IntuitionLabs

INTUITIONLABS / RESEARCH & PRACTICAL GUIDANCE

Pharmacovigilance Software: When Biotechs Need a Database

> 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 · 2026-02-07 · pharmacovigilance software · safety database · adverse event reporting · biotech compliance · fda ind reporting · signal detection · drug safety · clinical trials

Original article: https://intuitionlabs.ai/articles/pharmacovigilance-software-biotech-safety-database



In this article

1. Executive Summary
2. Introduction and Background
3. Regulatory and Compliance Requirements
4. US FDA IND and Postmarketing Reporting
5. EU and Other Regions
6. Implications for Small and Growing Biotechs
7. Pharmacovigilance Processes and Safety Database Functions
8. Pharmacovigilance Software Solutions
9. Data and Evidence
10. Implications and Future Directions
11. Conclusion

Executive Summary

Pharmacovigilance (PV) – the systematic collection, analysis, and reporting of adverse drug events – is a legal and ethical imperative for any biotech developing medicinal products (www.clinicalleader.com) (pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov). As small biotech firms grow and advance candidates into clinical development and beyond, they inevitably face the same regulatory and safety obligations as large pharmaceutical companies, despite far smaller budgets and teams (pharmatimes.com) (www.clinicalleader.com). This report analyzes **when and why growing biotechs should adopt specialized PV software and safety databases**, reviewing regulatory requirements, market trends, technological solutions, and real-world case examples. Data indicate that global PV software demand is rising (one estimate forecasts the market at **~$2.1 billion by 2025** (www.precedenceresearch.com)), and that failures in robust safety data capture can contribute to serious patient harm, as commentators reviewing past drug withdrawals have argued (editverse.com)). We find that even early-stage biotechs should **plan for a safety database** once they begin clinical trials: at a minimum, a system to consolidate all serious adverse events (SAEs) and suspected cases is advised by Phase II (if not Phase I) to ensure timely regulatory reporting and signal detection (www.clinicalleader.com) (www.law.cornell.edu). Key findings include:

- **Regulatory Mandates:** U.S. IND sponsors must report all serious, unexpected adverse reactions to FDA under 21 CFR 312.32 (usually within 7–15 days) (www.law.cornell.edu) (www.law.cornell.edu), and NDA holders must submit ongoing safety data (e.g. 21 CFR 314.80 PSUR/Periodic Reports). In the EU/UK, marketing authorization holders must appoint a Qualified Person for PV and maintain a Pharmacovigilance System Master File (PSMF) as a condition of holding a marketing authorisation, so both must be ready when the authorisation is granted rather than at commercial launch (www.gov.uk). In practice, these obligations force companies to have systematic case intake and tracking well before product launch.

- **Costs and Risks:** Although bespoke PV systems are expensive, relying on ad hoc methods (spreadsheets or manual logs) for safety case management is widely regarded as inadequate, and one EU QPPV notes that failing to validate an ICSR database can lead to a fine (www.pharmtech.com). Delays in safety signal detection can cause patient harm, a point industry commentators illustrate with historical drug-safety cases (editverse.com). Thus, the cost of not implementing a safety database can far exceed the expense of adopting one.
- **Solution Options:** A range of commercial PV software (from textbook enterprise suites like Oracle Argus and ArisGlobal LifeSphere to newer cloud platforms) exist to meet these needs (www.biomapas.com) (citrine-healthcare.com). Many vendors now offer cloud/SaaS versions designed exactly for smaller firms, which can drastically cut integration and validation burden. Table 1 below compares several leading offerings.
- **Trends and Future:** The PV software market is growing (projected ~5–9%+ CAGR globally (www.precedenceresearch.com) (www.datalibraryresearch.com)) on the back of stricter mandates and technology advances. Modern systems increasingly integrate AI/NLP for case ingestion and signal detection, real-time safety dashboards, and cloud-based scalability (pvedge.sarjen.com) (www.globalgrowthinsights.com). In the coming years, PV will become even more data-driven (e.g. real-world evidence, wearables) and interconnected across global databases (e.g. WHO's VigiBase with 40 million+ ICSRs (who-umc.org)).

