Review Article

Industrial FDA Form 483 Observations and Warning Letters to Pharmaceutical Companies: A Ten-Year Review and Case-Study Analysis of Regulatory Compliance Trends (2016–2026)

Dr. Surendra Pardhi[1], Mr. Suresh Singh Rajput[2], Dr. Atul Bisen[3], Mr. Yogesh Dewahe[4], Dr. Vaibhav Solanki[5]

[1]*Professor & Principal, Oriental Institute of Pharmacy, Lalbarra, Balaghat*
[2]*DGM, Cohance Lifesciences, Hyderabad*
[3]*Professor, Oriental Institute of Pharmacy, Lalbarra, Balaghat*
[4]*Assistant Professor, Sardar Patel University, Balaghat*
[5]*Associate Professor, Maharishi Dayanand Saraswati University, Ajmer*

ABSTRACT

The primary aim of this review is to examine FDA Form 483-related observations and subsequent Warning Letters involving pharmaceutical companies over approximately the last decade and identify recurring regulatory deficiencies that can affect pharmaceutical quality assurance. FDA Form 483 observations and subsequent Warning Letters provide important regulatory signals regarding weaknesses in pharmaceutical manufacturing, quality systems, laboratory controls, data integrity, documentation, contamination control and management oversight. This review-cum-case-study examines publicly available U.S. Food and Drug Administration regulatory actions involving pharmaceutical manufacturers and related drug-quality organizations during the ten-year period from September 2016 to September 2026. Particular attention is given to recurring observations associated with current Good Manufacturing Practice (cGMP), quality-unit responsibilities, laboratory data integrity, computerized systems, investigations, corrective and preventive action (CAPA), documentation, microbiological controls, sterile manufacturing and process control. The analysis demonstrates that regulatory concerns have progressively moved beyond isolated manufacturing deficiencies toward broader assessment of pharmaceutical quality systems, management oversight and reliability of electronic and paper-based data. Recent FDA actions further demonstrate that inadequate responses to Form FDA 483 observations, superficial CAPA, incomplete retrospective investigations and failure to establish effective data-governance systems can result in significant regulatory consequences. The case studies indicate that data integrity, laboratory controls, quality-unit independence, contamination control and effective investigations represent major areas requiring sustained management attention. The review proposes a risk-based regulatory-readiness framework integrating inspection preparation, documentation control, computerized-system governance, data-integrity assurance, deviation management, CAPA effectiveness and management review. This article not pointed any organization, study done only for knowledge & awareness on regulatory requirements.

KEYWORDS

FDA Form 483; Warning Letter; pharmaceutical industry; cGMP; data integrity; quality assurance; CAPA; quality control; FDA inspection; regulatory compliance; pharmaceutical manufacturing; laboratory compliance.

1. INTRODUCTION

The U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) uses inspections as an important mechanism for evaluating compliance with applicable statutory and regulatory requirements. During an inspection, investigators may identify objectionable conditions and document them on Form FDA 483, Inspectional Observations. FDA explains that the observations represent conditions observed during the inspection and do not themselves constitute a final agency determination.

When FDA subsequently determines that significant violations require formal regulatory communication, it may issue a Warning Letter. FDA describes Warning Letters as

communications notifying firms of significant violations and providing an opportunity for corrective action.

Consequently, the relationship may be represented as:

FDA inspection → Form FDA 483 observations → company response → FDA assessment → Warning Letter, when warranted → remediation/regulatory follow-up

The distinction is particularly important for pharmaceutical quality professionals because receiving a Form 483 does not automatically mean that a Warning Letter will follow. Conversely, a Warning Letter frequently indicates that FDA considers the identified problems sufficiently significant, systemic or inadequately addressed to warrant formal regulatory action.

1.1 Aim of the Review

- *To explain the relationship between FDA inspections, Form FDA 483 and Warning Letters.*
- *To review representative pharmaceutical Warning Letters issued during 2016–2026.*
- *To identify recurring cGMP deficiencies.*
- *To evaluate the increasing importance of data integrity.*
- *To examine deficiencies in quality-unit oversight.*
- *To analyze laboratory-control failures.*
- *To examine inadequate investigations and CAPA.*
- *To identify lessons for pharmaceutical manufacturers.*
- *To propose a preventive regulatory-compliance framework.*
- *To discuss implications for pharmaceutical education and industrial training.*

