



INTUITIONLABS / RESEARCH & PRACTICAL GUIDANCE

FDA Inactive Ingredient Database Maximum Potency and MDE

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 · 2026-10-16 · fda inactive ingredient database · maximum potency · maximum daily exposure · fda iid · excipient screening · excipient safety · formulation development · cmc regulatory · unii

Original article: <https://intuitionlabs.ai/articles/fda-inactive-ingredient-database-potency-mde-guide>



In this article

1. Executive Summary
2. Introduction and Background
3. What the IID Record Establishes
4. Maximum Potency Versus Maximum Daily Exposure
5. Match Ingredient Identity, Route and Dosage Form
6. Build a Reproducible Formulation Screen
7. Calculate Exposure and Escalate Evidence Gaps
8. Data Analysis and Evidence
9. Implications and Future Directions
10. Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs)
11. Conclusion

Executive Summary

The **FDA Inactive Ingredient Database maximum potency** records the highest unit-dose amount or applicable formula percentage in its approved-product precedent. The value must retain its ingredient, administration route and dosage form. **Maximum daily exposure (MDE)** describes the total excipient amount taken or used under the maximum daily regimen; its calculation multiplies excipient amount per administered unit by maximum units per day. A unit-dose amount alone therefore cannot establish daily exposure. (www.fda.gov) FDA also states that the potency and MDE maxima are not linked and may originate from different approved products. Neither dividing those maxima nor assuming an approved dosing frequency supplies a defensible comparator. (www.fda.gov)

For screening as of **October 16, 2026**, the accessible download documentation advertises **seven columns**, without separate MDE and MDE-unit fields in its published list. (www.fda.gov) **July 2026** was the newest explicitly dated change log observed; the current-download link was undated. (www.fda.gov) The current ZIP and live search remained inaccessible during this research, so actual-file schema, route coverage and missing-MDE rates were not audited. The recommended crosswalk preserves original values and adds documented quantity type, exposure, provenance and qualification fields.

The worked calculations use explicitly hypothetical inputs: an oral tablet gives **72 mg/day**, an intravenous solution **100 mg/day**, and a topical cream **30 mg/day applied**. These are dimensional-analysis examples using mass fraction, mass concentration and percent definitions, not FDA limits. (goldbook.iupac.org) (www.nist.gov) A favorable numerical comparison still leaves material quality and formulation performance to assess. USP describes process-specific excipient performance, while WHO guidance addresses manufacturing quality. (doi.usp.org) (www.who.int)

Public evidence can be incomplete: a **2020 study of 230 biological formulations** (journals.plos.org) reported an average **44.4%** without listed concentrations for commonly occurring inactive ingredients. (journals.plos.org) That historical labeling result is not an IID missingness estimate. The screening decision should combine verified identity, exposure and intended-use evidence. GSRS supports identifier searching; IPEC frames safety evidence around exposure context; STEP provides

pediatric evidence with links to underlying sources. (gsrs.ncats.nih.gov) (www.ipeceurope.org) (step-db.ucl.ac.uk) Unresolved identity, ambiguous units, missing MDE, new routes and population differences should lead to a defined evidence request, toxicology justification or application-specific FDA discussion.

Introduction and Background

A formulation screen asks a narrow question: does a proposed excipient use have a useful precedent in an approved U.S. drug product? The **FDA Inactive Ingredient Database (IID)** helps answer that question through ingredient, route and dosage-form records. Its maximum potency describes a unit-dose amount or, for some formulations, a concentration. That number must be interpreted before it can support an exposure comparison. (www.fda.gov)

The practical problem spans **chemistry, manufacturing and controls (CMC)**, toxicology and data management. A material can have a recognizable name yet differ in grade or functional properties. The United States Pharmacopeia (USP) explains that excipient performance can depend on the particular formulation and process, with relevant properties varying among suppliers and batches. A name match therefore leaves important development questions open. ([doi.usp.org](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2141.2011.08401.x))