In summary, **growing biotech firms should implement a formal safety database as early as practicable** – typically by the time of first human studies – to safeguard patients, comply with laws, and avoid crippling delays or fines. The detailed analysis below explains the context, options, and best practices in depth, with case studies illustrating how companies of different sizes have addressed these challenges.

Introduction and Background

Pharmacovigilance is the science and activities related to **detecting, assessing, understanding, and preventing adverse effects** associated with the use of medicines (www.clinicalleader.com) (www.biomapas.com). It is crucial to ensure that drugs remain safe throughout development and after market. For a biotech, ensuring PV is not just a legal box-check but a core component of product integrity and patient safety. By definition, any company developing a drug (chemical or biological) will eventually face the same PV obligations as large pharma. As one industry observer noted, even small biotechs may have **"PV obligations which match those of pharma companies several times their size."** (pharmatimes.com). This is because regulations generally kick in once human exposures begin, not based on company size. The central tool enabling PV is the **safety database**: as Citrine Healthcare explains, a safety database is *"the central repository for individual case safety reports (ICSRs) collected for a company's medicinal product(s) from all sources globally"* (citrine-healthcare.com). It must be kept validated and updated with current regulatory requirements, since it "facilitates the reporting of individual and aggregate safety data to authorities and third parties" and provides "key information for the detection of safety signals and ongoing evaluation of the risk–benefit profile" (citrine-healthcare.com).

Historically, PV matured after drug-safety tragedies of the early 1960s, leading regulators worldwide to tighten post-market safety surveillance. Today a multinational biotech – even a startup – faces a complex landscape: multiple regional reporting standards, mandatory roles (e.g.EU Qualified Person for PV), and increasing stakeholder scrutiny (pharmatimes.com) (www.gov.uk). Resources such as WHO's global VigiBase (now over 40 million reports (who-umc.org)) and FDA's FAERS emphasize how much data is generated. Biotechs, with limited staff and budgets, must decide **when** to invest in PV infrastructure. Do they rely on CROs and spreadsheets in early trials, delaying a formal database until later, or put systems in place early? This report systematically examines those questions.

We review the regulatory **requirements** (US, EU, other markets) that can trigger the need for a safety database; outline the **functional requirements** of PV software (case intake, coding, analytics, submissions); analyze industry **trends and market data** on PV software adoption; compare key **software solutions** (Table 1); present **case studies** of companies scaling their PV capabilities; and discuss future developments (AI, real-world evidence, global harmonization). Throughout, we cite authorities and data (market research, academic studies, expert commentary) to support each point. The goal is to offer a deep, practical guide for biotech CFOs, regulatory leads, and safety officers to know **when** and **how** to implement a safety database so that growth does not outstrip compliance.

Regulatory and Compliance Requirements

US FDA IND and Postmarketing Reporting

In the United States, any firm conducting clinical trials under an Investigational New Drug (IND) must comply with stringent SAE reporting rules. **21 CFR 312.32** mandates that Sponsors "must report any *suspected adverse reaction* that is both serious and unexpected" for IND studies (www.law.cornell.edu). Further, any **unexpected fatal or life-threatening suspected adverse reaction** must be reported to FDA *within 7 calendar days* of initial receipt (www.law.cornell.edu). Similarly, FDA expects other serious/responsible events (like a clinically important increase in SAE rate) to be reported under defined timelines. These requirements mean that even at Phase I, when a biotech is first exposing humans, it needs a reliable method to capture, assess, and forward relevant safety cases. While small trials may have few SAEs, an efficient system facilitates meeting the 7–15 day deadlines and compiling the annual Investigator's Brochure updates or Development Safety Update Reports (DSURs). Since April 1, 2026, IND safety reports of serious and unexpected suspected adverse reactions on commercial INDs must be submitted electronically to FDA's Adverse Event Monitoring System (AEMS) using E2B(R3) data standards, via database-to-database transmission or the Safety Reporting Portal; noncommercial INDs (investigator-sponsored and expanded access) are exempt (www.fda.gov).

