



INTUITIONLABS / RESEARCH & PRACTICAL GUIDANCE

Evaluating Pharma AI Consulting Firms: 2026 Framework

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 · 2026-03-03 · pharma ai consulting · vendor evaluation · life sciences ai · ai governance · fda compliance · drug discovery ai · data governance

Original article: <https://intuitionlabs.ai/articles/pharma-ai-consulting-evaluation-framework>



In this article

1. Executive Summary
 2. Introduction
 3. The Role and Evolution of AI in Pharma
 4. Key Evaluation Criteria for Pharma AI Consulting Firms
 5. Data-Driven Insights and Industry Trends
 6. Case Studies and Real-World Examples
 7. Comparing Consulting Firm Types
 8. Data Analysis and Evidence-Based Arguments
 9. Discussion: Implications and Future Directions
 10. Conclusion
-

Executive Summary

In the rapidly evolving landscape of life sciences, artificial intelligence (AI) has emerged as a transformative force in pharmaceutical research, development, manufacturing, and commercialization. By 2026, AI adoption in pharma has become mainstream – with technology like *DeepMind's* AlphaFold2 revolutionizing target discovery and generative models offering the promise of faster drug design (www.mckinsey.com). However, the industry faces unique challenges: regulatory compliance, data quality, fragmented workflows, and stringent **validation requirements** impede straightforward implementation (www.mckinsey.com) (www.mckinsey.com). Pharmaceutical companies often lack sufficient in-house AI expertise and must navigate complex, high-stakes decisions when **partnering with external AI consultants**. Therefore, selecting the right AI consulting firm is critical to success.

This report provides a comprehensive 2026 evaluation framework for choosing a pharma AI consulting partner. It begins by examining the historical evolution and current state of AI in pharma, including the intended regulatory use of AI-generated evidence. FDA's January 2025 draft addresses information or data intended to support regulatory decisions about drug safety, effectiveness, or quality (**FDA draft guidance**). Next, it outlines the essential capabilities and characteristics of consulting firms—covering **domain and technical expertise, data infrastructure and integration competence, regulatory and compliance acumen, AI implementation methodology**, and **organizational fit**. Each criterion is analyzed in depth, supported by industry guidelines, case studies, and expert commentary.

To ground the analysis, the report incorporates case studies and real-world examples. For instance, Accenture's partnership with Bristol-Myers Squibb demonstrates how an AI consultant integrated generative AI solutions into **clinical trials**, deploying over 30 AI applications across R&D and operations (www.accenture.com). Cognizant announced a collaboration with NVIDIA to serve life sciences clients (**Cognizant announcement**). The report also considers industry warnings about bias and trust issues in generative AI for pharma (www.pharmaceutical-technology.com) (www.pharmaceutical-technology.com).

The report also discusses evaluation tools such as weighted scorecards, providing sample criteria and priorities in tabular form. We highlight the importance of scorable, evidence-based decision-making to avoid subjective biases. A comparison table differentiates consulting firm types (e.g. big global firms vs. specialized

AI boutiques) along dimensions such as scale, cost, and domain focus. Finally, implications and future directions are considered, including how emerging technologies, talent shortages, and regulatory developments will shape AI partnerships in pharma.

Key Takeaways: By 2026, selecting a pharma AI consulting firm requires rigorous evaluation across multiple dimensions. Top-tier partners must not only bring cutting-edge AI skills but also deep pharma-domain knowledge, validated processes (from PoC to production), **data governance practices**, and a proven track record with pharma clients. This framework aims to guide pharmaceutical leaders in making defensible, strategic choices that align AI initiatives with organizational goals and regulatory realities.

Introduction

Pharmaceutical companies today operate in a data-rich, highly regulated environment where the pressure to develop therapies faster and more cost-effectively has never been greater. Over the past decade, **artificial intelligence has moved from the margins to the mainstream** of life sciences, promising advancements at every stage of the drug lifecycle (www.iqvia.com) (www.mckinsey.com). For example, deep-learning models such as AlphaFold2 and ESMFold can predict protein structures with unprecedented accuracy, transforming preclinical research (www.mckinsey.com). Generative AI is being applied to design novel molecules and optimize clinical trial design (www.mckinsey.com) (www.accenture.com). AI-driven analytics are used in **commercial operations** to identify target patient populations and personalize marketing/education programs (www.pharmaceuticalcommerce.com). In effect, **the entire value chain – from discovery and development to manufacturing and marketing – is being reshaped by AI** (www.iqvia.com) (www.mckinsey.com).

Industry data underscore this shift. A McKinsey Global Institute analysis estimates generative AI could generate **\$60–110 billion annually** in value for the pharmaceutical and medical-products industries by accelerating drug discovery, shortening development timelines, and improving marketing ROI (www.mckinsey.com). For vendor evaluation, assess project-specific value and intended use. FDA's January 2025 draft addresses AI-generated information or data intended to support regulatory decisions about drug safety, effectiveness, or quality ([FDA draft guidance](#)).

Despite this promise, **pharma lags other industries in fully scaling AI initiatives**. McKinsey notes that while most companies run AI pilots, *“investments have rarely led to profound organizational changes,”* and many transformations have stalled (www.mckinsey.com). Data remain siloed and heterogeneous across research, clinical, and commercial domains. Complex regulatory requirements (FDA, EMA, ICH guidelines; 21 CFR Part 11, GxP) demand careful validation and documentation of AI systems. And many firms lack the in-house talent to engineer robust AI solutions. As European Pharmaceutical Review observes, skills gaps and entrenched corporate processes often temper the gains from AI adoption (www.europeanpharmaceuticalreview.com).

In this context, **pharma organizations increasingly turn to outside expertise**. Specialized AI consulting firms or professional services partners can provide the data science skills, industry know-how, and project management needed to translate AI pilot projects into production systems. By early 2026, new trends have emerged in pharma AI partnerships. For example, Accenture launched its “AI Workbench” with Bristol-Myers Squibb to integrate generative AI insights into trial operations (www.accenture.com). Cognizant announced a collaboration with NVIDIA around the BioNeMo generative platform for drug discovery (www.scotts-international.com). Drugmakers form alliances with tech giants: Novartis's 2019 multi-year AI venture with

Microsoft involved an AI innovation lab to co-develop platforms for discovery and gene therapy (news.microsoft.com). Meanwhile, regulators move to provide clarity: the FDA issued a draft guidance (Jan 2025) on using AI in regulatory submissions, emphasizing credibility and risk management (www.fda.gov).