The advisory perspective in this IntuitionLabs report is to separate three decisions: matching the substance, calculating exposure, and qualifying the intended use. The method below recommends a traceable screening record with an explicit unresolved state. This approach follows the scientific emphasis on reviewing existing evidence before choosing additional safety studies. ([pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/22111111/))

Teams should distinguish the evidence they need:

- **Precedent evidence:** retain the precise ingredient, route and dosage form associated with the database value. (www.fda.gov)
- **Exposure evidence:** document concentration, administered amount and the maximum proposed regimen, keeping the dimensions visible. ([pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/22111111/))
- **Material evidence:** assess grade, relevant specifications and formulation performance alongside the numerical screen. ([doi.usp.org](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2141.2011.08401.x))
- **Label provenance:** distinguish a submitted public label from evidence of the applicable approved labeling. (dailymed.nlm.nih.gov)
- **Population evidence:** evaluate the intended patients and treatment duration, especially when adult experience is being considered for pediatric development. (www.ema.europa.eu)

This is a decision method with a crosswalk template. The current bulk ZIP and interactive search could not be retrieved during this research session after the prescribed fallback. Accordingly, current-file row totals, measured route coverage and missing-MDE percentages remain unverified. The report uses the accessible FDA documentation and clearly labeled hypothetical calculations; it supplies no reconstructed product formula.

What the IID Record Establishes

Read the row at its original grain

The useful unit of interpretation is the **ingredient, route of administration and dosage form combination**. A value associated with an oral tablet cannot be carried automatically into an injectable solution screen. Within the appropriate combination, maximum potency records prior approved-product use. FDA's draft guidance explicitly distinguishes this historical amount from a maximum permissible or acceptable daily intake. (www.fda.gov)

FDA's **July 2019 IID guidance remains labeled draft and not for implementation** on its guidance landing page. (www.fda.gov) Its explanations help interpret the database, but historical statements about a potency-only display must be read alongside subsequent enhancements. FDA's enhancements explanation says that MDE is displayed instead of maximum potency when MDE is available. (www.fda.gov)

The download landing page advertises **seven fields**, including the Chemical Abstracts Service (CAS) registry number and **Unique Ingredient Identifier (UNII)**. *Table 1* separates that published field list from the additional fields recommended for an internal screen. The distinction matters because the advertised download schema does not itself provide separate MDE and MDE-unit columns. (www.fda.gov)

Field group	Published or proposed fields	Interpretation and screening treatment
Published identity	Inactive Ingredient; CAS Number; UNII	Preserve original strings. Link normalized names through an adjudicated identifier mapping.
Published administration	Route; Dosage Form	Preserve both fields in the screening key. Do not collapse routes or release forms merely to obtain a match.
Published quantity	Potency Amount; Potency Unit	Retain the amount and its original unit together. Establish what the displayed quantity represents before comparison.
Proposed exposure enrichment	MDE; MDE unit; quantity type; supporting source	Populate only from an explicitly identified exposure source. Leave unavailable MDE empty and flag it.
Proposed provenance	File quarter; retrieval date; original row; source URL	Record observed release information and retain uncertainty where the current file is undated or inaccessible.
Proposed qualification	Synonym; identity decision; qualification note; calculation status	Keep a human-readable explanation of the match, assumptions and evidence gaps.

The proposed fields are **analyst recommendations**, not an assertion about the current ZIP's contents. Their purpose is to prevent a generic numeric column from silently becoming a daily exposure. Substance identifiers can support this separation: the Global Substance Registration System (GSRS) API documents UNII-based searching, while a commercial grade remains a separate identification consideration in European Medicines Agency (EMA) excipient guidance. (gsrs.ncats.nih.gov) (www.ema.europa.eu)

Preserve an unresolved result

An apparent blank is a data state requiring investigation. FDA's field-description page permits a blank potency amount when it cannot be calculated. Preserve blanks and any NA strings as originally supplied, alongside separate normalized missing-state flags. An unavailable quantity does not support substituting zero.