After approval, marketing applications (NDAs) impose ongoing PV obligations. **21 CFR 314.80–314.81** require reporting of postmarketing "adverse drug experiences" and periodic safety reports. In the US the default periodic report is the periodic adverse drug experience report (PADER), submitted quarterly for the first three years after approval and annually thereafter; FDA allows the ICH E2C(R2) PBRER format to be used in its place under a waiver. Serious and unexpected adverse drug experiences must be submitted as 15-day Alert reports within 15 calendar days of initial receipt, and postmarketing safety reports must generally be submitted

electronically, with paper Form 3500A reserved for applicants granted a waiver (www.ecfr.gov). Electronic ICSRs go to FDA's AEMS in E2B(R3) format through database-to-database transmission, or through the Safety Reporting Portal for applicants without E2B capability (www.fda.gov). These requirements effectively mandate that MAHs (Marketing Authorization Holders) operate a pharmacovigilance system – including a database of all ICSRs – to compile and retrieve data for submissions. Without a proper case management system, a company would struggle to locate previous reports for follow-up or aggregate analysis, risking non-compliance (and fines) (www.pharmtech.com).

EU and Other Regions

Pharmacovigilance obligations in the European Union and UK are similar in intent but differ in structure. EU law (Directive 2001/83/EC and implementing regulations) requires that MAHs of authorized products appoint a **Qualified Person for Pharmacovigilance (QPPV)** and maintain a **Pharmacovigilance System Master File (PSMF)** detailing global safety processes (www.gov.uk). These must be in place from the grant of a marketing authorisation under the EU centralised or national procedures, so preparation starts during the application rather than at commercial launch. DSURs (ICH E2F) and Periodic Safety Update Reports (PSURs) according to EMA modules become mandatory pre- and post-authorization. For example, one guidance notes that biotechs often submit initially in the US because of simpler single-regulator safety requirements, whereas in Europe each member state may impose unique PV demands (making a centralized safety database even more critical for EU ambitions) (pharmatimes.com).

Globally, many ICH regions (Japan’s PMDA, Health Canada, Australia, etc.) follow the spirit of ICH safety reporting (ICSRs and periodic reports) albeit with local forms. As a rule of thumb, **any company preparing a marketing submission in a regulated country needs a validated safety database by launch**. Smaller biotechs that plan U.S. INDs or EU CTAs/NDAs should thus build PV processes early, to accumulate case data consistently across geographies. As the PharmaTimes commentary observes, when a biotech grows “with ambitions for Europe as well as the US,” they must satisfy both regimes, even though most pre-approval requirements are broadly harmonized (pharmatimes.com). In practical terms, as soon as a biotech begins multi-regional trials, again a unified safety database becomes invaluable.

Implications for Small and Growing Biotechs

For startups, these laws mean **you can’t ignore safety data**. In practice, many biotechs initially outsource PV tasks (e.g. contracting a CRO to do ICSR processing and reporting) because early trials are small (www.clinicalleader.com). However, regulators still expect Sponsor oversight. As a Halozyme executive recounts, there are “two crucial capabilities” to weigh: case processing (collection, triage, reporting) and subsequent medical review/signal detection (www.clinicalleader.com). Small biotechs often delay full in-house staffing of these capabilities until needed – but critically they are advised to **centralize all trial safety data into one system** to maintain visibility (www.clinicalleader.com). For example, having separate CRO-managed spreadsheets per study impedes global signal detection and makes annual DSUR compilation far more error-prone (www.clinicalleader.com). Fragmented records are a compliance risk: one EU QPPV writes that using spreadsheets to manage validation is “not acceptable” and that failing to validate the ICSR database can lead to a fine, a particular concern for SMEs that cannot justify a top-tier PV database (www.pharmtech.com).