1.2 Difference between Form 483 and Warning Letter

Table 1. Difference between Form FDA 483 and Warning Letter

Feature	Form FDA 483	FDA Warning Letter
Purpose	Records inspectional observations	Communicates significant violations requiring corrective action
Timing	Generally presented at inspection conclusion	May follow review of inspection findings and firm's response
Nature	Investigator observations	Formal FDA regulatory correspondence
Final agency action?	No	More serious regulatory communication, but not itself a final adjudication
Main focus	Conditions observed during inspection	Significant violations and required remediation
Company response	Firm may respond	FDA generally requests detailed corrective action
Typical subjects	cGMP, laboratory, documentation, facilities, systems	Significant/systemic violations
Regulatory significance	Early compliance signal	Escalated compliance concern

FDA emphasizes that Form 483 is based on conditions observed during the inspection and does not necessarily contain every objectionable condition at the facility.

2. METHODOLOGY

2.1 Study Design

The present work uses a descriptive review-cum-case-study design based primarily on publicly available FDA regulatory records.

2.2 Study Period

3 September 2016 to 3 September 2026.

The period was selected to represent approximately the most recent ten years as of the date of preparation.

2.3 Information Source

The principal source was the FDA's publicly available Warning Letter and inspection-related database. FDA provides publicly accessible compliance records, including Form FDA 483 and establishment inspection information through its Office of Inspections and Investigations resources.

2.4 Selection of Cases

Representative cases were selected to demonstrate recurring compliance themes rather than to claim that they constitute every pharmaceutical Warning Letter issued during the decade.

The cases were selected based on their relevance to:

- *cGMP compliance*
- *Data integrity*
- *Laboratory controls*
- *Documentation*
- *Quality-unit oversight*
- *Computerized systems*
- *Investigations*
- *CAPA*
- *Sterile manufacturing*
- *Microbiological control*
- *Management responsibility*

3. REPRESENTATIVE FDA CASE STUDIES

3.1 Case Study 1: Med-Pharmex Inc. — 2017

FDA issued a Warning Letter to Med-Pharmex in May 2017 following inspection findings involving significant cGMP deficiencies. The FDA indicated that the firm had received Form FDA 483 observations and that its response did not adequately address the identified concerns. Among the observations were deficiencies involving sterile-drug manufacturing and contamination-control practices.

Regulatory lesson: Sterile manufacturing requires a highly controlled environment in which facility design, personnel practices, environmental controls, aseptic technique and microbiological monitoring operate as an integrated contamination-control system.

QA implication: A pharmaceutical company's response to an FDA 483 should not merely address the individual observation. It should determine whether the observation represents a broader system failure.

3.2 Case Study 2: Izeen Pharma Inc. — 2019

The FDA Warning Letter to Izeen Pharma identified concerns involving data integrity and quality-system deficiencies. FDA requested a comprehensive assessment of the extent of inaccurate data and an evaluation of the potential impact on drugs distributed to the United States.

The FDA also emphasized the need for a risk assessment addressing the potential effects of data-integrity failures on product quality and patient safety.

Key lesson: A data-integrity problem is not necessarily restricted to a single laboratory result.

It may require evaluation of:

individual result → batch → product → laboratory → computerized system → personnel → historical records → distributed product

3.3 Case Study 3: Windlas Healthcare Private Limited — 2020

FDA's Warning Letter to Windlas Healthcare identified incomplete laboratory data and weaknesses in laboratory controls. The FDA described circumstances involving analytical testing in which chromatographic information was not appropriately represented in the laboratory records.

Regulatory significance: Laboratory records must provide an accurate representation of the testing actually performed.

The case illustrates why: raw data, chromatograms, integration, sequence information, sample identification, calculations, system metadata must be appropriately controlled and reviewed.

QA lesson: If laboratory data cannot reconstruct what actually happened, the laboratory result cannot provide a reliable foundation for batch-release decisions.

3.4 Case Study 4: Pfizer Healthcare India — 2020

FDA's 2020 Warning Letter concerning Pfizer Healthcare India identified deficiencies involving investigations and CAPA associated with injectable products. FDA noted inadequate investigation of a sterility failure and continued use of equipment associated with the problem before appropriate corrective action was implemented.

Key lesson: An investigation should establish:

problem → containment → root cause → product impact → corrective action → preventive action → effectiveness verification

Merely identifying a probable cause without demonstrating effective prevention of recurrence is insufficient.

3.5 Case Study 5: Adamson Analytical Laboratories — 2021

Adamson Analytical Laboratories received a Warning Letter following observations involving computerized laboratory systems. FDA identified inadequate controls over GC data-acquisition systems, including privileges that permitted laboratory personnel to delete data sequences, modify methods and enable or disable audit trails.