(www.fda.gov)

Keep the screening conclusion narrower than the evidence. A compendial quality reference, a substance identifier and a prior-use amount answer different questions. USP's manufacturing chapter addresses facilities and controls; the European Directorate for the Quality of Medicines & HealthCare (EDQM) similarly distinguishes a Certificate of Suitability (CEP) from a good manufacturing practice (GMP) certificate. Neither document should be converted into a numerical exposure clearance.

([doi.usp.org](https://doi.org/10.1117/1.3598888)) (faq.edqm.eu)

Maximum Potency Versus Maximum Daily Exposure

The calculation that changes the decision

Maximum potency answers how much excipient appears in the relevant unit dose, or the highest formula percentage for percentage-based records. **Maximum daily exposure (MDE)** answers how much would be taken or used across the maximum recommended daily regimen. For a stated drug strength, translate the drug's **maximum daily dose (MDD)** into the maximum number of administered product units. For oral products, FDA also uses the term **maximum daily intake (MDI)** for excipient exposure. (www.fda.gov)

For a proposed formulation, calculate:

Proposed daily exposure = excipient amount per administered unit × maximum administered units per day.

For a solution expressed in mass per volume, the equivalent calculation is concentration multiplied by maximum daily volume. The National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) distinguishes mass concentration as constituent mass divided by mixture volume, which explains why mg/mL multiplied by mL/day produces mg/day. (www.nist.gov)

A percentage needs its denominator. **Mass fraction** is constituent mass divided by total mixture mass; it differs from a mass concentration. Consequently, a percentage based on mass cannot be multiplied by an administered volume without an appropriate mass-volume conversion. The International Union of Pure and Applied Chemistry (IUPAC) defines mass fraction, while NIST distinguishes mass fraction, mass concentration and density. (goldbook.iupac.org) (www.nist.gov)

The important interpretation checks are:

- **Solid unit:** establish whether the excipient amount is per tablet, capsule, sachet or another administered unit.
- **Liquid amount:** retain both the numerator and denominator of a strength such as mg per stated volume.
- **Mass fraction:** multiply the fraction by the total product mass used daily.
- **Volume fraction:** calculate excipient volume first; a mass result requires appropriate density information. (www.nist.gov)
- **Reconstitution:** document whether concentration describes the supplied material or the preparation actually administered.

These are dimensional-analysis checks proposed for the screening worksheet. They follow the different quantity definitions rather than assuming every "percent" is interchangeable. NIST defines the percent symbol as the number **0.01**, while distinguishing the quantity to which that number applies. (www.nist.gov) (goldbook.iupac.org)

Do not reverse-engineer an approved regimen

FDA states that maximum potency and MDE **are not linked**. Their maxima can come from different approved products. Dividing one public maximum by another does not establish a product's number of daily doses; multiplying a public maximum potency by an assumed regimen does not produce an FDA-supplied MDE. (www.fda.gov)

Use independently documented proposed-product inputs for the proposed exposure. Keep the comparator's quantity type separate. If that type is unknown, the correct screen is "comparison unresolved." It is reasonable to seek additional existing human-exposure evidence, but the applicability of that evidence still needs assessment. The pediatric workshop review describes using prior human data when appropriate, rather than treating every historical exposure as transferable. (pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov)

A convenient screening ratio is proposed daily exposure divided by a compatible, documented MDE. Label it **a comparison ratio**, not a margin of safety. Toxicological interpretation still depends on exposure duration, route and context. The International Pharmaceutical Excipients Council (IPEC) Safety Guide overview expressly frames supporting safety evidence around those factors. (www.ipec-europe.org)

Match Ingredient Identity, Route and Dosage Form

Normalize names without erasing distinctions

Create a **raw-name field** and a separate search-normalized field. Trimming whitespace, standardizing case and recording known synonyms can improve retrieval. Those operations should not authorize merging two substances. Chemical Abstracts Service (CAS) describes its registry identifiers as a way to identify substances unambiguously despite multiple possible names. (www.cas.org)

A recommended identity workflow is:

- **Retain the source name:** preserve the exact FDA string alongside any preferred internal label.
- **Check the UNII:** use the identifier as a matching aid and investigate absent or conflicting mappings.
- **Cross-check the CAS number:** use it as a corroborating identifier rather than a substitute for a material definition.