In summary, a biotech should *anticipate* needing a robust electronic safety database by the time it has multiple trials or products in flight. Triggers include entering Phase II (first multi-site trials), starting international studies, or filing for multi-region approvals. Fulfilling all relevant CFRs/EMAs typically requires reliable, standardized case data. In the next sections we describe what such a database must do, and how companies decide which solution to adopt.

Pharmacovigilance Processes and Safety Database Functions

Modern PV activities revolve around collecting **Individual Case Safety Reports (ICSRs)** and using them for both reactive and proactive safety management. A quality safety database must support the end-to-end case lifecycle:

- **Case Collection/Input:** The system must capture any report of an adverse event related (or possibly related) to the product, from any source. This includes clinical trial sites (clinical SAEs), spontaneous reports from healthcare professionals or patients, literature, and *even social media or literature mining* where applicable. ICSRs generally include patient demographics, event details, drug details, relevant labs/diagnoses, reporter info, and causality assessment. The database should enforce coding standards (e.g., MedDRA for events, WHO Drug or AMH for products) to ensure consistency (www.biomapas.com). Modern systems often incorporate *Automated Data Capture* (AI/NLP) to extract information from PDFs, forms, or call transcripts, greatly improving intake efficiency (www.globalgrowthinsights.com) (pvedge.sarjen.com).
- **Case Management and Triage:** Every incoming case is classified (serious/non-serious, expected/unexpected, related/unrelated) according to regulations (e.g. the Definitions in 21 CFR 312.32 (www.law.cornell.edu) and ICH E2A). The system must flag expedited cases (e.g. patient death, life-threatening) so that they are reviewed immediately. Workflow features help assign cases to pharmacovigilance personnel for medical review, narrative writing, and follow-up (obtaining missing info). Audit trails record every action for GxP compliance.
- **Aggregate Reporting:** Safety databases generate the documents regulators require. For instance, they produce human-readable forms such as *CIOMS I* and FDA Form 3500A as well as electronic ICH E2B(R3) ICSR messages for regulatory submission (www.biomapas.com). Annual/periodic reports (DSURs in development, PSURs/PBRERs after approval) require cross-dataset summaries (exposure statistics, listing of all events, signal analyses). The database must efficiently assemble line listings and aggregate tables from the ICSRs for these reports, often across multiple studies or geographies.
- **Signal Detection and Risk Management:** Beyond compliance, a mature safety database supports pharmacovigilance science. It should allow generation of statistical disproportionality analyses (e.g. Proportional Reporting Ratios, Bayesian signals) and data visualizations (e.g. trend charts, patient narratives timelines) to identify emerging safety issues (www.biomapas.com) (www.clinicalleader.com). One expert notes that even with limited data, tools like Spotfire or Tableau are useful for reviewing lab trends or hepatic event profiles (www.clinicalleader.com). At scale, systems may integrate with external

data (e.g. FDA's AERS, WHO VigiBase (who-umc.org)) to contextualize findings or utilize AI to flag unusual signals automatically (pvedge.sarjen.com) (pvedge.sarjen.com). Importantly, any identified signal should feed back into the global risk–benefit evaluation of the product, possibly prompting label updates or risk management plan (RMP) changes.

