IntuitionLabs

INTUITIONLABS / RESEARCH & PRACTICAL GUIDANCE

ICH Q3D Elemental Impurities: Risk Assessment Guide

> 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 · 2026-05-11 · ich q3d · elemental impurities · risk assessment · permitted daily exposure · pharmaceutical compliance · icp-ms testing · heavy metals · quality risk management

Original article: https://intuitionlabs.ai/articles/ich-q3d-elemental-impurities-risk-assessment



In this article

1. ICH Q3D Elemental Impurities: Risk Assessment Guide & Software Tools for Pharma
2. Executive Summary
3. Introduction and Background
4. Risk Assessment Methodology
5. Analytical Methods for Elemental Impurity Testing
6. Case Studies and Examples of Q3D Implementation
7. Software Tools for ICH Q3D Compliance
8. Data Trends and Industry Perspectives
9. Implications and Future Directions
10. Tables
11. Conclusion

ICH Q3D Elemental Impurities: Risk Assessment Guide & Software Tools for Pharma

Executive Summary

Elemental impurities (heavy metals and trace elements) in drug products pose significant toxicological risks. The ICH Q3D guideline provides a harmonized framework for assessing and controlling elemental impurities, leveraging quality risk management principles. It defines 24 target elements, classifies them based on toxicity and likelihood of occurrence, and establishes permitted daily exposures (PDEs) for each route of administration (www.allfordrugs.com) (www.ktr.co.jp). Rather than mandating blanket testing, Q3D mandates a risk-based approach: manufacturers must identify potential impurity sources (raw materials, reagents, catalysts, equipment, container closures, etc.), compare estimated daily intakes against PDEs, and implement control strategies only for elements at risk of exceeding safe limits (www.allfordrugs.com) (www.americanpharmaceuticalreview.com). This approach allows flexibility (testing final product vs component control) but emphasizes that analytical data alone is insufficient without a structured risk assessment (www.americanpharmaceuticalreview.com).

Risk assessments typically follow one of two approaches: a **product-oriented approach** (measuring the final product) and a **component-based approach** (evaluating each raw material/excipient/APIs) (www.americanpharmaceuticalreview.com). Most industry stakeholders favor the component approach, which relies heavily on sourcing and supplier data. Following ICH Q9 quality risk management principles, the process includes defining a maximum daily dose (MDD), converting PDEs to concentration limits (e.g. using a default daily intake of 10 g or actual MDD), and determining control thresholds (commonly 30% of PDE)

(www.americanpharmaceuticalreview.com). If impurity levels are consistently below the control threshold, existing manufacturing controls are deemed adequate; if levels exceed thresholds, enhanced controls or testing are implemented (www.americanpharmaceuticalreview.com) (www.an.shimadzu.co.jp).

Modern elemental analysis (ICP-MS/OES, AA) enables sensitive detection well below PDE-based limits. Industry publications demonstrate that validated ICP-MS methods can reliably quantitate Class 1 (As, Cd, Hg, Pb) and Class 2A (Co, V, Ni) elements at or below 10% of PDE (www.ktr.co.jp). For example, one analytical case study validated an ICP-MS method to detect Class 1/2A metals at 0.1×PDE levels in a commercial tablet and found all method performance criteria met (www.ktr.co.jp). Similarly, a Shimadzu report showed an ICP-OES analysis of all 24 Q3D elements in model products with detection limits that met the allowable concentrations (www.an.shimadzu.co.jp). These studies illustrate that the rigorous analytical demands of Q3D are technically feasible.

Despite the technical feasibility, implementing ICH Q3D poses challenges. Pharmaceutical companies must integrate risk assessment into development and lifecycle management. For many generic manufacturers, the need for ICP-MS testing can be onerous: a Japanese industry report noted that many generics firms lack in-house instrumentation, making elemental impurity testing a significant burden (www.jga.gr.jp). This has driven interest in in-silico and software solutions. Lhasa's Vitic Q3D, a commercial tool, offers an expert-curated elemental impurities database and automated elemental impurities assessments to streamline Q3D assessments (www.lhasalimited.org).

This report provides a comprehensive exploration of ICH Q3D risk assessment and software tools. Section topics include: the historical and regulatory context of Q3D; the classification of elements and toxicological basis of PDEs; detailed risk assessment methodologies (including conversion of PDEs to concentration limits and decision strategies); analytical methods and validation considerations; examples of implementations and case studies; software solutions for automating Q3D assessments; and future outlook.

Introduction and Background

Elemental impurities (also called "metal impurities" or "trace element impurities") are metal atoms or compounds unintentionally present in drug substances or products. These impurities can arise from natural sources (minerals in raw materials, catalytic reagents), manufacturing equipment (stainless steel corrosion), process aids (talc, conductors), and packaging. Even at trace levels, some metals (e.g. arsenic, cadmium, lead, mercury, nickel) can pose significant health risks if ingested chronically (www.ema.europa.eu) (www.labcorp.com). Historically, pharmacopeial heavy metal tests were crude (e.g. colorimetric sulfide tests).Advances in analytical instrumentation (ICP-MS/OES) and increased regulatory focus on safety have driven the need for modern guidelines.