- **Preserve qualifiers:** retain information describing salts, hydration, polymer type, mixture composition and commercial grade.
- **Record the adjudication:** distinguish confirmed identity, possible synonym and unresolved identity. (gsrs.ncats.nih.gov)

These are proposed data-governance controls. They build on GSRS's documented identifier search capability and CAS's explanation that a registry number itself has no inherent chemical significance. A code facilitates matching; interpreting the material still requires substance information. (gsrs.ncats.nih.gov) (www.cas.org)

Do not let synonym expansion erase the difference between a substance and a supplier's grade. EMA's dossier guidance identifies commercial-grade information where a common name does not adequately describe relevant properties. USP separately warns that performance-relevant properties may vary among suppliers and batches. These sources support retaining both substance identity and material attributes in the crosswalk. (www.ema.europa.eu) (doi.usp.org)

For a mixture, preserve the composition evidence needed to determine what is being compared. EMA calls for qualitative and quantitative mixture composition. A match to a broad mixture name cannot establish the daily amounts of its individual constituents without that information. (www.ema.europa.eu)

Keep route and dosage form in the join

FDA adopted Structured Product Labeling (SPL) terminology for routes and dosage forms and explains that standardization collapsed historical categories. A lower number of records across releases can therefore reflect terminology changes. Name matching should be accompanied by a versioned terminology crosswalk. (www.fda.gov)

The proposed screening key is **verified ingredient identity + route + dosage form + quantity type + unit basis**. This extends the source row with safeguards for the comparison. It helps prevent immediate-release and modified-release records, or concentration and daily-amount records, from being combined merely because the ingredient name matches.

Retain route specificity even when two products are both described informally as injections. USP's excipient manufacturing chapter highlights additional challenges for specialized applications such as parenteral, ocular and inhalation use. Such considerations reinforce the need for a product-specific assessment after a database match. (doi.usp.org)

Finally, avoid using shared ingredient names as proof of formulation equivalence. An original permeability study examined individual excipients and explicitly did not test excipient combinations. Its scope illustrates why evidence about individual components does not establish the behavior of a complete formulation. (link.springer.com)

For **combination products**, calculate excipient exposure from administered product units. The number of active ingredients does not multiply the excipient amount in each unit. Account for every intended administration and assess formulation interactions separately; the published permeability experiment did not test excipient combinations. (link.springer.com)

Build a Reproducible Formulation Screen

Separate source data, transformations and decisions

Start with an immutable copy of each source file that is actually obtained. FDA describes quarterly updates in **April, July, October and January**. (www.fda.gov) A scheduled month does not prove that a new release has already appeared. In the pages retrieved for this report, **July 2026 was the newest explicitly dated change log**. (www.fda.gov) The current-download link itself was undated.

Recommended steps:

1. **Inspect the schema:** compare the actual headers with the landing-page description before loading values.
2. **Preserve source rows:** retain the original names, amounts, units and missing-value strings.
3. **Normalize conservatively:** create separate derived fields for names, identifiers and units.
4. **Resolve quantity type:** distinguish unit-dose potency, concentration and documented daily exposure.
5. **Match the proposed use:** require identity, route, dosage form and compatible dimensions.
6. **Calculate proposed exposure:** retain the formula and every independently supplied input.
7. **Classify evidence gaps:** separate missing data from a documented mismatch.
8. **Record disposition:** identify the supporting evidence and the development decision it informs.