- **Data Integration:** Biotechs often rely on electronic data from multiple sources (electronic Case Report Forms in trials, EHR, lab systems). Ideally, the safety database can *interoperate* with these systems to avoid manual transcription. For example, Argus Safety and many platforms offer CTMS or EDC interfaces so that AEs captured in a trial database flow directly into the safety system. This reduces duplication of effort and errors. Likewise, the database should export submission files in standard ICH formats (E2B XML, e.g. for FDA and EU reporting) and process acknowledgements from the receiving systems (e.g. FDA's AEMS for drugs and biologics, VAERS for vaccines, EudraVigilance in the EU). Many modern PV systems are cloud-based, ensuring worldwide teams can access a single global repository (pvedge.sarjen.com) (www.globalgrowthinsights.com).

In summary, a *safety database* is far more than a spreadsheet. It is a validated, structured platform to **capture every report**, manage reviews, generate reports, and detect signals. Without such a system, legal compliance is tenuous and the ability to see the full safety picture across trials and markets is lost. The next section reviews the available software options that fulfill these functions.

Pharmacovigilance Software Solutions

A wide array of commercial PV systems caters to biotechs and pharma. These range from legacy enterprise suites to newer cloud-native platforms. Table 1 below highlights several prominent examples, comparing vendors, deployment, and key features. (This is not exhaustive but illustrates the landscape.)

Software	Vendor	Deployment	Key Features	Typical Clients
Oracle Argus Safety	Oracle	On-premises or Cloud	Global ICSR case management, automated workflow, signal analysis via separately licensed Oracle Empirica products, supports CIOMS, FDA and E2B submissions.	Large pharma, CROs
ArisGlobal LifeSphere Safety	ArisGlobal	Cloud (SaaS)	Unified global safety database, configurable to programs, rich signal analytics, RMP and DSUR support.	Pharma, mid-size biotech
Veeva Vault Safety (Drug Safety)	Veeva Systems	SaaS Cloud	Part of Veeva Vault Suite, streamlined ICSR intake, real-time dashboards, eSubmission (E2B/R3), UI/workflow flexibility.	Enterprise, innovative biotech
Ennov PV	Ennov	Cloud or On-premises	ICSR management, MedDRA coding, E2B submissions, part of Ennov's wider regulatory and quality software suite.	Biotech/medtech, generic companies
PharmaBASE	Pharma Soft (Turkey)	Cloud	Drug safety database; companion PharmaSEARCH literature monitoring and DetectIO signal detection products.	Pharma companies, CROs

Software	Vendor	Deployment	Key Features	Typical Clients
Flex Databases Pharmacovigilance	Flex Databases	On-premises or Cloud	Pharmacovigilance module within a wider clinical platform; CIOMS/MedWatch forms and E2B(R3) XML output.	Biotech (especially EU-focused)

Table 1. Examples of pharmacovigilance safety database software. Features listed are illustrative; actual capabilities vary by version. Citations: Argus and ARISg are cited as "two most commonly used" global DBs (www.biomapas.com), other rows summarize vendor-described capabilities and should be confirmed with each vendor.

Key Observations: All major systems provide core ICSR case entry, MedDRA/WHO drug coding, and regulatory submission support. Differences lie in deployment (on-premises legacy vs SaaS cloud), ease of configurability, and integrated analytics. For example, Veeva Vault Safety is a fully cloud-based solution that scales easily for distributed small teams and includes features that support 21 CFR Part 11 compliance (audit trails, user access controls), although compliance also depends on each customer's validation and procedures (www.globalgrowthinsights.com). Oracle Argus and ARISg have a long track record (often in-house deployments at big pharmas) and considerable customization, which can be overkill in cost for a tiny biotech (www.pharmtech.com). Many emerging startups instead prefer lighter, cloud-first platforms (like Vault Safety or Ennov) or even PV-focused CRO services that host the database on the client's behalf.

Selection of a database should consider predicted volume (how many cases per month), number of products, global reach, and budget (www.pharmtech.com) (www.biomapas.com). For a single-product biotech with a few dozen annual cases, a lean SaaS system may suffice. For multi-product/many-country pipelines, a robust enterprise system (and possibly multiple QPPVs) is needed to meet "the scale of variation" in global requirements (pharmatimes.com). In either case, the vendor's ability to handle latest standards (e.g. ICH E2B(R3) for electronic ICSRs, E2F for DSURs and E2C(R2) for PBRERs) is critical.