The ICH Q3D guideline was developed under the auspices of the International Council for Harmonisation (ICH) to harmonize global standards for elemental impurities in pharmaceuticals. Finalized by Step 4 in 2014 and adopted around 2015, Q3D superseded older regional standards and introduced a science-based, risk-management approach (www.ema.europa.eu) (www.americanpharmaceuticalreview.com). The guideline covers 24 elements (analogous and overlapping with the 15 elements in USP<232>) that were identified as safety concerns. It provides **Permitted Daily Exposures** (PDEs) in micrograms per day for oral, parenteral,

and inhalation routes for each element, based on toxicological evaluation. The guideline emphasizes that control of elemental impurities should follow the principles of ICH Q9 quality risk management (www.ema.europa.eu).

Implementation timelines varied by region. The EMA and FDA announced that Q3D would apply to applications post-2016 – specifically June 2016 for new drug products and December 2017 for already marketed products (www.americanpharmaceuticalreview.com). In the US, USP general chapters <232> (limits) and <233> (analytical procedures) were also updated in 2018 to align with Q3D (though USP232's scope is somewhat narrower) (www.labcorp.com). Japan issued Q3D guidance in 2015 (effective for NDAs from April 2017) and revised it in 2020 (www.jga.gr.jp). Country-specific implementation notices (e.g. Japan's 2020 notice requiring all products be assessed within 3 years of the 2021 pharmacopeial update (www.jga.gr.jp)) further globalized enforcement. Many major regulators (EMA, FDA, PMDA/Japan, Health Canada, TGA/Australia) have adopted the guideline, and most ICH regions now require Q3D-compliance in new marketing applications (www.americanpharmaceuticalreview.com) (www.tga.gov.au).

The **scope of elemental impurities** in Q3D excludes the "Big Four" heavy metals' traditional testing (in <231>) and instead focuses on a risk-based set of elements (24 in total). As stated by regulatory sources: "This document presents a process to assess and control elemental impurities in the drug product using the principles of risk management as described in ICH Q9" (www.ema.europa.eu). In other words, Q3D is not a simple list of heavy metals; it is a framework for systemic risk assessment, control strategy design, and justification within regulatory dossiers.

Table 1 summarizes the 24 Q3D elements, their classification, and PDE values by route (oral, parenteral, inhalation). The elements are divided into **four classes** based on toxicity and probability of occurrence:

- **Class 1 (High concern):** Arsenic (As), Cadmium (Cd), Mercury (Hg), Lead (Pb) – known toxic metals which may appear in products from environmental or material sources. Risk assessment is required for Class 1 in *all* products (www.labcorp.com) (www.ktr.co.jp).
- **Class 2A (Moderate-high concern):** Cobalt (Co), Nickel (Ni), Vanadium (V) – elements that are toxic and likely present (e.g. in stainless steel or catalysts). Required for risk assessment in all products (www.labcorp.com) (www.ktr.co.jp).
- **Class 2B (Moderate-low concern):** Silver (Ag), Gold (Au), Iridium (Ir), Osmium (Os), Palladium (Pd), Platinum (Pt), Rhodium (Rh), Ruthenium (Ru), Selenium (Se), Thallium (Tl) – elements with toxicity but low natural abundance; risk assessment only if intentionally added (e.g. as catalyst) (www.labcorp.com) (www.ktr.co.jp).
- **Class 3 (Low concern):** Barium (Ba), Chromium (Cr), Copper (Cu), Lithium (Li), Molybdenum (Mo), Antimony (Sb), Tin (Sn) – elements of relatively low toxicity; generally only of concern for parenteral/inhalation routes (oral route often excluded) (www.labcorp.com) (www.ktr.co.jp).

The rationale appears to be: focus first on the worst toxins and those likely introduced, then consider others mainly if conditions suggest risk. As one industry review notes, Class 1 and 2A elements "need to be considered in all risk assessments," whereas others may be documented and set aside if not present (www.americanpharmaceuticalreview.com).

Table 1. ICH Q3D elemental impurity classes and permitted daily exposures (PDE) by route (µg/day), as given in ICH Q3D(R2) Appendix 2, Table A.2.1 (EMA). The R2 revision (26 April 2022) corrected the PDEs for gold, silver and nickel. *PDE = Permitted Daily Exposure; MDD assumed where relevant (Option 1 default 10 g oral intake).*

Element (Symbol)	Class	PDE Oral (µg/day)	PDE Parenteral (µg/day)	PDE Inhalation (µg/day)
Arsenic (As)	1	15	15	2
Cadmium (Cd)	1	5	2	3
Mercury (Hg)	1	30	3	1
Lead (Pb)	1	5	5	5
Cobalt (Co)	2A	50	5	3
Nickel (Ni)	2A	200	20	6
Vanadium (V)	2A	100	10	1
Thallium (Tl)	2B	8	8	8
Silver (Ag)	2B	150	15	7
Gold (Au)	2B	300	300	3
Palladium (Pd)	2B	100	10	1
Iridium (Ir)	2B	100	10	1
Osmium (Os)	2B	100	10	1
Rhodium (Rh)	2B	100	10	1
Ruthenium (Ru)	2B	100	10	1
Selenium (Se)	2B	150	80	130
Platinum (Pt)	2B	100	10	1
Lithium (Li)	3	550	250	25
Antimony (Sb)	3	1200	90	20
Barium (Ba)	3	1400	700	300
Chromium (Cr)	3	11000	1100	3
Copper (Cu)	3	3000	300	30
Molybdenum (Mo)	3	3000	1500	10
Tin (Sn)	3	6000	600	60

Sources: ICH Q3D(R2) PDE values (EMA); classification from ICH guidelines (www.labcorp.com) (www.ktr.co.jp).