This sequence is a recommended implementation, supported by the need for formulation-specific understanding and controlled material quality. USP describes process-dependent excipient performance, while World Health Organization (WHO) guidance addresses excipient production, control, storage and distribution under a quality-management framework. (doi.usp.org) (www.who.int)

When public labels are used for enrichment, retain their provenance. DailyMed contains submitted, in-use labeling, which may differ from the latest FDA-approved text. Record the label version and check the source appropriate to the approval claim. (dailymed.nlm.nih.gov)

A copyable crosswalk header is useful before populating a screening file:

```
ingredient_raw,synonym,unii,cas_raw,route,dosage_form,maximum_potency,potency_unit,mde,mde_unit,quantity_type,file_quarter,qualification
```

Populate potency and MDE only when each is explicitly identified in its source. If a download does not distinguish the two, preserve its original columns and place the interpretation in a separate, documented enrichment step. Do not label a value as MDE merely because a desired output column exists.

Keep material qualification alongside this data workflow. WHO's manufacturing guidance addresses quality and purity; EDQM explains that evaluating a CEP dossier does not evaluate GMP compliance. These complementary documents should remain distinct evidence objects, each with its own purpose and applicability. (www.who.int) (faq.edqm.eu)

Build useful views without overstating coverage

A **route-by-dosage-form availability matrix** should be generated from the obtained release, using verified ingredient identifiers within each cell. Useful cell states are matching rows present, no matching row found, and source not evaluated. Add separate counts of rows with documented MDE and rows with usable potency. This is a proposed analysis; no such counts were verified here. The view is intended to organize the critical review of existing evidence recommended in the pediatric formulation literature. ([pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov))

For duplicate handling, distinguish identical repeated source rows from records that share an identity but differ in route, form, units or measurement type. Resolve conflicts through a documented rule and retain the originals. Treating all shared-name rows as duplicates would discard the very context needed for qualification. The broader scientific approach is to review the existing evidence and its applicability before deciding what additional testing is necessary. ([pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov)) (www.ipeceurope.org)

Calculate Exposure and Escalate Evidence Gaps

Worked calculations (Hypothetical Example)

Table 2 uses **illustrative inputs invented solely for arithmetic**. These are not IID values. The conversions use IUPAC's mass-fraction definition and NIST's mass-concentration and percent conventions. (goldbook.iupac.org) (www.nist.gov)

Route and dosage form	Illustrative excipient input	Illustrative maximum regimen	Calculated proposed daily exposure	Qualification note
Oral tablet	12 mg per tablet	6 tablets/day	$12 \times 6 = \mathbf{72 \text{ mg/day}}$	Compare daily exposure only with a compatible documented MDE; retain the unit-dose amount separately.
Intravenous solution	0.2% mass per volume, interpreted here as 0.2 g/100 mL	50 mL/day	$2 \text{ mg/mL} \times 50 = \mathbf{100 \text{ mg/day}}$	Verify concentration basis, reconstitution and actual administered volume.
Topical cream	1% mass fraction, equivalent to 10 mg/g	3 g/day	$10 \text{ mg/g} \times 3 = \mathbf{30 \text{ mg/day applied}}$	Applied mass does not establish systemic absorption.

The topical result describes the amount placed on the body under the stated assumption. It does not supply a measured absorbed dose or address local tolerance. IPEC's safety framework includes route-dependent evidence and specialized considerations such as local irritation. Keep an applied-dose result separate from any model of systemic exposure. (www.ipeceurope.org)

For the oral example, an illustrative compatible MDE of **90 mg/day** would yield a comparison ratio of **$72/90 = 0.80$** . That comparator is hypothetical too. The ratio merely describes the arithmetic relationship between the supplied amounts. It cannot resolve population, treatment duration or formulation-performance differences, which remain part of the assessment. ([pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov)) (doi.usp.org)

Flag the gaps that change the next action

Use a short evidence-gap code with a written explanation:

- **Missing MDE:** retain an unknown value and seek exposure evidence; never infer the comparator's regimen.
- **Ambiguous units:** obtain the denominator and concentration basis before calculating.
- **Identity uncertainty:** resolve the substance definition, grade or mixture composition.
- **Route or form mismatch:** assess whether a scientific bridge exists for the proposed use.
- **Combination uncertainty:** calculate the relevant proposed administration and evaluate the full formulation.
- **Population or duration difference:** review evidence applicable to the intended patients and treatment period.
- **Historical naming conflict:** preserve the original term and document the current mapping.