The sections below summarize supporting evidence, then the implications and outlook for biotech PV systems.

Data and Evidence

- **ADR Prevalence:** Adverse drug reactions are a major source of clinical risk. A prospective hospital study found that **12.4% of admitted patients** experienced an ADR, and ADRs accounted for 8.1% of admissions (pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov). Such figures underscore why corporate PV cannot be an afterthought.
- **PV Market Growth:** Market research predicts the global PV software market will grow steadily. One report forecasts **$2.09 billion in 2025** to **$5.06 billion by 2035** (≈9.2% CAGR) (www.precedenceresearch.com). Others estimate slightly lower absolutes (~$130–190 M in mid-2020s) with CAGR 5–7% (www.datalibraryresearch.com) (www.globalgrowthinsights.com). In all cases, growth is driven by rising regulatory scrutiny and adoption of cloud/AI technology (www.globalgrowthinsights.com) (www.datalibraryresearch.com).

- **Regulatory Compliance Risk:** An EU QPPV writing in Pharmaceutical Technology warned that PV system weaknesses can cause safety signals to be missed and that failing to validate the ICSR database can lead to a fine, a particular challenge for SMEs (www.pharmtech.com).
- **Case Study – Emerging Vaccine:** BioPoint describes a client that faced an unprecedented PV challenge after receiving emergency approval for a COVID-19 vaccine. The consultancy deployed multidisciplinary PV teams and supported safety surveillance, signal detection with data analytics, medical and literature review, aggregate reporting and new tracking systems as worldwide use scaled up (biopointinc.com) (biopointinc.com). This illustrates how rapid growth can strain PV operations and why scalable safety processes matter.
- **Case Study – Mid-Size Pharma:** A consultancy case study (no longer available online, so its details could not be independently verified) described a company moving from spreadsheet-based case entry and manual report generation to an automated safety database, removing manual CIOMS and line-listing work (jilfora.com).

Implications and Future Directions

The **implications** for growing biotechs are clear: scale PV capabilities in step with product development. Implementing a safety database early allows companies to stay ahead of regulation, detect problems internally, and present data more compellingly to investors and partners. Delaying PV investment risks not only non-compliance but also potentially catastrophic safety oversights. Companies should budget for PV earlier in the timeline than they might intuitively think: many PV experts advise aiming for a unified database by Phase II or earlier (www.clinicalleader.com) (pharmatimes.com).

Looking ahead, the PV landscape will continue to evolve rapidly. Artificial intelligence and machine learning promise to automate case intake and signal detection (pvedge.sarjen.com) (www.globalgrowthinsights.com), reducing manual workload. Cloud-based “SaaS” models will dominate, enabling startups to tap enterprise-grade PV tools with subscription pricing (avoiding hefty implementation costs). Regulatory bodies are also investing in digital PV reporting (e.g. EMA’s continued upgrades to EudraVigilance) and encouraging real-world evidence; thus, PV software will increasingly need to integrate social media, wearable device data, and electronic health records for a more comprehensive safety picture. Finally, global harmonization efforts (via ICH updates, WHO collaborations) aim to streamline cross-border PV, but they also raise the bar: companies should anticipate multi-region data exchanges.

Biotechs should monitor these trends. For example, pilot projects in digital PV, like AI-driven literature monitoring or patient registries, could soon become mainstream. Early engagement on emerging topics (e.g. data privacy in PV databases under GDPR vs HIPAA) will also be vital. In essence, PV is moving from a compliance cost towards a strategic capability: databases and software that allow deep safety analytics will become competitive advantages in drug development.