Notably, elements like Al, Fe, Zn, Mn are excluded because no PDEs were established; regulators may address them by other means (strengthened pharmacopeial standards or separate guidances). The Q3D approach recognizes that **excipients and APIs lack fixed daily doses**, making risk assessment challenging for components. Therefore, a default assumption (10 g/day, Option 1) is often used for setting component limits (www.americanpharmaceuticalreview.com). The guideline also provides calculation options (1, 2A, 2B, 3) for converting PDEs to concentration limits for product or components, which will be detailed below.

In summary, ICH Q3D establishes a risk-based framework: define PDEs for priority elements, classify them, and require each drugmaker to perform a systematic assessment of impurity sources, exposures, and controls. Implementation guides and training modules (produced by an IWG) further clarify how to conduct evaluations and document strategies (www.allfordrugs.com) (www.americanpharmaceuticalreview.com). The end goal is a science-driven substantiation that control measures ensure patient exposure stays **below safe limits**.

Risk Assessment Methodology

ICH Q3D lays out a **structured risk assessment process**, drawing on general quality risk management (Q9) principles. The key steps, adapted from implementation training and guidance, include:

1. **Identify all potential sources of elemental impurities.** These include:

- **Active pharmaceutical ingredient (API):** Residues from catalysts or reagents, raw materials used in synthesis.
- **Excipients and formulation components:** Binders, fillers, lubricants, coating agents that may themselves contain trace metals (from natural origin or manufacturing).
- **Process aids and equipment:** Stainless steel reactors and filters (Cr, Ni, Co), glassware, water, gases.
- **Containers/closure systems:** Leachable metals from packaging (e.g. tin solder in tubes, silicone oil, rubber stoppers).
- **Cross-contamination:** Shared equipment used for other products containing metal impurities.
- **Environmental contamination.** Each component in the drug product supply chain is evaluated for likelihood of elemental impurity. The American Pharm Rev article emphasizes considering **all sources – water, manufacturing equipment, process materials, packaging** in the risk assessment (www.americanpharmaceuticalreview.com).

2. **Gather data on impurity levels in each source.** Typical data sources include:

- Vendor or supplier certifications of elemental impurity content (e.g. certificate of analysis for raw materials or excipients).
- Published or proprietary databases of impurity levels. (Lhasa's Vitic system, discussed later, is one example of an industry-curated database of recent ICP-MS analyses.)
- Analytical testing (if necessary) of representative samples of materials or water to quantify certain elements.
- Historical data or literature values.

3. **Determine the maximum daily dose (MDD) of the drug product.** The PDE is expressed as µg of impurity per day. Converting PDE to a concentration requires an assumption about daily usage:

- **Option 1:** Common permitted concentration limits across all components for drug products with a daily intake of not more than 10 g, calculated at a fixed 10 g/day with Equation 1 (concentration = PDE / daily amount of drug product), as tabulated in Q3D(R2) Table A.2.2. (www.americanpharmaceuticalreview.com).
- **Option 2a:** Like Option 1, but using the actual maximum daily intake of the drug product in Equation 1 to derive common concentration limits across components. For low-dose products this yields higher concentration limits.
- **Option 2b:** Applicant-set permitted concentrations for individual components, based on the likely distribution of each element; the summed mass across components (Equation 2: PDE ≥ Σ Ck × Mk) must not exceed the PDE.
- **Option 3:** Finished product analysis: the element is measured in the final drug product, and Equation 1 with the maximum total daily dose gives the maximum permitted concentration. The choice of option affects resulting action limits.

4. **Calculate impurity concentrations in the final product.** For each element and route, the PDE (µg/day) is divided by the relevant mass (or volume) of product ingested per day to yield a concentration limit (µg/g or µg/mL). For example, with Option 1 (10 g), the concentration limit J = PDE (µg/day) / 10, as done in Table 2 of a published case (www.ktr.co.jp).

5. **Compare estimated exposures to PDEs or concentration limits.** Two reference levels are considered:

- **Control threshold:** By convention, 30% of the PDE is often used as an action threshold (www.americanpharmaceuticalreview.com). If an element's estimated daily intake is below 30% PDE, it is deemed "no concern" and may be omitted from specification/testing (barring changes in process). If between 30% PDE and 100% PDE (Option 1 limit), it is at low or moderate risk: controls should be employed (component limits or occasional testing) and possibly put in specifications.
- **Allowable limit:** The PDE itself (100% PDE) is the non-exceedance criterion. Exposure above PDE would require justification (for example, via toxicological rationale) or stronger controls. As one industry review explains: if observed levels "do not exceed the control threshold, the metal can be excluded from the specification. If higher than the control threshold but below the guideline limit, the element should be subject to control and specification. If higher than the guideline limit, additional justification or restrictions are needed" (www.americanpharmaceuticalreview.com).