These flags are proposed workflow categories. Their scientific basis is the need to assess intended exposure and context rather than rely on a single number. IPEC frames safety studies around route and treatment period, and the pediatric workshop review considers doses, concentrations and regimen together. (www.ipeceurope.org) ([pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov))

For children, search dedicated evidence beyond a general precedent row. The European Paediatric Formulation Initiative (EuPFI) describes its STEP project as supporting pediatric excipient risk assessment. The Safety and Toxicity of Excipients for Paediatrics (STEP) database compiles manually extracted information and provides source links, enabling assessment of the underlying evidence rather than relying solely on a database label. (eupfi.co.uk) (step-db.ucl.ac.uk)

Escalate an unresolved use through toxicology and CMC review, then formulate an application-specific regulatory question when needed. FDA's IID training material points generic-product development questions toward the **Controlled Correspondence pathway**. Use that route as described for its intended context rather than assuming that every development question has the same submission channel. (www.fda.gov)

Data Analysis and Evidence

Quantify the limits of public evidence

The most important quantitative distinction is between **dose amount and daily amount**. Dimensional checks should precede ratios or visualizations: a numerator in mg/day requires a compatible denominator, while a percentage requires its mass or volume basis. NIST's quantity definitions provide the mathematical foundation for those checks. (www.nist.gov)

An original **2020 label-based study of 230 biological formulations encompassing 208 unique drugs** provides a useful, limited illustration of public-data completeness. ([journals.plos.org](#)) It reported an average **4.45 excipients per formulation**. ([journals.plos.org](#)) These are results from that study's sample, not a current census of IID records.

The authors reported an average **44.4%** of biological formulations without listed concentrations for the most commonly occurring inactive ingredients. Their concentration analysis used weight per volume. This finding supports checking whether a public label supplies the quantitative input needed for an exposure calculation; it does not estimate the IID's missing-MDE rate. ([journals.plos.org](#))

Label provenance also matters. The National Library of Medicine's DailyMed service presents companies' submitted, in-use labeling and cautions that it may differ from the latest FDA-approved labeling. A label can help establish a proposed calculation input, but approval status, version and relevance need independent confirmation. ([dailymed.nlm.nih.gov](#))

Evidence about formulation behavior has a different scope. A primary permeability experiment studied **four Biopharmaceutics Classification System (BCS) Class III compounds, one Class I compound and five excipients**, using laboratory and animal-perfusion models. Its design was targeted; its results cannot establish universal equivalence or acceptability of every excipient combination. ([link.springer.com](#))

Reconcile quarterly changes by meaning

Table 3 summarizes the change categories described by FDA and the proposed response in a screening system. FDA separates corrections, deletions and MDE replacements, while new entries appear on the primary IID webpage. The table specifies handling rules; it does not claim measured counts from the inaccessible current ZIP. ([www.fda.gov](#))

Quarterly event	FDA-described meaning	Recommended screening response
Correction	Current changed record is shown above its previous version.	Retain before-and-after values; rerun affected matches and calculations.
Deleted record	Often a route or dosage-form correction creates a replacement record.	Investigate the replacement before concluding that ingredient precedent disappeared.
MDE replacement	A daily-exposure record replaces a prior maximum-potency record under the described process.	Change the quantity type explicitly; do not derive an approved regimen from the two values.
New entry	Displayed on the primary IID webpage, outside the change log's listed categories.	Compare obtained releases and review flagged records; do not treat the correction log as a complete additions list.