Conclusion

In the biotechnology context, **“When do you need a safety database?”** The evidence-based answer is: **As soon as you begin systematic human exposure – and well before you have too many disjointed reports to manage.** Small companies may initially rely on contract services or manual tracking for a handful of cases, but they do so at risk. By the time a pipeline enters mid-stage clinical trials or multiple indications, a validated PV database should be in place (www.clinicalleader.com) (www.pharmtech.com). This ensures all serious and unexpected events are captured centrally (critical for FDA and EMA submissions), enables robust signal detection across the product portfolio, and avoids regulatory pitfalls (www.law.cornell.edu) (www.clinicalleader.com).

Throughout this report, we have documented how PV regulations (CFRs, ICH/EMA guidelines) require comprehensive data management and how software solutions can meet these needs. Biotechs that plan ahead can leverage modern PV platforms to scale safely: those that delay may face compliance headaches or, worse, miss safety signals with severe consequences for patients and their business reputation (editverse.com) (www.pharmtech.com).

In conclusion, the regulations require safety assessment, recordkeeping and timely reporting rather than any particular software, but for a growing biotech with clinical-stage assets a dedicated safety database (in-house or CRO-hosted) is the practical way to meet them. It is an **essential investment** in regulatory readiness and patient safety. By adopting an appropriate PV system and processes early – supported by the right software and expertise – biotechs both protect their patients and pave the way for successful product launch.

References: All claims and data above are supported by industry sources, regulatory guidances, market reports, and expert commentary (www.clinicalleader.com) (www.clinicalleader.com) (citrine-healthcare.com) (www.biomapas.com) (www.law.cornell.edu) (www.gov.uk) (pvedge.sarjen.com) (www.globalgrowthinsights.com) (www.pharmtech.com) (editverse.com) (pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov) (pharmatimes.com), as indicated by the inline citations.

Source links

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

1. https://www.clinicalleader.com/doc/you-re-a-small-biotech-how-should-you-implement-a-pharmacovigilance-system-0001
2. https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC5099543/
3. https://pharmatimes.com/magazine/2021/november_2021/pharmacovigilance_for_biotechs/
4. https://www.precedenceresearch.com/pharmacovigilance-and-drug-safety-software-market
5. https://editverse.com/pharmacovigilance-database-disasters-that-triggered-global-drug-recalls/
6. https://www.law.cornell.edu/cfr/text/21/312.32
7. https://intuitionlabs.ai/articles/dsur-vs-psur-pbrer
8. https://www.gov.uk/guidance/guidance-on-qualified-person-responsible-for-pharmacovigilance-qppv-including-pharmacovigilance-system-master-files-psmf
9. https://www.pharmtech.com/view/pharmacovigilance-under-scrutiny-why-companies-are-falling-short

10. https://www.biomapas.com/selecting-a-pharmacovigilance-drug-safety-database/
11. https://citrine-healthcare.com/pharmacovigilance-safety-database.html
12. https://www.datalibraryresearch.com/market-analysis/drug-safety-solutions-and-pharmacovigilance-software-market-4907
13. https://pvedge.sarjen.com/pv-enhancement/the-evolution-of-pharmacovigilance-software-a-historical-overview/
14. https://www.globalgrowthinsights.com/market-reports/pharmacovigilance-and-drug-safety-software-market-100027
15. https://who-umc.org/vigibase/
16. https://intuitionlabs.ai/articles/e2b-r3-icsr-reporting-standard
17. https://www.fda.gov/drugs/investigational-new-drug-application-ind/ind-application-reporting-ind-safety-reports
18. https://www.ecfr.gov/current/title-21/chapter-I/subchapter-D/part-314/subpart-B/section-314.80
19. https://www.fda.gov/drugs/fda-adverse-event-monitoring-system-aems/fda-adverse-event-monitoring-system-aems-electronic-submissions
20. https://biopointinc.com/project/case-study-worldwide-pharmacovigilance-capabilities/
21. https://jilfora.com/case-studies/case-study-1

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.