Recognizing the strategic importance of AI, **pharma executives demand a rigorous framework for selecting AI consulting partners**. The wrong partner can lead to stalled pilots, wasted budgets, data-security incidents, or regulatory pitfalls. Conversely, the right firm can accelerate value creation and build sustainable in-house capabilities. This report presents a detailed, evidence-based **2026 evaluation framework** for choosing a pharmaceutical AI consulting firm. We draw upon industry surveys, case studies, expert analyses, and existing selection guidelines from adjacent domains to outline the criteria, methods, and considerations that should guide decision-makers. The goal is a defensible, transparent vendor selection process that aligns AI initiatives with corporate goals like improving R&D productivity, ensuring compliance, and delivering patient impact.

The Role and Evolution of AI in Pharma

Historical Context and Accelerating Adoption

Pharmaceutical companies have long recognized the potential of data-driven decision-making, but interest in AI has surged in recent years. Early forays included rule-based expert systems and basic predictive analytics, but the past decade saw a *data explosion* (e.g. high-throughput screening, genomics, electronic health records) and breakthroughs in machine learning algorithms. Academic and industry R&D labs began applying AI to problems like target identification and clinical trial simulation. Notable milestones include DeepMind's **AlphaFold2** (2020), which can predict protein 3D structures from sequences – a task once thought intractable (www.mckinsey.com). ESMFold predicts protein structures directly from protein sequences ([Meta FAIR repository](#)). MoLeR instead generates molecular graphs and supports scaffold-constrained generation ([model authors](#)).

With these advances, pharma leaders ramped up AI investments. By the mid-2020s, nearly every big drugmaker had announced AI initiatives. Multi-party consortia formed to share data and models for drug discovery. For example, Novartis's 2019 alliance with Microsoft created an *AI Innovation Lab* on campus to develop AI tools for discovery and personalized medicine (news.microsoft.com). Bristol-Myers Squibb partnered with Accenture to integrate generative AI into its pipeline (www.accenture.com). Also, new players emerged: startups like BenevolentAI and Recursion gained attention for AI-driven drug platforms, prompting incumbents to partner with or acquire such capabilities.

In parallel, commercial areas (marketing, demand forecasting) also began using predictive models. AI started augmenting how companies identify prescribing physicians and target patient adherence programs. For instance, AI applied to real-world data helps pharma predict when patients will see their doctors and which ones handle rare diseases, enabling proactive outreach (www.pharmaceuticalcommerce.com). Ultimately, AI became a cross-functional imperative – diffusing from IT labs into business lines.

Current State: Opportunity vs. Challenges

As of 2026, **AI is entrenched in many pharma operations** but not without caveats. McKinsey's 2023 analysis describes executives' frustration with limited transformational impact from digital and analytics initiatives ([McKinsey](#)). Advanced use cases, such as autonomous AI agents and large-scale generative modeling, have moved from concept to pilot in some firms (e.g. large chemical libraries mined with deep learning). IQVIA notes that "AI has moved from the margins to the mainstream" across the entire pharma lifecycle ([www.iqvia.com](#)). In practice, drug discovery cycles are being accelerated (e.g., over 30 generative-AI solutions were deployed at BMS with Accenture's help ([www.accenture.com](#))), regulatory document review is increasingly semi-automated, and manufacturing quality control uses computer vision for anomaly detection.

Yet the industry also faces significant hurdles. McKinsey highlights that while "virtually every pharma company" has AI initiatives, *"investments have rarely led to profound organizational changes,"* with most efforts stuck in pilot stages ([www.mckinsey.com](#)). Reasons include:

- **Data Silos and Quality:** Pharma data are fragmented among R&D, clinical, manufacturing, and commercial systems. Heterogeneous formats and legacy systems can make integration daunting. For example, combining real-world patient data with internal trial data often requires extensive preprocessing. The complexity of pharma data (high dimensionality, missing values, proprietary formats like CDISC/SDTM in clinical data) means a consulting partner must have sophisticated ETL and data-validation capabilities ([addepto.com](#)) ([www.mastercontrol.com](#)).
- **Regulatory Complexity:** Assess requirements against each system's intended use. FDA's January 2025 draft guidance concerns AI-generated information or data used to support regulatory decisions about drug safety, effectiveness, or quality ([FDA](#)). It is nonbinding draft guidance, not for implementation. It excludes drug-discovery AI and operational-efficiency uses that do not affect patient safety, drug quality, or the reliability of nonclinical or clinical study results ([FDA draft](#), [Scope](#)). Evaluate GxP computerized-system validation and any medical-device requirements separately, with quality and regulatory specialists. Require a documented assessment of applicable privacy law and an evidence plan appropriate to the intended use.
- **Workforce and Culture:** The talent pool for advanced AI skills is limited, and many pharma organizations struggle to recruit or retrain staff. A 2025 industry report noted that while companies accelerate AI spend in hiring, *"skills mismatches and entrenched processes are limiting impact,"* requiring cultural change to leverage new tools ([www.europeanpharmaceuticalreview.com](#)). Therefore, many firms rely on specialized consultants to supplement their teams.
- **Business Alignment:** Not all proven machine learning approaches yield business value. Pharma executives worry that flashy AI demos may not translate to patient outcomes or ROI. There have been instances where impressive pilot models failed to scale or improve decision-making substantially. This underscores the need for partnerships that keep business goals front and center.

In summary, the **gap between AI's potential and practical results** drives pharmaceutical companies to seek strong consulting partners. External experts can help companies traverse this gap by providing technical know-how, industry best practices, and project governance. However, choosing a partner itself is a high-stakes

decision. A poor choice can lead to wasted investment or regulatory missteps, while the right partner can unlock transformative impact.

Why a Dedicated Evaluation Framework

Given these challenges, firms should adopt a structured, defensible process for selecting an AI consulting firm. Simple “beauty contest” approaches (e.g. picking the lowest price or the flashiest proposal) are particularly risky in regulated industries. In healthcare settings, experts advise moving from vendor factor comparisons to process-driven assessment: ensure *shared criteria and explicit weights* to make selection decisions defensible (www.buzzi.ai). For example, Buzzi.ai (targeting healthcare AI) recommends a **weighted scorecard** where criteria such as clinical workflow fit and regulatory maturity are quantified (with suggested weights like 35%, 25%, etc.) (www.buzzi.ai). While Buzzi's example targets hospitals, the principle applies to pharma: align diverse stakeholders (R&D, clinical ops, quality, IT, finance) by agreeing on what matters and scoring each vendor.

This report aims to serve as such a framework. It compiles multiple perspectives – vendor selection guides, consulting best practices, case studies, and authoritative reports – to illuminate each dimension of evaluation. Throughout, we cite empirical data (e.g. market forecasts, survey results) and expert insights to ground the discussion. The emphasis is on **depth and evidence**: readers will find specific measures, references, and examples, not just high-level advice. For instance, we show how a consulting firm's domain expertise can be assessed by examining past case studies and client references; we present sample scorecard categories (with weights) to translate qualitative judgments into quantitative scores. By 2026, AI-driven transformation in pharma is critical, and selecting the right partner is itself a business-critical decision that must be treated rigorously.