A meaningful change report therefore tracks **semantic changes**, including units and measurement type, alongside numeric differences. FDA expressly warns against assuming that a replacement MDE is a multiple of the earlier potency. That is a reason to rerun interpretation, not simply overwrite a number. ([www.fda.gov](#))

Recommended release metrics include matched ingredients, unresolved identities, incompatible units, missing quantity types and screens affected by an update. Report each metric with its denominator and the exact release analyzed. Pediatric evidence resources should likewise be treated as leads to underlying studies: STEP explicitly does not guarantee completeness or currency. ([step-db.ucl.ac.uk](#))

Implications and Future Directions

The durable improvement is a screening record that makes uncertainty visible. A matched ingredient with unclear units needs a different action from a well-defined ingredient used by a new route. A suitable quality grade needs a different evidence trail from an exposure comparison. USP's performance chapter and WHO's manufacturing guidance support keeping these dimensions visible through development. ([doi.usp.org](#)) ([www.who.int](#))

For an automated workflow, require a documented reason whenever a normalization rule merges names or a conversion changes dimensions. Keep calculated exposure separate from a regulator-supplied comparator. GSRS offers identifier-based search, while CAS provides a cross-name identification system; neither resource removes the need to preserve the material definition used in the formulation. ([gsrs.ncats.nih.gov](#)) ([www.cas.org](#))

The evidence package should connect identity, function, quality standards and intended use. The International Council for Harmonisation's common technical document organization links dosage-form components with their functions and quality references. EDQM's explanation of a CEP reinforces the need to distinguish quality documentation from manufacturing certification and other qualification questions. ([database.ich.org](#)) ([faq.edqm.eu](#))

If more evidence is required, ask the supplier what supporting information can be referenced. IPEC-Americas explains that Type IV drug master files (DMFs) can contain confidential formulation, safety and manufacturing information, while also stating that an excipient is not required to have a DMF. The existence or absence of that document should therefore be recorded without turning it into an automatic screening verdict. ([ipecamericas.org](#))

International sources can inform scientific thinking without becoming U.S. requirements. Australia's Therapeutic Goods Administration (TGA), in its separate listed-medicines framework, calls for safety evidence relevant to duration, dosage, target population and route. This corroborates the context-based assessment approach; it does not establish an FDA excipient limit. ([www.tga.gov.au](#)) TGA's guidance also distinguishes restrictions on concentration and maximum daily dose, reinforcing the importance of specifying the quantity under assessment. ([www.tga.gov.au](#))

Pediatric development particularly benefits from targeted literature work. EuPFI's excipient workstream focuses on retrieving and evaluating safety and toxicity information for children. Its resources should complement assessment of the actual proposed dose and patients, with original studies checked for applicability and remaining uncertainty. ([eupfi.co.uk](#)) ([step-db.ucl.ac.uk](#))

Future refreshes of a derivative IID crosswalk should publish their source release, transformation rules, unresolved mappings and meaningful changes. Before presenting a crosswalk as current, obtain and inspect the underlying release. Before presenting a screening result as sufficient, connect it to a product-specific justification. Where available evidence is incomplete, the next useful output is a precise evidence request.

Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs)

Is maximum potency an excipient limit?

It is a prior-use quantity, not a universal safety ceiling or permission for every new product. The interpretation depends on the matched administration context and proposed exposure. FDA's draft guidance explicitly distinguishes potency from permissible daily intake; IPEC describes safety assessment in relation to intended exposure. (www.fda.gov) (www.ipec-europe.org)

Can a missing IID MDE be calculated from maximum potency?

A proposed product's daily exposure can be calculated from its own excipient amount and regimen. An FDA comparator MDE cannot be recovered by guessing the regimen behind a maximum-potency row. FDA says the two maxima are not linked. (www.fda.gov)

Does a UNII match settle formulation suitability?

It supports substance matching. The GSRS API documents identifier searching, while USP explains that properties relevant to performance can remain formulation and process dependent. Keep grade, composition and intended use in the assessment. (gsrs.ncats.nih.gov) (doi.usp.org)

Where should a pediatric evidence gap be investigated?

Review age-relevant literature and the original sources behind resources such as STEP. EuPFI describes the database as supporting excipient risk assessment in children; its presence should initiate evidence review rather than replace it. (eupfi.co.uk) (step-db.ucl.ac.uk)

Conclusion

The FDA inactive ingredient database maximum potency is most useful when the amount retains its ingredient, route, dosage form and measurement meaning. A workable screen preserves those attributes, calculates the proposed exposure transparently and records uncertainty before a development team relies on the comparison.

