
Sep 16, 2024	FDA begins accepting eCTD v4.0 for new INDs/NDAs (www.fda.gov).	FDA eCTD Announcement (CDER/CBER)
Future (TBD)	FDA has said it will give advance notice before supporting **only eCTD v4.0**; no date announced (www.fda.gov).	FDA eCTD Webpage

Table 2. *Comparison of eCTD v3.2.2 vs. v4.0 (major features).* Adapted from industry analyses (www.freyrsolutions.com) (www.freyrsolutions.com).

Feature	eCTD v3.2.2	eCTD v4.0
XML Submission Backbone	Multiple regional/index XML files	Single HL7 RPS-based XML file (`submissionunit.xml`) (www.freyrsolutions.com)
Document Re-use (`UUID`)	Cross-sequence file references possible but limited	Documents get UUIDs; can be re-used in later seq. (www.freyrsolutions.com)
Lifecycle Operations	New/Replace on individual files only	Can replace or group multiple docs at once (www.freyrsolutions.com)
Table of Contents (Index Structure)	Hierarchical, fixed headings	Flat, context/keyword driven indexing (www.freyrsolutions.com)
Study Tagging Files (STFs)	Required for clinical/data modules	STFs eliminated; use *Document Groups* instead (www.freyrsolutions.com)
Controlled Vocabularies	Minimally enforced	Extensive, managed by ICH/RPS for clarity (www.freyrsolutions.com)
Underlying Standard	ICH-specific DTD/Stylesheet	**HL7 RPS** (global messaging standard) (www.freyrsolutions.com)
Tool/Tech Dependency	Modest (vendors built ICH tools)	High (automated systems needed to parse RPS) (www.freyrsolutions.com)

These tables emphasize that while eCTD v3.2.2 served industry for many years, v4.0 represents a paradigm shift. Sponsors should use this comparison when planning their publishing tool upgrades and data strategy.

Conclusion

Preparing a first IND or NDA as an eCTD is a complex but well-defined process. It encompasses regulatory strategy, scientific documentation, and technical publishing. As we have detailed: the foundation is understanding the FDA's eCTD requirements and timelines (www.fda.gov) (www.fda.gov), then systematically building the dossier (Modules 1–5) in compliance with CTD structure (www.freyrsolutions.com). Critical steps include obtaining application identifiers, registering with the FDA gateway, formatting every document correctly, and validating the entire package (www.fda.gov) (www.onixls.com). Resources such as the FDA's eCTD webpage and validation criteria (www.fda.gov) (www.fda.gov), industry guidance and checklists (www.onixls.com) (www.pharmaregulatory.in), and case-study learnings (www.pharmaregulatory.in) (www.slideshare.net) support sponsors throughout.

The implications of doing it right are profound. A pristine first submission can lead to accelerated review, probably first-cycle action, and better footing for global filings. Conversely, mistakes in eCTD formatting can torpedo an application before science is considered. Therefore, careful attention to detail – as encapsulated in this guide's best practices – is vital. Looking forward, sponsors also need to gear up for eCTD v4.0, which promises even greater efficiencies (www.freyrsolutions.com) (www.fda.gov). Investing in eCTD expertise now is an investment in faster drug development and global reach.

In summary, the first IND/NDA eCTD submission should be approached as a major project: coordinate with the FDA early, leverage proper tools and standards, and treat every checklist item as a requirement. By doing so – as echoed through the FDA guidance, industry analyses, and case examples cited here – sponsors maximize the chance of a smooth regulatory review and eliminate needless delays. This comprehensive guide, grounded in authoritative sources (www.fda.gov) (www.fda.gov) (www.onixls.com) (www.pharmaregulatory.in), should equip regulatory teams to achieve that goal with confidence.

Source links

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

1. https://www.ema.europa.eu/en/ich-m-4-common-technical-document-registration-pharmaceuticals-human-use-organisation-ctd-scientific-guideline
2. https://www.fda.gov/drugs/forms-submission-requirements/electronic-regulatory-submission-and-review
3. https://www.fda.gov/drugs/electronic-regulatory-submission-and-review/ectd-submission-standards-ectd-v322-and-regional-m1
4. https://www.fda.gov/drugs/electronic-regulatory-submission-and-review/electronic-common-technical-document-ectd
5. https://www.freyrsolutions.com/blog/challenges-faced-by-life-sciences-companies-in-ectd-submissions
6. https://www.freyrsolutions.com/blog/ectd-322-vs-ectd-40-how-significant-is-the-change
7. https://www.fda.gov/drugs/electronic-regulatory-submission-and-review/submit-using-ectd
8. https://www.onixls.com/2020/03/top-7-questions-ask-submitting-ectd-application/

9. https://www.pharmaregulatory.in/tag/nda-success-case-studies/
10. https://www.slideshare.net/slideshow/nda-submission-experience-rescue-case-study/107310470
11. https://intuitionlabs.ai/articles/generic-drug-patent-challenge-guide
12. https://esubmission.ema.europa.eu/eCTD%20NMV/eCTD.html
13. https://www.accessdata.fda.gov/scripts/cder/training/ectd/submit/submit/fd_03_01_0020.htm
14. https://assyro.com/blog/from-draft-to-ectd-compress-your-ind-prep-timeline-without-burnout
15. https://www.fda.gov/drugs/electronic-regulatory-submission-and-review/submit-ectd-v40-or-standardized-data-sample-fda

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.