Key Evaluation Criteria for Pharma AI Consulting Firms

When vetting potential AI consulting firms for a pharmaceutical engagement, decision-makers must consider multiple dimensions. Below we detail these aspects, drawing on best-practice checklists, frameworks, and empirical findings. Each criterion is supported by citations from industry sources. Where relevant, we mention how criteria apply specifically in biotech or pharma settings.

1. AI Strategy and Business Alignment

Definition: The consulting firm should approach AI projects as business initiatives, not just technical experiments. This means starting from the pharmaceutical client's key objectives (e.g. shorten trial timelines, improve yield, or comply with regulations) and linking AI deliverables to measurable outcomes.

Why it matters: A common failure mode is building an AI prototype that is technically impressive but misaligned with business needs. Firms may end up “doing AI for AI's sake,” generating models without measurable impact. To avoid this, advisors stress *outcome-driven methods*. For example, the Agility PR Solutions checklist emphasizes that the strongest partners connect every project to executive-level business outcomes like revenue, efficiency, or compliance (www.agilitypr.com). Likewise, a practical guide by SMS Data Center suggests asking potential partners how they will map their work to KPIs and whether they have examples of AI supporting specific business priorities (www.smsdatacenter.com).

Evidence/Best Practices:

- **KPI Mapping:** Good AI consultants will develop a KPI map or success metrics upfront. They should be able to show case studies where their work directly raised a metric (e.g. reduced time-to-market by X%, increased process yield, etc.) (www.agilitypr.com) (www.smsdatacenter.com).
- **Proof-of-Value (PoV) Stage:** Credible firms advocate a staged approach (PoC → MVP → production). They clearly explain which questions are answered in the PoC (feasibility), how business value is validated in the MVP, and what constitutes production readiness (addepto.com). For instance, the Addepto guide advises asking partners to articulate why early phases cannot promise full outcomes until validated (addepto.com).
- **Value Discovery:** Top partners systematically discover value opportunities across the client's organization. They might map end-to-end processes, identify where AI can trigger downstream benefits, and quantify potential impact across use cases (addepto.com).

Indicative Scoring (example):

Criterion	Key Questions
Business Outcome Alignment	"How will this project improve X% of our process or Y% of compliance rates?"
Strategy and Roadmap	"Can you outline your phased plan from PoC to deployment, and what gets validated at each step?"
Return-on-Investment Focus	"How do you quantify ROI or cost-benefit, and have you achieved stated ROI in prior projects?"

A partner that demonstrates a clear focus on business outcomes, perhaps supported by references or published case results, should score highly here. Weak candidates often default to talking about the technology *first* rather than impact.

2. Industry and Domain Expertise

Definition: The consulting firm must possess deep knowledge of the pharmaceutical domain. This includes familiarity with R&D processes (target discovery, preclinical, clinical trials), regulatory requirements, manufacturing practices, supply chain, and commercial operations unique to pharma. Domain expertise also means understanding the data characteristics and constraints of pharma contexts.

Why it matters: Generic AI capabilities are insufficient if the firm does not understand pharma. AI solutions that succeed in retail or general healthcare may stumble in pharma due to differences in data, processes, and stakes. For example, understanding clinical trial protocols, pharmacovigilance regulations, and lab data nuances is crucial. Without industry fluency, an AI model might miss constraints like **Good Clinical Practice (GCP)** data formats or misinterpret chemical safety data. Conversely, a firm with pharma experience can jumpstart projects with relevant heuristics and avoid rework.

Evidence/Best Practices:

- **Proven Use Cases:** Firms should be able to cite specific pharma (or broader life-sciences) case studies that are similar in scope. SMS Data Center advises requesting case studies (not just logos) showing what the firm did and the results achieved, to ensure understanding of sector "edge cases"

(www.smsdatacenter.com).

- **Regulatory Understanding:** As Xcelacore notes, healthcare-focused AI consultants must **demonstrate knowledge of clinical workflows and regulations** (HIPAA, GDPR) (xcelacore.com). In pharma, equivalent familiarity (FDA/EMA polymorph, Phases I–IV, GMP) is expected. Partners should have experience with regulatory submissions and compliance data, not just raw AI skills.
- **Citations/Qualifications:** Look for consultants with staffed bioinformaticians, data scientists with PhDs in life sciences, or teams that have worked at pharma companies. Some firms (e.g. ZS Associates) specifically market deep expertise in pharma marketing analytics, while others (like Deloitte Life Sciences) emphasize drug discovery and compliance. A partially relevant stat: one industry report notes firms like IQVIA and ZS bring **“deep domain knowledge in clinical and commercial areas”**, distinguishing them from generalist providers (intuitionlabs.ai).

Example: Novartis' AI Innovation Lab with Microsoft focused on therapy-specific projects (AMD, cell therapy) (news.microsoft.com), illustrating the need to align AI work with pharma expertise. Thus, ask a consultant: “Have you built AI solutions for, say, patient stratification in oncology trials or for NGS data analysis in biotechnology contexts?” Their answers and previous work samples will reveal their domain fluency.

Indicative Scoring (table excerpt):

Criterion	Key Indicators
Sector Experience	Prior projects in pharma/biotech (drug discovery, trials, etc.)
Data Familiarity	Knowledge of pharma data standards (CDISC, MedDRA, barcodes, etc.)
Regulatory & Quality Understanding	Track record in GxP/GMP/GCP-compliant environments
Business Process Insight	Awareness of drug lifecycle processes (e.g. IND/NDA milestones)

A consulting firm showing evidence of multiple successful pharma engagements (with measurable outcomes) should be preferred. At minimum, they should understand that pharma is not just “another healthcare project” but has distinct requirements.

3. Technical AI and Engineering Expertise

Definition: The firm’s team should have strong AI/ML skills and robust engineering practices. This covers proficiency in state-of-the-art tools and algorithms, software architecture, data engineering, and production-ready system design. Crucially, expertise must span both *research* (modeling) and *engineering* (deployment, monitoring).

Why it matters: Pharma projects often begin with novel algorithms (e.g. molecule design using transformers) but require production systems that integrate with enterprise IT. Consultants who are great at prototyping models without engineering discipline risk creating unsustainable solutions. Conversely, a team steeped only in traditional IT may lack cutting-edge AI knowledge.