6. **Establish control strategy.** Based on the risk ranking:

- **Low-risk elements (<30% PDE):** Document a justification and no routine testing needed (www.allfordrugs.com).
- **Moderate-risk (30–100% PDE):** Implement controls. This may include setting component/device specifications, selecting "low-metal" materials, or performing confirmatory testing of the finished product sufficient to show compliance, possibly at release or periodically.

- **High-risk (approaching/exceeding PDE):** Must take action: find more controlled raw materials, implement purification steps, or restrict the route of administration if inhalation (since inhalation PDEs can be very low). In some cases a toxicology expert may provide a justification for a higher (non-default) limit, but this is typically only for life-saving drugs etc.

This iterative risk assessment process is documented as part of the drug registration dossier (often in the CTD Quality section or risk management plan). The Q3D guideline explicitly states that “any control strategy should be based on the risk assessment” – regulatory expectations are that companies justify every decision with data or rationale, not relying on blanket acceptance of limits (www.allfordrugs.com).

Notably, the **preferred approach is component-based**. Testing the final product alone (product-oriented approach) is permissible, but authorities caution that “analytical data – without a risk assessment – is not sufficient. Any justification to omit routine controls must have more extensive information than data from limited testing” (www.americanpharmaceuticalreview.com). In practice, companies typically focus on controlling individual components (APIs and excipients) and manufacturing steps, then summing contributions. A clear benefit of this approach is that if all components are inherently low in metals (below Option1 limits), they can be mixed in any proportion. In contrast, final product testing alone cannot identify root causes if an impurity is found.

An important variation arises for **injectable or inhaled products**. Since PDEs for parenteral and especially inhalation routes are often much lower than oral (see Table 1), a critical impurity for an injection might be trivial for oral. Q3D explicitly distinguishes routes in its PDEs. Therefore, many manufacturers conduct separate risk assessments for each route. For example, if developing both an oral tablet and an inhalation spray of the same API, the PDE thresholds and resulting controls could differ markedly. The design of inhalation products often focuses more on avoiding Class 1/2 metals entirely.

Finally, risk assessments are **living documents**. By ICH Q3D and Q9 principles, the control strategy must be maintained through the product lifecycle. Any change (new supplier, formulation change, new process equipment, etc.) that could affect elemental impurities should trigger a reassessment. The training modules emphasize oversight of change: “changes require re-evaluation and possibly confirmatory testing” (www.allfordrugs.com). In other words, companies should integrate EI risk into change control and quality management systems.

Calculation of Concentration Limits

To illustrate the numerical translation of PDE to concentration, consider an example from a Japanese analytical case study (www.ktr.co.jp). For a tablet product with assumed MDD = 10 g, the PDEs for Class 1/2A elements (As, Cd, Hg, Pb, Co, V, Ni) were converted to “J” limits:

- As (PDE 15 µg/day): J = 15/10 = 1.5 µg/g
- Cd (5): J = 0.5 µg/g
- Hg (30): J = 3 µg/g
- Pb (5): J = 0.5 µg/g
- Co (50): J = 5 µg/g
- V (100): J = 10 µg/g

- Ni (200): J = 20 µg/g

Thus, for this 10 g/day product, arsenic had an action limit of 1.5 µg/g at which the full PDE would be reached. The laboratory set its own target LOQ at 0.1×J (10% of the J limit) (i.e. 0.15 µg/g for As, etc.), and demonstrated that the ICP-MS method met all performance criteria at these levels (www.ktr.co.jp). This example shows that applying the math of Option 1 (default 10 g) yields practical concentration levels.

In summary, the risk assessment combines toxicology (PDEs) with product-specific parameters (dose, components). The logic flows from hazard identification (elemental impurity) to exposure estimation (dose × contamination level) to control decision (compare to PDE). Each decision point must be documented and justified in accordance with the guideline.

Analytical Methods for Elemental Impurity Testing

While ICH Q3D allows risk-based exemptions from routine testing, analytical verification remains an essential component when impurities are suspected or to confirm compliance. High-sensitivity, multi-element analytical techniques are the norm:

- **Inductively Coupled Plasma Mass Spectrometry (ICP-MS):** The gold standard for elemental trace analysis. It can detect most metals down to ppb (µg/kg) or sub-ppb levels. Triple-quadrupole (ICP-QQQ) or high-resolution instruments can mitigate interferences in complex matrices. For example, Kaneka Tech Research used an Agilent 7900 ICP-MS to validate detection of Class 1/2A elements in pharmaceuticals (www.ktr.co.jp).
- **ICP Optical Emission Spectroscopy (ICP-OES):** Often used for screening all 24 elements quickly. Less sensitive than ICP-MS, but Shimadzu's multi-type ICP-OES demonstrated the ability to analyze all 24 elements in lab samples and achieve detection limits that met the vendor's stated allowable concentrations (www.an.shimadzu.co.jp). The Shimadzu study showed that in both an eye-drop and a tablet, the detection limits (after sample prep) sufficiently met the allowable concentrations (the PDE-based concentration at an assumed daily dose of 1 mL for the eye drop and 0.2 g for the tablet) (www.an.shimadzu.co.jp).
- **Atomic Absorption (AA):** Flame or graphite furnace AA can be used for certain elements (Pb, Cd, Hg, etc.) but generally has higher detection limits. It may have niche use, but modern drug testing tends toward ICP techniques.
- **Mercury Analyzer or cold-vapor AA:** For mercury specifically, a dedicated method (e.g. EPA 7471A style) may be used. ICH Q3D notes that for Hg, a range of techniques is acceptable as long as they are validated.
- **Sample preparation:** Accurate analysis demands robust sample prep (acid digestion, microwave-assisted decomposition) to bring samples into solution (or suspensions) without contamination. The Kaneka example used microwave digestion followed by ICP-MS for a commercial oral dosage form (www.ktr.co.jp). Good contamination control (e.g. ultrapure reagents, metal-free labware) is critical given the low ppb target levels.