The recommended workflow keeps **substance identity**, **material quality**, **proposed daily exposure** and **context-specific qualification** as connected evidence. Identifier systems help link names, while formulation science addresses properties and performance that a matching code cannot capture. (www.cas.org) (doi.usp.org)

For each candidate, the decision record should explain what matched, which quantities were compared, how the daily amount was calculated and which assumptions remain. Existing exposure information can reduce unnecessary additional work when it is applicable, but its relevance must be established for the intended product and population. (pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov)

The same discipline applies to refreshes. Retain source releases, preserve before-and-after interpretations and distinguish changed terminology from changed exposure evidence. A dependable derivative asset exposes its provenance and unresolved records, allowing teams to review the consequences of an update.

The resulting output is a documented screening conclusion with a defined next action. It can identify a useful precedent, show why a proposed comparison remains incomplete, or focus a toxicology assessment or regulatory discussion. That is the practical value of treating IID data as structured evidence throughout formulation development.

Source links

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

1. <https://www.fda.gov/drugs/drug-approvals-and-databases/inactive-ingredients-approved-drug-products-search-frequently-asked-questions>
2. <https://www.fda.gov/drugs/drug-approvals-and-databases/questions-answers-regarding-enhancements-inactive-ingredient-database-iid>
3. <https://www.fda.gov/drugs/drug-approvals-and-databases/inactive-ingredients-database-download>
4. <https://www.fda.gov/drugs/drug-approvals-and-databases/quarterly-inactive-ingredient-database-iid-change-log>
5. <https://goldbook.iupac.org/terms/view/M03722>
6. <https://www.nist.gov/pml/special-publication-811/nist-guide-si-chapter-8>
7. https://doi.usp.org/USPNF/USPNF_M2312_08_01.html
8. <https://www.who.int/publications/m/item/trs-1060---annex-3--who-good-manufacturing-practices-for-excipients-used-in-pharmaceutical-products>
9. <https://journals.plos.org/plosone/article?id=10.1371/journal.pone.0235076>
10. <https://gsrs.ncats.nih.gov/api-documentation>
11. <https://www.ipec-europe.org/articles/ipec-safety-guide.html>
12. <https://step-db.ucl.ac.uk/eupfi/appDirectLink.do?appFlag=login>
13. <https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC5771984>
14. <https://dailymed.nlm.nih.gov/dailymed/about-dailymed.cfm>
15. https://www.ema.europa.eu/en/documents/scientific-guideline/guideline-pharmaceutical-development-medicines-paediatric-use_en.pdf
16. <https://www.fda.gov/media/128687/download>
17. <https://www.fda.gov/regulatory-information/search-fda-guidance-documents/using-inactive-ingredient-database-guidance-industry>
18. https://www.ema.europa.eu/en/documents/scientific-guideline/guideline-excipients-dossier-application-marketing-authorisation-medicinal-product-revision-2_en.pdf
19. <https://www.fda.gov/drugs/drug-approvals-and-databases/inactive-ingredient-field-descriptions>
20. https://doi.usp.org/USPNF/USPNF_M99797_01_01.html

21. <https://faq.edqm.eu/pages/viewpage.action?pageId=1377020>
22. <https://www.nist.gov/pml/special-publication-811/nist-guide-si-chapter-7-rules-and-style-conventions-expressing-values>
23. <https://www.cas.org/about/faqs>
24. <https://www.fda.gov/drugs/drug-approvals-and-databases/most-recent-changes-iiid-database>
25. <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s11095-015-1773-4>
26. <https://eupfi.co.uk/workstreams>
27. <https://www.fda.gov/media/194078/download?attachment=>
28. https://database.ich.org/sites/default/files/M4_R4__Guideline.pdf
29. <https://ipecamerica.org/what-ipec-americas/excipient-faqs>
30. <https://www.tga.gov.au/resources/guidance/understanding-application-requirements-new-substance-listed-medicines>
31. <https://eupfi.co.uk/eupfi-workstreams/pharmaceutical-excipients>

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.