Evidence/Best Practices:

- **Open-Tool Proficiency:** SMS Data Center recommends ensuring vendors use mainstream frameworks (TensorFlow, PyTorch, scikit-learn) rather than proprietary black-box systems (www.smsdatacenter.com). This reduces lock-in and ensures internal teams can later take over. Firms should demonstrate fluency in these tools, as well as cloud platforms dominant in pharma (AWS, Azure, GCP).
- **Modeling vs. MLOps:** Addepto's checklist highlights evaluating the partner's approach across PoC/MVP/Production stages (addepto.com) (addepto.com). In particular, ask about **MLOps** practices: how models are versioned, tested, deployed, and monitored (addepto.com). Mature AI engineering means built-in capabilities for tracking data lineage, model drift, and retraining automation. Weak candidates may neglect this, focusing only on accuracy metrics (addepto.com).
- **System Integration:** AI seldom operates in isolation. Partners should exhibit **"hybrid integration expertise"**: the ability to weave AI components seamlessly into existing software systems (addepto.com). Look for evidence they have built CI/CD pipelines and application interfaces (APIs) that integrate ML modules with legacy databases or LIMS.
- **Quality Engineering:** Since even generated code (e.g., from Copilot) or rapid prototyping introduces bugs, inquire about code review, testing frameworks, and security vetting in their development process (addepto.com) (addepto.com).
- **Examples:** Ask technical questions: "What open-source libraries do you use for cheminformatics or medical NLP?" or "How would you architect the model in a 24/7 production environment?" Strong answers will reference data preprocessing, containerization (Docker/Kubernetes), security scanning, and fault tolerance.

Indicative Scoring (table excerpt):

Criterion	Evaluation Factors
ML Frameworks	Experience with TensorFlow/PyTorch; use of durable, standard tools
MLOps/DevOps	CI/CD for ML, model versioning, automated retraining pipelines
Scalable Architecture	Cloud deployment, microservices, fault tolerance, API design
Testing & QA	Unit tests, continuous integration, data validation checkpoints
Data Engineering	Handling large pharma datasets, pipelines to clean, pre-process data

Avoid firms that claim AI prowess but cannot explain how their models will move beyond the lab notebook. Instead, prioritize partners who frame AI work as an engineering project with guardrails, rather than isolated research experiments.

4. Data Management and Integration Capability

Definition: Ability to handle, integrate, govern, and secure the vast, complex data that underpins pharma AI. This includes data strategy, linkage of disparate sources, and ensuring data integrity.

Why it matters: High-quality, accessible data is the foundation of any AI solution. Pharma data often resides in multiple silos: R&D (lab notebooks, omics, EMR data), clinical (trials databases), manufacturing (SCADA, LIMS), and commercial (CMS, CRM). Integrating these requires specialist skill. Poor data quality or silos can derail projects, wasting time just on cleaning. Moreover, missing data governance can lead to compliance issues.

Evidence/Best Practices:

- **Data Readiness Assessment:** Leading consultants will start by auditing a client's data maturity. Addepto advises asking partners how they assess data readiness and handle insufficient data (addepto.com). Metrics might include data completeness, consistency, and compliance with standards.
- **Governance Practices:** The partner should enforce data governance frameworks covering metadata management, version control, and lineage. Look for references to compliance with frameworks like **NIST's AI Risk Management Framework (RMF)**, which emphasizes mapping and managing data for AI systems (www.smsdatacenter.com).
- **Integration Techniques:** Preference goes to firms experienced with enterprise data integration tools and APIs. They should plan for real-time or batch integration as needed. For instance, the MasterControl guide flags "modern API architecture" and pre-built integrations as green flags for AI vendors (www.mastercontrol.com). A consulting firm should similarly have connectors to pharma platforms (e.g. SAP for supply chain, or common clinical data standards).
- **Data Security:** Data handling goes hand-in-hand with privacy and security. Ensure the consultant details encryption, access controls, and compliance with data privacy laws during integration. This ties back to regulatory awareness but emphasizes the data pipeline.

Indicative Evaluation (table excerpt):

Criterion	Signs of Strength
Data Inventory & Audit	Conducted thorough audit of available data sources and quality
Cross-System Integration	Demonstrated experience linking clinical, lab, manufacturing data
Data Quality Controls	Plans for cleaning, deduplication, imputation strategies
Metadata & Lineage	Tools/processes to track data lineage, versions, and ownership
Compliance w/ Privacy & Security	Procedures for HIPAA/GxP compliance in data handling
Scalability of Data Infrastructure	Use of scalable data lakes/warehouses (e.g. cloud-based, database tech)

Given that up to 80% of data science effort can go into data preparation, a firm's approach here is a key differentiator. Ideally, they will have templates or accelerators for common pharma data tasks (e.g. mapping lab assay outputs to model features) and show how they mitigate data issues before modeling begins.

5. Regulatory, Privacy, and Risk Management

Definition: The firm must exhibit a robust approach to regulatory compliance, data privacy, security, and overall AI risk governance specific to pharma.

Why it matters: Pharma is one of the most regulated industries, with strict requirements on data integrity, patient privacy, and product safety. Any AI consulting engagement should be “**GxP-aware**”; solutions often have to operate as or within validated systems. Moreover, if AI outputs inform regulatory submissions or patient care, they fall under additional scrutiny. Consultants lacking this perspective may inadvertently jeopardize compliance, slowing projects or exposing the company to audit findings.

Evidence/Best Practices:

- **Risk Frameworks:** Leading firms should leverage recognized AI risk frameworks. SMS Data Center cites the NIST AI RMF as an example: the methods should “*echo recognized frameworks*” covering governance, risk assessment, bias, privacy, and monitoring (www.smsdatacenter.com). Ask the partner how they plan to measure and mitigate AI-specific risks (e.g. bias, robustness, privacy leakage).
- **Security and Privacy Protocols:** Require a use-case-specific legal applicability assessment before data access. HIPAA applies to covered entities and business associates; a covered entity engaging a business associate must establish a written business associate contract or other qualifying arrangement ([HHS](#)). Separately assess GDPR territorial scope, controller and processor roles, processing obligations, and relevant national laws ([EDPB territorial-scope guidance](#)). Ask the partner to document the required access controls, encryption, retention rules, and privacy safeguards for the proposed processing.
- **Data Lineage and Audit Trails:** As noted in MasterControl’s guide, pharma systems often need “*complete audit trails from raw data collection through AI analysis to final decisions*” for regulatory compliance (www.mastercontrol.com). The consulting partner should incorporate tools or documentation to meet 21 CFR Part 11 (data auditability) and similar requirements.
- **Validation and Testing:** Separate model credibility evidence for drug-regulatory decision-making, GxP computerized-system validation, and medical-device requirements by intended use. FDA’s January 2025 AI draft addresses information or data intended to support regulatory decisions about drug safety, effectiveness, or quality; it is nonbinding and not for implementation ([FDA](#)). Its scope excludes drug discovery and operational-efficiency uses without the specified safety, quality, or study-reliability impacts ([FDA draft, Scope](#)). ISO 13485 specifies a quality management system for the medical-device industry ([ISO](#)); assess its relevance only for work in that context. Ask quality and regulatory specialists to define the applicable validation plan and acceptance criteria.
- **Evidence of Prior Compliance Work:** Ideally, the firm can show examples of delivering in regulated settings (e.g. implementing AI for GMP manufacturing, or working under an FDA audit). Even references should highlight compliance capabilities.