Validation of these methods under Q3D often follows USP<233>. The Japanese case study, validated in line with USP<233>, set its own target LOQ at 0.1×J (10% of the concentration limit) and reported good results for accuracy, precision, and linearity (www.ktr.co.jp). Their results showed good outcomes across all nine validation items, including at levels as low as 0.1×J. Such data confirm that properly executed ICP-MS can reliably detect impurities at or below the regulatory thresholds.

Another important concept is the **control threshold** (typically 30% of PDE). In practice, for routine monitoring or batch-release testing, labs may need only verify that levels are below 30% PDE, rather than at full PDE. Shimadzu's presentation exemplifies this: the detection limits in their ICP-OES assays comfortably met the "allowable concentration" listed for all elements in both sample types (www.an.shimadzu.co.jp). On that basis, a lab using such a method could check that each element's signal is below the method's detection limit, which Shimadzu reports meets the allowable concentration (the PDE-based concentration at an assumed daily dose); whether it also falls below 30% PDE would need to be calculated separately.

In summary, modern elemental analysis techniques are well-equipped to support Q3D. Companies often rely on in-house or contract analytical labs with ICP-MS/OES instruments. The resulting data are used to confirm risk assessments and (if necessary) to qualify suppliers or processes. Notably, Q3D explicitly states that routine analysis of Class 1 metals is **not required** absent specific risk (www.allfordrugs.com), but if an identified risk exists (or if a regulatory authority questions a component), targeted testing of the finished product or intermediate will be performed using these validated methods.

Case Studies and Examples of Q3D Implementation

While regulators do not prescribe exactly how to conduct a Q3D assessment, numerous industry publications illustrate practical implementations:

- **Analytical Validation Case:** The Kaneka Tech Research example (www.ktr.co.jp) shows a lab performing method validation specifically for Q3D compliance. By spiking an oral dosage form with known amounts of As, Cd, Hg, Pb, Co, V, Ni at 0.1–1.5×J, they met the laboratory's acceptance criteria (spike recovery of 70–120% and RSD of 20% or less) across these elements (www.ktr.co.jp). This confirms that once risk-identified, analytical demands are manageable with good laboratory practice. It also highlights the point that each drug (with unique formulation) may require its own method optimization.
- **Instrumental Screening:** Shimadzu's example with ICP-OES screened an ophthalmic solution and tablet for all 24 elements (www.an.shimadzu.co.jp). Shimadzu reports that the detection limits converted to sample concentration (µg/mL or µg/g) comfortably met the allowable concentrations listed for each element in its Tables 1–2. For instance, for the eye drop Shimadzu's table lists a parenteral PDE of 15 µg for As and an allowable concentration of 15 µg/mL (based on 1 mL used per day), against a detection limit of 0.04 µg/mL, far below the allowable value (www.an.shimadzu.co.jp). Similar success was seen for other elements. This case underscores that multi-element scanning can convincingly demonstrate a product's compliance to Q3D limits, especially for products where a full risk assessment flagged elements requiring final verification.

- **International Implementation Example:** Japan's regulatory timeline illustrates how guidance evolves post-ICH. After issuing Q3D in 2015, Japanese authorities revised it in 2020 to include explicit expectations for all products. A December 2020 notification mandated that **within three years** after the June 2021 pharmacopeial notification, **all** drug products (new and existing) must have ICH-Q3D-compliant assessments (www.jga.gr.jp). This means that by mid-2024/2025, every Japanese pharmaceutical product, regardless of approval date, must be evaluated for elemental impurities. Such measures force systematic implementation. However, the JGA article notes a practical challenge: generic drug companies often lack ICP-MS and must outsource testing, imposing significant costs for firms with broad product portfolios (www.jga.gr.jp). This is a real-world compliance burden.
- **Industry Perspective:** In industry-led publications, experts reiterate Q3D's principles. For example, an American Pharmaceutical Review article by a Merck consultant details the recommended risk assessment workflow and emphasizes that "analytical data – without a risk assessment – is not sufficient" (www.americanpharmaceuticalreview.com). It also provides a "control-threshold" decision tree (Figure 5 of that article) for elements not intentionally added: if measured values never exceed 30% PDE, specification is not needed; if they exceed 30% PDE, then they require in-specification controls (www.americanpharmaceuticalreview.com). This mirrors what companies experience in practice – regulatory reviewers expect clear demonstration that each element is either harmless or controlled.
- **Supply Chain Coordination:** Virtually all case studies stress the importance of supplier collaboration. Because raw materials and equipment are major sources of elemental impurities, companies often require each ingredient manufacturer to supply a Q3D risk assessment or certificate. Some publish "acceptable impurities" lists for excipients based on Option 1 limits (www.americanpharmaceuticalreview.com). We do not have space for a full example, but it bears noting that "control of elemental impurities is often addressed contractually with vendors" and some companies conduct their own screening of new suppliers as part of qualification.