Indicative Evaluation Points:

Criterion	Verification Methods
Regulatory Audit Preparedness	Request redacted validation plans and reports, requirements-to-test traceability, approved test results, change-control records, and audit-response records appropriate to the intended use.
Data Privacy by Design	Demonstrated use of privacy-enhancing techniques (anonymization, federated learning)

Criterion	Verification Methods
AI Governance Plan	Formal plan covering bias checks, monitoring, fail-safes
Security Certifications	Team security clearances, compliance with ISO/IEC 27001 or related
Legal and Ethical Expertise	Involvement of legal experts or ethicists, particularly for generative AI outputs

Given the rising concerns with AI transparency, one warning is relevant: Pharmaceutical Technology recently warned that “**ethical questions over bias thwart pharma’s reliance on [generative AI]**” (www.pharmaceutical-technology.com). Hence, vendors must convince clients they can minimize such risks (e.g. through bias testing, fairness audits, explainable AI).

6. Quality of Delivery and Engineering Discipline

Definition: This covers the consulting firm’s project management, engineering standards, and post-delivery support. It reflects whether the firm can deliver on time, within budget, and hand over maintainable solutions.

Why it matters: Even a technically sound AI solution can fail if delivered poorly. Issues include project delays, scope creep, or poorly documented code. Pharma stakeholders require diligent documentation, user training, and change management for any new system.

Evidence/Best Practices:

- **Methodology and Transparency:** Evaluate whether the firm uses a well-defined methodology (like Agile, CRISP-DM adapted for ML) and maintains transparency (regular demos, milestone reviews). Addepto suggests asking partners to walk through their implementation process (addepto.com).
- **Code and Model Reviews:** Strong teams perform code reviews, software audits, and peer checks. They should also supply documentation (notebooks, code comments, user manuals) and training. Ask if they provide “lasting capabilities” through knowledge transfer, so the client doesn’t remain dependent (www.smsdatacenter.com).
- **Testing and Maintenance:** The firm should have plans for unit/integration tests, ongoing monitoring (guarding against model drift), and even for eventual decommissioning or upgrade paths. Addepto warns that immature MLOps practices can allow AI systems to degrade unnoticed until business impact becomes obvious (Addepto).
- **Performance Metrics:** Beyond initial accuracy, firms should discuss how they will validate that models meet quality standards consistently. E.g., confusion matrix benchmarks, UAT (user acceptance testing) in the field, or formal validations.
- **Vendor Stability:** Ensure the consulting firm itself is reliable (financially stable, not on the verge of bankruptcy), and check customer reference surveys to gauge satisfaction. Trust in the partner’s business continuity is part of delivery quality.

Indicative Evaluation Dimensions:

Criterion	Indicators
Project Management	Use of formal PM tools, clear roles (PM, engineers, QA, regulators)
Documentation & Training	Delivery of user manuals, training sessions for client staff
Post-Delivery Support	Offering maintenance, updates, or SLAs after project completion
Continuous Testing	Automated regression tests for models, version control of code
Accountability & Communication	Responsiveness to issues, transparency in problem resolution

Request evidence of relevant quality certifications and prior client audits, including their scope, dates, findings, and applicability to the proposed work.

7. Track Record, References, and Proof Points

Definition: The firm's past performance – including case studies, client references, published success metrics, and domain reputation.

Why it matters: Historical success is the best predictor of future performance. Pharma companies should vet how similar past projects turned out. References can also reveal how a partner handles challenges.

Evidence/Best Practices:

- **Case Studies:** Look for detailed stories of past engagements. These should outline the problem, solution, and results. For example, Accenture's published case study with BMS notes "over 30 generative AI solutions across R&D and commercialization" and describes the "Workbench" trial accelerator (www.accenture.com). Such details (number of solutions, areas covered, outcomes like reduced trial time) build confidence.
- **Client References:** Speak directly with other clients if possible. Clutch.co and Gartner lists can identify firms; ask arranged references the same questions you ask candidates.
- **Awards and Leadership:** Verify any claimed award or analyst recognition against the original report, including its publication date, assessed service category, and evaluation scope. Treat recognition as supporting evidence alongside project-specific references.
- **Benchmarks and ROI:** Firms that publish whitepapers on ROI or have peer-reviewed publications on outcomes can stand out. For example, a vendor who cites a study showing "15% reduction in trial costs from our AI models" provides tangible evidence.

Indicative Evaluation:

Item	What to Check
Portfolio Relevance	Projects with similar use-cases (e.g. AI in diagnostics)
Client Testimonials	Verifiable quotes or referrals from pharma clients
Outcome Metrics	Quantifiable results (time saved, cost reduced, accuracy gained)
Industry Recognition	Reports, awards, or press coverage of past engagements

Transparency is key: beware vendors that share only anonymized or minimal details. Ideally, at least one reference should be willing to describe their experience in a moderated conversation or written feedback.

8. Trust, Cultural Fit, and Soft Factors

Definition: The intangible qualities that affect partnership success – trustworthiness, alignment of work culture, communication style, and even geographical/time-zone fit.

Why it matters: Even a technically superb firm can fail to deliver value if it does not integrate well with the client's team. Issues can arise from slow communication, differing project ownership expectations, or misalignment in work ethics. Trust also means a partner will prioritize the client's confidentiality and act with integrity.

Evidence/Best Practices:

- **Transparency:** During evaluation, assess openness: How transparent is the partner about their processes, limitations, and pricing? Hidden add-ons or overpromising are red flags.
- **Culture and Communication:** Are they comfortable reporting in the governance style you require (regular executive updates, steering committees)? Do they speak your language (e.g. a consultant who uses pharma terminology correctly suggests better understanding)? Sensor via initial meetings if there is a rapport.
- **Account Structure:** Determine how the vendor intends to structure the engagement. Dedicated team or rotating resources? Local presence vs. remote delivery? This affects agility and day-to-day interaction.
- **Cost and Commercial Terms:** Though one of many factors, partner reliability includes having clear, fair contractual terms. Watch for unusual clauses (e.g. hidden IP ownership, data rights). Reputable firms will usually have well-tested contract templates. Cost should be evaluated considering value, not just low price.
- **Vendor Viability:** Finally, consider the firm's long-term viability. A consultancy choosing to exit the market or being acquired mid-project can risk continuity. Independent financial stability (if not confidential) or years in business may provide reassurance.

Evaluation Notes:

- Some organizations use formal **scorecards or weighted criteria** (see Table 1 below) so that this subjective category is part of a defensible rubric rather than an afterthought.
- It can be helpful to include stakeholders from legal, procurement, IT, as well as the business unit in vetting. Each will weigh factors (technical vs. compliance vs. price) differently, so structured scoring avoids biased decisions.
- Trust signals can include certifications (e.g. ISO 27001 for cybersecurity), partnerships (alliances with major cloud providers), and transparent privacy policies.

Example Scorecard

To illustrate how these criteria might be structured, Table 1 shows a simplified example of evaluation categories and suggested focus areas (weights are indicative and should be tuned per project):

Table 1: Sample Evaluation Criteria Scorecard

Category (Example)	Possible Weight	Key Focus Areas / Questions
Business Alignment & ROI	20%	Projected benefits, PoC/MVP plan, KPI linkage, ROI validation
Domain Expertise (Pharma)	15%	Pharma use cases, regulatory knowledge, therapeutic area familiarity
Data & IT Integration	15%	Data readiness, system integration (CRCs, EHR/LIMS/etc.), data quality checks
AI Technology Skills	15%	Algorithms, tool proficiency, MLOps processes (CI/CD for models)
Regulatory/Compliance	15%	Experience with FDA/EMA filings, data privacy (HIPAA/GDPR), audit trail capability
Project Delivery Quality	10%	PM processes, documentation, testing regime, code quality
Reputation & References	5%	Similar project track record, client testimonials, industry recognition
Cost & Commercial Terms	5%	Pricing structure fairness, contract flexibility, total cost of ownership

This is an illustrative procurement framework, not a validated industry standard. The example weights total 100%; adapt them before reviewing proposals and keep the revised total at 100%.

Scoring method: Rate each category from 0 to 4: **0** = no evidence or an unmet requirement; **1** = an assertion or demo without relevant delivery evidence; **2** = relevant documents or a comparable reference, with material gaps; **3** = the agreed requirements supported by reviewed artifacts and a verified reference; **4** = the requirements demonstrated in a representative pilot with measured results and an agreed support and handover plan. Record the evidence, gaps, and reviewer rationale for every rating. Calculate the total out of 100 as $\Sigma(\text{weight in percentage points} \times \text{rating} \div 4)$. For example, ratings of 3 in all categories yield 75/100.

Mandatory gates: Before ranking, quality, legal, and security reviewers should agree on pass/fail requirements for lawful data access and processing, security controls, validation and audit evidence appropriate to the intended use, and contractual data/IP ownership and exit provisions. An unmet mandatory requirement disqualifies a candidate until resolved; a high weighted score cannot offset it.

Using a scorecard like this encourages cross-functional alignment. For example, clinicians and data scientists might weight workflow fit higher, while IT and compliance focus on security/regulatory points (www.buzzi.ai). The goal is a balanced, evidence-based comparison rather than picking a vendor based solely on one stakeholder's top criterion.

Data-Driven Insights and Industry Trends

Alongside qualitative criteria, it is important to consider macro trends and data that shape the ecosystem of AI consulting in pharma.

Market Growth and Adoption Rates

- **Market Estimates:** When using a market forecast in procurement, record its publication date, defined product/service scope, base year, geography, methodology, and denominator. Compare like-for-like estimates; do not infer a candidate's delivery capability from aggregate market growth.
- **Regional Fit:** Assess the proposed delivery locations, applicable legal requirements, language coverage, and support hours for the engagement.
- **Technology Trends:** Generative AI is a focal point. An expert in life sciences technology reports that pharma entered a “new era” with autonomous AI agents and large models reshaping all functions (www.iqvia.com). Patient-facing generative tools (e.g. chatbots) and generative design for molecules are widespread R&D trials. Conversely, traditional machine learning (e.g. random forests for disease classification) remains relevant for specialized tasks.

These trends imply that consulting firms should not only be adept today at current ML, but also ready to leverage emergent AI capabilities (foundation models, generative pipelines). Evaluation criteria might thus include *innovation capacity*: does the partner participate in AI research forums or foster labs for generative model development? Are they conversant with the latest (e.g. transformers, quantum ML) in therapeutics?

Case Study Highlights

Examining real engagements provides concrete lessons:

- **BMS & Accenture:** Accenture reports that BMS implemented more than 30 generative AI solutions across Research & Development, Global Product Development & Supply, and Commercialization. It describes “Workbench” as a clinical trial accelerator combining AI-driven insights with real-time operational data ([Accenture case study](#)). Ask prospective partners to explain the scope of comparable work and provide evidence of their specific responsibilities.
- **Novartis & Microsoft (announced 2019):** This multi-year alliance created an in-house “AI Innovation Lab” at Novartis, with Microsoft experts on-site. Projects included personalized treatments for macular degeneration and gene/cell therapy analytics (news.microsoft.com). The lab's existence showed Novartis valuing a deep, embedded partnership rather than a one-off consultancy. It underscores that sometimes the “consulting firm” may be a technology corporation deeply entwined with the client (in this case, Microsoft providing Azure and data science talent). Selection implication: consider whether your partner should be a traditional consultancy or if a strategic tech alliance (e.g. with cloud/AI vendors) is more appropriate.

Use the documented examples to ask candidates how they will integrate data, coordinate stakeholders, and address pharma-specific requirements. Verify responsibilities and outcomes through project records and client references.

Expert Opinions and Survey Data

Beyond individual instances, surveys and expert analyses yield insights:

- **Investment Drivers:** Pharma executives cite accelerating innovation and efficiency as top AI drivers (www.iqvia.com). The IQVIA blog notes industry respondents most value AI for **faster innovation, increased efficiency, and higher profits** (www.iqvia.com). This aligns with the motivation for choosing an AI partner: any consultancy must clearly address these expectations.
- **Evidence of Confidence:** Ask sponsors to identify the business decision the project must improve and define how value will be measured. Verify cited surveys against their original sample, population, wording, and publication date before using them to justify investment.
- **Ethical Concerns:** As mentioned, industry commentary in 2024–2025 alerted that without addressing AI bias and transparency, pharma risk losing trust in new tools (www.pharmaceutical-technology.com). Therefore, a consulting firm's stance on ethics (including assessment of requirements under the EU AI Act, which entered into force on 1 August 2024 (European Commission)) may become a selection factor.
- **Talent Gap:** Recruiters at a 2025 CPHI conference warned that attracting top AI talent in pharma requires cultural changes (www.europeanpharmaceuticalreview.com). Many companies, therefore, rely on external firms to fill that gap. In evaluating partners, ask how they augment their staff (e.g. use of subcontractors, offshore teams, or their own analytics centers).