In all cases, the evidence supports that **risk-based review plus targeted testing** is effective. If an impurity is detected above PDE in an approved product, the company would have to investigate and possibly re-work. However, Q3D's articulated approach is to prevent such events by upstream control, and to document all internal decisions built on scientific justification. Generic status or route of administration do not exempt a product; indeed, regulators expect uniform compliance for all routes (oral, parenteral, inhalation with separate PDEs).

Software Tools for ICH Q3D Compliance

The complex, data-intensive nature of Q3D risk assessments has spurred development of specialized software to assist pharmaceutical companies. Such tools aim to reduce manual effort (often dozens of spreadsheets) and ensure consistency. Key examples include:

Software Tool	Vendor/Developer	Description and Features
Vitic Q3D	Lhasa Limited (UK)	In silico risk assessment platform using a curated, high-quality elemental impurities database (www.lhasalimited.org). It automates ICH Q3D calculations (Options 1, 2A, 2B) for APIs/excipients, identifies potential impurity sources, and generates comprehensive Q3D reports for submission (www.lhasalimited.org). Designed with input from pharma experts, Lhasa states that Vitic Q3D "reduces the need for in-house analytical testing, and streamlines the Q3D assessment workflow by providing a centralised data management system" (www.lhasalimited.org).
Pharma-Hub Platform	Altox (Brazil)	Integrated web-based suite ("Pharma-Hub") for drug impurities compliance. Contains multiple tools for managing regulatory obligations across impurity guidelines (ICH Q3A/B/C/D/M7, nitrosamines, etc.) (hub.altox.com.br). Q3D-specific functionality is not described on the cited pages (hub.altox.com.br) (sys.altox.com.br). It also features the **Tox Researcher** search function, which "combines keywords and molecular descriptors" to locate relevant impurity data and regulatory references across documents (sys.altox.com.br).
Tox Researcher	Altox (Brazil)	A search and mapping tool focused on impurities. It helps users identify which impurities (elemental or otherwise) are reportable or require qualification under regulations. Users input chemical descriptors or names, and the tool returns related reference links (e.g. regulatory guidance pages) and impurity criteria. Primarily used to track obligations (e.g. under Brazil's ANVISA RDC53 and other global rules) (sys.altox.com.br). While not exclusively for Q3D, it supports the initial hazard identification step by gathering relevant impurity information.
[Other eQMS/QRM tools]	Generic QMS/QRM providers	General-purpose quality management systems are not Q3D-specific and contain no elemental impurity database; any use of them for Q3D record-keeping is a company-level choice.

The Vitic Q3D solution, launched in mid-2025, is a Lhasa product for Q3D assessments. Lhasa emphasizes that it uses an "expert-curated elemental impurities database" and performs "automated elemental impurities assessments" to unify ICH Q3D reporting (www.lhasalimited.org). According to Lhasa, the product generates automated calculations for ICH Q3D Options 1, 2A and 2B simultaneously, helps identify elemental impurity sources in APIs and excipients, and produces reports ready for Q3D submission; Lhasa states it can save up to 50% of the time typically required to run an assessment. According to Lhasa, Vitic Q3D "aligns with our mission to enable informed decisions on chemical safety" and will "transform ICH Q3D assessments" by smoothing workflows and reducing the need for testing (www.lhasalimited.org). Lhasa describes the tool as streamlining the Q3D assessment workflow by providing a centralised data management system.

Altox's **Pharma-Hub** is an example of a broader trend: using centralized data platforms and search tools for compliance. For example, Altox describes Pharma-Hub as "all solutions for drug impurities in one place," built by experts in regulatory, synthesis, stability, analytical, toxicology and chemoinformatics (hub.altox.com.br). Public detail about Altox's exact features for Q3D is limited. (hub.altox.com.br) (sys.altox.com.br).

Smaller tools or services also exist. Some laboratories offer contract risk assessment services (advisories rather than standalone software). Industry consortia (like USP or EFfCI) have published open data on elemental traces in excipients, which some firms integrate into their risk spreadsheets. In addition, certain

laboratory information management systems (LIMS) can be configured to track batch data for metal analysis and trigger alerts if levels approach 30% PDE. Among the tools discussed here, only Vitic Q3D is described by its vendor as a dedicated ICH Q3D assessment tool.

Key advantages of these tools include: saving time (Lhasa claims up to 50% faster assessments (www.lhasalimited.org)), standardizing methodology across product lines, and retaining institutional knowledge. Automated report generation ensures consistent documentation of rationale (often required by regulators). Moreover, such software can be updated when guidelines change (e.g. base PDE changes). As regulators increasingly expect sophisticated data handling, software solutions help demonstrate a high level of compliance maturity.

It is important to note that **software does not replace expert judgment**. Tools assist calculation and data management, but qualified professionals must still interpret results and make final control decisions. The outputs of software are only as good as the input data (garbage in, garbage out). Nevertheless, these applications are now part of many companies' quality systems. The overall industry trend is toward digitalization of quality processes, and elemental impurity assessment is one beneficiary of this trend.