Case Studies and Real-World Examples

Use published accounts as starting points for reference checks. Reported results are specific to the described engagement.

Pharma Company/Context	AI Consulting Partner	Scope of Work	Reported Outcome / Evaluation Use
Bristol Myers Squibb — Clinical Trials and R&D	Accenture	Accenture reports more than 30 generative AI solutions across R&D, Global Product Development & Supply, and Commercialization, alongside the Workbench clinical trial accelerator (Accenture case study).	Accenture describes Workbench as combining AI-driven insights with real-time operational data. Ask candidates for comparable integration evidence and client references.
Large biopharma company, unnamed in the source — Pharmacovigilance	Deloitte ConvergeHEALTH	Deloitte describes using ML and NLP to automate adverse-event case processing and route exceptional cases to experts (Deloitte case study).	Deloitte reports a 50–60% reduction in processing time per case. Request project-specific evidence of intended use, validation, and controls when assessing a proposed solution.

For each candidate, request a traceable case account identifying the problem, the firm's responsibilities, the evidence behind any measured result, and the limits on comparison with the proposed project. Distinguish an announced services collaboration from a documented client deployment. Do not infer regulatory recognition or validation from a vendor's case-study description.

Comparing Consulting Firm Types

Use firm type to organize due diligence, then compare actual proposals, teams, architecture, fees, IP terms, and exit provisions. SMS Data Center recommends a lightweight but rigorous approach to risk ([SMS Data Center](#)). The questions below are prompts for assessment, not measured differences between firm sizes.

Firm Type	Capabilities to Verify	Commercial and Delivery Questions
Large Global Consultancies (e.g. Accenture, Deloitte, Capgemini)	Verify the proposed team's pharma experience, integration scope, references, and delivery locations.	Compare actual fees and staffing seniority; ask how decisions, scope changes, and accountability will be managed.
Boutique AI Specialists	Verify expertise in the specific scientific or operational use case and access to the required engineering and quality skills.	Test capacity, key-person continuity, subcontracting, architecture portability, and handover arrangements. Review IP, licensing, and exit terms.
Technology Vendors	Verify platform expertise, interoperability, and pharma workflow experience.	Review licensing and infrastructure costs, SLAs, data export, product dependencies, and alternative architectures.
Academic or Research Labs	Verify the relevant research expertise and proposed route from prototype to an operational system.	Agree milestones, validation responsibilities, publication rights, IP ownership, and post-project support.

Selecting Firm Type

In many cases, organizations engage **multiple partners**: for example, a big consultancy to lead transformation and manage stakeholders, plus a niche AI vendor to build the specialized algorithm. The table above can help frame discussions: if your use case is very novel, an academic or boutique partner might be best for R&D; if you need an integrated enterprise solution, a large firm or tech vendor might be safer.

Use a consistent checklist to evaluate each candidate's proposed responsibilities, team, evidence, and delivery plan ([SMS Data Center](#)).

Data Analysis and Evidence-Based Arguments

In formulating this framework, we rely on concrete data and expert insights wherever possible:

- **Regulatory Evidence:** FDA labels its January 2025 AI document as draft guidance, not for implementation, containing nonbinding recommendations ([FDA](#)). Keep guidance status separate from evidence that a particular vendor's system has been validated for its intended use.
- **Comparative Data:** When comparing criteria (like the scorecard categories), we drew on sources like Buzzi that provide a weighted breakdown of what clinicians and IT might prioritize (www.buzzi.ai). While weights vary by organization, using a structured scorecard minimizes anecdotal decisions.
- **Case Metrics:** Check each reported number against its original source and record the measurement period, baseline, denominator, and whether the result was independently assessed. Use the same metric consistently when discussing an engagement.

- **Expert Commentary:** We did not shy away from including cautionary expert quotes on the downsides of AI (bias, hype). For example, Natasha Spencer-Jolliffe in *Pharmaceutical Technology* warns that bias may “thwart pharma’s reliance on [AI]” (www.pharmaceutical-technology.com), and Florian Schnappauf of Veeva highlights AI’s transformative promise (www.pharmaceutical-technology.com). These perspectives highlight that consulting partners must address both the upsides and the risks.

Discussion: Implications and Future Directions

As AI continues to evolve, the evaluation of consulting firms must also adapt. Key future-facing considerations include:

- **Generative AI and LLMs:** By 2026, large language models (LLMs) and generative frameworks (like those used in BioNeMo) have become mainstream. Partners should be proficient in these. The McKinsey report forecasts that generative AI could unlock up to \$110b/year for pharma (www.mckinsey.com), but warns that foundation models may need task-specific fine-tuning (www.mckinsey.com). Thus, an evaluation must probe a firm’s capabilities in fine-tuning pre-trained models for scientific texts, code, or imaging.
- **Ethical and Regulatory Shifts:** The EU AI Act entered into force on 1 August 2024 ([European Commission](http://EuropeanCommission)). Entry into force and application deadlines are distinct: require counsel to verify the requirements and deadlines applicable to the intended system and the parties’ roles before deployment. FDA’s January 2025 drug/biological-product AI guidance remains labeled draft, not for implementation, with nonbinding recommendations (FDA). Ask candidates how they will track changes and update the project’s regulatory assessment.
- **Hybrid Human-AI Workflows:** AI in pharma is moving towards augmenting rather than replacing experts. For example, AI-assisted workflows for chemists or radiologists. Selecting partners who understand human-in-the-loop design and active learning will be important. Consultants should incorporate human-centered design methods.
- **Data Privacy Technology:** With growing data privacy concerns, technologies like differential privacy or federated learning might become criteria. Pharma companies with multi-center data projects will look for partners who can implement privacy-preserving analytics.
- **Skill Transfer and Up-skilling:** Ultimately, pharma firms want to retain knowledge. Evaluation criteria should include a company’s plan to train or certify client employees. This is an implication drawn from the observed talent gap: partners that leave behind knowledgeable teams add more lasting value.
- **Third-Party Validation:** We anticipate that industry evaluation bodies or consortia may emerge to rate AI consulting firms (analogous to NICE guidelines or PAMF’s model for digital health). Staying engaged with industry benchmarks, and perhaps helping to establish them, could differentiate a forward-looking vendor.
- **Cost of AI and Infrastructure:** Over time, the economics of AI change (e.g., GPU costs, cloud prices). A consulting partner must help clients evaluate total cost of ownership – an often overlooked aspect. Hence, criteria around cost transparency become more important.

In summary, the implications for pharma organizations are clear. AI consulting is not a transient fad; it is central to long-term competitiveness. Thus, investing the time to rigorously evaluate partners is justified by the scale of potential gains (and risks). Consultation should be seen as a strategic partnership; expect to work closely with your chosen firm and re-evaluate periodically as new capabilities emerge.

Conclusion

By 2026, AI has reshaped pharmaceutical and life-science industries, turning once-hypothetical scenarios into everyday tools for discovery, development, and patient engagement. The stakes are high: with billions of dollars potentially unlocked by AI (www.mckinsey.com), companies that harness its power can accelerate breakthroughs and reduce costs. Conversely, missteps in AI deployment—motivated by poor vendor choice—can squander resources and delay benefits.

This framework provides a comprehensive approach to vendor selection. It emphasizes evidence over impressions: from the strategic alignment and domain expertise of the partner, through technical capabilities and quality processes, to proven outcomes and soft factors like trust. It combines procurement recommendations with attributed industry analysis and published case accounts to inform the criteria. Verify each source's scope and relevance to the proposed engagement. When used diligently, it can guide pharma decision-makers toward partners who not only have “smart data scientists” but can translate technology into **measurable business value and regulatory compliance** (www.smsdatacenter.com) (www.agilitypr.com).

The evaluation tables and case examples reinforce that selecting an AI consulting partner is not a simple “checklist” task. It requires cross-functional input (clinicians, IT, legal, execs) and a balanced consideration of technical, business, and regulatory dimensions. The future of AI in pharma will demand continuous learning for both companies and their partners. Therefore, the final criterion may well be adaptability: how well the firm can evolve with the technology and the organization's changing needs.

In closing, pharmaceutical executives and project sponsors should remember that **AI initiatives are change initiatives**. The consulting partner choice is one of the most critical decisions in that journey. This 2026 framework is designed to be iterative and to grow as the industry does. We encourage organizations to adjust weights and add new criteria reflecting emerging trends (like AI ethics). With careful planning, rigorous evaluation, and the right partner, pharma companies can ensure their AI investments drive real innovation, patient benefit, and competitive advantage.

Source Notes: Citations appear as inline Markdown links. Consulting-firm case accounts report the publishing firm's results; evaluate those claims alongside client references and project records. FDA's January 2025 AI guidance is draft and nonbinding, not for implementation ([FDA](https://www.fda.gov)). The scorecard and procurement questions are illustrative recommendations, not a validated industry standard.

Source links

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

1. <https://www.mckinsey.com/industries/life-sciences/our-insights/generative-ai-in-the-pharmaceutical-industry-moving-from-hype-to-reality>
2. <https://intuitionlabs.ai/articles/risk-based-ai-validation-pharma-ich-q9>

3. <https://www.mckinsey.com/industries/life-sciences/our-insights/rewired-pharma-companies-will-win-in-the-digital-age>
4. <https://intuitionlabs.ai/articles/pharma-ai-vendor-due-diligence-checklist>
5. <https://www.fda.gov/regulatory-information/search-fda-guidance-documents/considerations-use-artificial-intelligence-support-regulatory-decision-making-drug-and-biological>
6. <https://intuitionlabs.ai/articles/pharma-ai-governance-gxp-compliance>
7. <https://intuitionlabs.ai/articles/ai-clinical-development-plans-trials>
8. <https://www.accenture.com/ie-en/case-studies/health/bristol-myers-squibb-accelerates-drug-development-genai>
9. <https://news.cognizant.com/2024-03-19-Cognizant-to-apply-generative-AI-to-enhance-drug-discovery-for-pharmaceutical-clients-with-NVIDIA-BioNeMo>
10. <https://www.pharmaceutical-technology.com/features/can-pharma-overcome-generative-ais-bias-problem/>
11. <https://intuitionlabs.ai/articles/data-integrity-ai-alcoa-framework>
12. <https://www.iqvia.com/blogs/2025/10/how-emerging-ai-capabilities-are-reshaping-life-sciences>
13. <https://intuitionlabs.ai/articles/veeva-crm-ai-predictive-hcp-targeting>
14. <https://www.pharmaceuticalcommerce.com/view/applying-ai-case-studies-in-pharma>
15. <https://www.europeanpharmaceuticalreview.com/news/267542/ai-reshapes-pharma-recruitment-but-skills-gaps-culture-and-bias-temper-gains/>
16. <https://www.scotts-international.com/artificial-intelligence-in-drug-discovery-market-by-process-target-lead-use-case-design-optimisation-vaccine-antibody-disease-understanding-pk-pd-therapy-cancer-cns-cvs-tool-ml-dl-cnn-gan-end-user-reg%2Ct2013903/4>
17. <https://news.microsoft.com/2019/10/01/novartis-and-microsoft-announce-collaboration-to-transform-medicine-with-artificial-intelligence/>
18. <https://github.com/facebookresearch/esm>
19. <https://www.microsoft.com/en-us/research/publication/learning-to-extend-molecular-scaffolds-with-structural-motifs/>
20. <https://addepto.com/blog/how-to-choose-the-right-ai-consulting-company-in-2026/>
21. <https://www.mastercontrol.com/gxp-lifeline/the-ultimate-ai-vendor-evaluation-guide--choosing-ai-ready-partners-for-life-sciences-manufacturing/>
22. <https://www.fda.gov/media/184830/download>
23. <https://www.buzzi.ai/insights/healthcare-ai-solutions-provider-selection-guide>
24. <https://www.agilitypr.com/pr-news/pr-skills-profession/top-10-criteria-for-choosing-the-right-ai-consulting-company-for-your-business/>
25. <https://www.smsdatacenter.com/ai-analytics/10-key-criteria-for-choosing-the-right-ai-consulting-partner/>
26. <https://xcelacore.com/partnering-with-the-right-ai-consultant/>
27. <https://www.hhs.gov/hipaa/for-professionals/covered-entities/index.html>
28. https://www.edpb.europa.eu/documents/guideline/guidelines-32018-on-the-territorial-scope-of-the-gdpr-article-3-version-adopted_en
29. <https://www.iso.org/iso-13485-medical-devices.html>
30. <https://addepto.com/blog/how-to-choose-the-right-ai-consulting-company/>
31. <https://www.accenture.com/en/case-studies/health/bristol-myers-squibb-accelerates-drug-development-genai>
32. https://commission.europa.eu/news-and-media/news/ai-act-enters-force-2024-08-01_en

33. <https://www.deloitte.com/us/en/insights/industry/life-sciences/ai-and-pharma.html>

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.