Data Trends and Industry Perspectives

While comprehensive open data on Q3D implementation is scarce (largely because risk assessments are proprietary and part of confidential regulatory filings), some general observations can be made:

- **Surveyed applications:** Combining guidelines and pharmacopeias, more than 20 elements are regulated, affecting a vast majority of new drug applications. The FDA even published a "Q&A" document (ICH Q&A Annex 1) summarizing common sponsor questions, implying frequent inquiries.
- **Workload:** Industry reports suggest that preparing a Q3D risk assessment for a drug product can involve dozens of raw and excipient materials and multiple manufacturing steps. Without software aid, this often means a large matrix of data in spreadsheets. The effort required scales with the number of materials, manufacturing steps and routes of administration.
- **Supply chain focus:** Companies have discovered significant insights via Q3D. For instance, an API manufacturer might use ICP-MS screening to find that a catalyst trace (nickel or palladium) is above expected levels, leading to tighter supplier controls.
- **Integration with other quality initiatives:** Elemental impurity risk assessment is now often tied to broader Quality by Design (QbD) efforts. For new products, Q3D evaluation is integrated into early development, with decisions (e.g. choice of synthesis route or excipient) influenced by impurity risk. This prevents late surprises. Training modules developed by ICH even mention the idea of "platform risk assessments" – carrying knowledge across similar projects (e.g. a platform oligonucleotide process might already include a known Q3D assessment) (www.allfordrugs.com).

Companies also monitor **exposure to related regulations**. For example, because elements like aluminum and iron are not limited by Q3D, some monitor them via other channels (especially for parenterals, where compendial or pharmacopoeial limits on those often exist). Industry observers note that ICH Q3D has inspired analogous guidance in related areas (e.g. elemental impurities in cosmetics or biocides) to ensure consistency.

Overall, expert consensus is that ICH Q3D has been a positive step for patient safety, encouraging rigorous impurity control. At the same time, it has increased regulatory compliance workload. Balancing safety with practical testing demands is a key theme; hence the emphasis on risk management to focus resources on truly relevant impurities. Software tools and industry best practices are evolving to support this balance.

Implications and Future Directions

Looking forward, several trends and potential developments emerge:

- **Regulatory expansion:** ICH Q3D mainly covers the listed 24 elements. There is discussion in the community about other potentially toxic metals (e.g. cobalt is included, but what about beryllium or chromium VI in traces, etc.?). So far, the guideline footnotes acknowledge that certain metals (aluminum, iron, manganese, zinc) are excluded, but they are controlled by other monographs. Any future revisions of Q3D (R3?) might consider adding or clarifying such cases if new safety data arises. Additionally, as new therapies (gene therapy, nanoparticles) emerge, application of metal impurity principles to novel product types will be considered.
- **Harmonization of methods:** ICH Q3D refers to USP<232>/<233> for methodology, and regulators expect validated methods. Collaboration among pharmacopeias could standardize expectations worldwide. The IWG training docs already mention USP<233> as the validation model, implicitly harmonizing global practice. The growth of non-destructive screening techniques or on-line sensors is unlikely to impact control strategies, since final product measurement (Option 3) is already an accepted strategy. However, in-process monitoring (e.g. of final washout water) could complement risk management if those analytical methods evolve.
- **Data sharing initiatives:** There is an emerging trend of industry consortia sharing impurity data (perhaps anonymized). The Lhasa Elemental Impurities data sharing project underpins Vitic Q3D. Similarly, universities or pharmacopeias might expand open-access tables of trace metal content in excipient lots. Such data can reduce duplicate testing: if one company’s data shows an excipient batch is clean, others using the same grade could use that as justification (with appropriate quality agreements).
- **Digitalization and AI:** Machine learning tools could eventually predict impurity levels from chemical/process parameters or from big datasets. For now, software automates calculations rather than making judgment calls, but AI might assist in flagging unusual impurities or optimizing supplier choices. Integration of AI-driven alert systems into LIMS/QMS is plausible.
- **Lifecycle and post-market:** Pharmacovigilance of impurities is not explicitly mandated (impurities are managed through GMP), but regulators may increasingly audit older drugs’ Q3D compliance. Companies should consider rolling Q3D updates as part of periodic quality system review, similar to stability data updates.
- **Environmental and patient impact:** Over the long term, focus on elemental impurities has ancillary effects: pushing formulations toward cleaner sources (minimizing toxic metals) can also reduce environmental burden of heavy metals. The patient safety implication is that chronic low-level exposure

to heavy metals (even below PDE) is gradually decreasing. If the trend continues, future iterations of PDEs could shift slightly as new toxicology data emerge (just as R1 made a minor correction for Cd inhalation).

- **Training and culture:** The ICH Q3D training modules are publicly available, but widespread industry training still lags. Expect more third-party training (webinars, workshops), as well as eventual inclusion of elemental impurity risk in academic pharmacy and engineering curricula. Companies increasingly appoint or designate “impurity subject experts” to oversee Q3D/Q3A/M7/M8 portfolios (these ICH Q-numbers are all impurity-related).

In conclusion, ICH Q3D risk assessment is now an integral part of pharmaceutical quality systems. The future will likely bring incremental refinements to the guideline and innovative tools for implementation. The core principles – identify hazards, quantify exposure, compare to toxicity thresholds, and control appropriately – will remain central. The combination of regulatory guidance, scientific methodology, and software support ensures that elemental impurity risks are managed proactively, safeguarding drug quality and patient health.

Tables

Table 2. Selected software tools for ICH Q3D risk assessment and impurity compliance (www.lhasalimited.org) (sys.altox.com.br). Each tool supports the Q3D workflow in different ways.

Software Tool	Vendor/Developer	Description and Key Features
Vitic Q3D	Lhasa Limited (UK)	In silico Q3D risk assessment platform with a curated elemental impurities database (www.lhasalimited.org). Automates calculations for Options 1/2A/2B, identifies impurity sources in APIs/excipients, and generates Q3D assessment reports (per the vendor). Helps reduce in-house testing by leveraging shared data (up to “50% time savings”) (www.lhasalimited.org).
Pharma-Hub	Altox (Brazil)	Integrated web platform for drug impurities compliance (hub.altox.com.br). Contains multiple modules for regulatory requirements (ICH Q guidelines, nitrosamines, etc.). Q3D-specific functionality is not described on the cited pages. Uses tools like **Tox Researcher** to map molecules to applicable impurity obligations (hub.altox.com.br) (sys.altox.com.br).
Tox Researcher	Altox Systems (Brazil)	Search tool for impurity risk information (sys.altox.com.br). Combines keywords and molecular descriptors to find related regulatory links and impurity data. Assists in initial hazard identification and global regulatory mapping (e.g., ANVISA, ICH).
General QMS software	Various	General-purpose quality/risk management software. Not Q3D-specific and not a source of elemental impurity data.

Sources: Lhasa and Altox product information (www.lhasalimited.org) (sys.altox.com.br). Additional modules (e.g. general QMS software) may be used internally to track Q3D assessments though not dedicated to elemental impurities per se.

Conclusion

ICH Q3D has fundamentally changed how the pharmaceutical industry approaches elemental impurities. Its risk-based paradigm aligns impurity control with patient exposure, rather than onerous blanket testing. By providing clear PDEs and a structured assessment framework, Q3D enables science-driven control strategies that focus resources where needed. Implementing Q3D requires cross-functional collaboration among chemists, toxicologists, and quality professionals. Emerging software tools and data-sharing initiatives are streamlining this process, though experienced judgment remains critical.

This report has reviewed the extensive guidance on Q3D, examined implementation examples, and highlighted modern tools aiding compliance. Key points include:

- The ICH Q3D risk-management process for assessing and controlling elemental impurities in the drug product, with route-specific PDEs for 24 elements (Table 1) (www.ema.europa.eu).
- The workflow for risk assessment incorporating ICH Q9 principles (identify sources, estimate exposure, compare to PDE, set controls) (www.ema.europa.eu) (www.americanpharmaceuticalreview.com).
- Analytical strategies showing how validated ICP methods meet stringent LOQs for Q3D (www.ktr.co.jp) (www.an.shimadzu.co.jp).
- The importance of documentation: regulators expect well-supported risk justifications rather than blind testing (www.americanpharmaceuticalreview.com) (www.allfordrugs.com).
- The role of software such as Lhasa's Vitic Q3D in automating the assessment process (www.lhasalimited.org).
- Global regulatory adoption: major agencies have made Q3D compliance mandatory for new and (in some regions) existing products (www.americanpharmaceuticalreview.com) (www.jga.gr.jp).
- Future perspectives: continuous improvement of impurity control through data analytics, expanded regulatory scope if needed, and tight integration with quality systems.

By fully integrating Q3D risk assessment into quality-by-design and life-cycle management, pharmaceutical manufacturers can ensure that elemental impurities remain at safe levels. The combination of ICH guidance, scientific data, and supportive technology provides a robust path forward. For any specific implementation, organizations should refer directly to ICH Q3D(R2) and related pharmacopeial chapters, as well as seek expert consultation tailored to their products.

Source links

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

1. https://www.allfordrugs.com/2016/05/17/ich-q3d-implementation-working-group-iwg-training-modules
2. https://www.ktr.co.jp/analysis/case/case_152.html
3. https://www.americanpharmaceuticalreview.com/Specialty/Microbiology/Featured-Articles/239888-Elemental-Impurities-Implications-for-Manufacturers-of-Drug-Products-APIs-and-Excipients?cid=25260&ctid=1
4. https://www.an.shimadzu.co.jp/industries/small-molecule-pharmaceutical/development/ichq3d/index.html
5. https://www.jga.gr.jp/jgapedia/column/202108.html
6. https://www.lhasalimited.org/news/lhasa-launches-vitic-q3d-for-ich-q3d-assessments

7. https://www.ema.europa.eu/en/ich-q3d-elemental-impurities-scientific-guideline
8. https://www.labcorp.com/education-events/articles/elemental-impurities-usp-and-ich-q3d-guidelines
9. https://www.tga.gov.au/resources/resource/international-scientific-guidelines/ich-guideline-q3d-r2-elemental-impurities
10. https://www.lhasalimited.org/vitic-q3d-assessment-software
11. https://hub.altox.com.br
12. https://sys.altox.com.br/br

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.