Significance: This case illustrates the convergence of:

laboratory practice + computerized systems + cybersecurity + data integrity + quality assurance.

Preventive requirements: A modern pharmaceutical laboratory should consider: unique user accounts; role-based access; restricted administrator privileges; audit-trail controls; backup; data retention; periodic access review; validated computerized systems; independent QA review.

3.6 Case Study 6: Centrient Pharmaceuticals India — 2022

FDA's Warning Letter to Centrient Pharmaceuticals India identified weaknesses in quality-unit oversight, document control and computerized-system controls. FDA described uncontrolled documents and inappropriate handling of records, as well as shared or handwritten login credentials for laboratory-related software.

Regulatory lesson: Data integrity depends not only on laboratory analysts but also on:

document control + access control + management oversight + quality-unit governance.

Shared passwords fundamentally weaken attribution because an electronic action cannot reliably be linked to a unique individual.

3.7 Case Study 7: Intas Pharmaceuticals — 2023

FDA's Warning Letter to Intas Pharmaceuticals identified serious quality-system and data-integrity deficiencies. FDA cited inadequate oversight of original cGMP documents, deficient computerized-system controls, inadequate laboratory investigations and aborted chromatographic sequences.

The FDA also linked the findings to deficiencies in senior management responsibility and quality-assurance oversight.

Major lesson: Data integrity should be regarded as a management responsibility, not simply a laboratory responsibility.

3.8 Case Study 8: Cipla Limited — 2023

FDA's Warning Letter to Cipla identified inadequate quality systems and data-integrity deficiencies. FDA requested an assessment covering omissions, alterations, deletions, record destruction, non-contemporaneous documentation and other deficiencies.

Key lesson: A data-integrity investigation should be: comprehensive; retrospective; risk-based; independent where appropriate; scientifically justified; connected to product impact.

3.9 Case Study 9: Sichuan Deebio Pharmaceutical — 2024

FDA identified laboratory-data-integrity problems involving microbiological testing. Investigators found that microbiological plates were not being read and documented contemporaneously and identified contradictory information concerning laboratory records.

Key lesson: Contemporaneous recording is fundamental.

A result generated today but reconstructed later from memory does not provide the same level of reliability as a contemporaneous, attributable record.

3.10 Case Study 10: Brassica Pharma — 2024

FDA identified significant microbiological data-integrity concerns at Brassica Pharma. The FDA described circumstances in which sterility testing was not consistently performed and records were allegedly fabricated for tests that had not been conducted.

Regulatory significance: This type of observation creates a particularly serious risk because microbiological results may directly support sterility assurance and product release.

Quality lesson: A laboratory must have controls ensuring that:

test performed = result generated = original record retained = result reviewed = batch decision justified

3.11 Case Study 11: Unexo Lifesciences — 2024

FDA's Warning Letter to Unexo Lifesciences identified inadequate quality-unit oversight, deficiencies in batch documentation and data-integrity concerns. FDA reported problems involving missing and damaged batch-production records and duplicate/incomplete records.

3.11.1 Lesson for Good Documentation Practices

Documentation must be:

- *Attributable*
- *Legible*
- *Contemporaneous*
- *Original*
- *Accurate*
- *Complete*
- *Consistent*
- *Enduring*
- *Available*

The case demonstrates that physical document control remains important even in an increasingly digital pharmaceutical environment.

3.12 Case Study 12: Granules India — 2025

FDA issued a Warning Letter to Granules India in February 2025 concerning significant cGMP violations associated with finished pharmaceuticals.

This case illustrates the continuing regulatory importance of pharmaceutical manufacturing controls and demonstrates that regulatory scrutiny extends to major established pharmaceutical organizations.

3.13 Case Study 13: Recent 2026 Regulatory Actions

The 2026 FDA Warning Letters demonstrate that data integrity and quality-system expectations remain active regulatory priorities.

3.13.1 Reliance Life Sciences

FDA inspected Reliance Life Sciences Private Limited in February 2026 and subsequently issued a Warning Letter concerning significant cGMP violations involving finished pharmaceuticals.

3.13.2 Dabur India

FDA's July 2026 Warning Letter to Dabur India identified inadequate quality-unit oversight and concerns regarding the integrity of production records and data supporting product quality. FDA emphasized that incomplete or unreliable records compromise the ability of the quality unit to fulfill its responsibilities.

3.13.3 Huons

FDA's June 2026 Warning Letter to Huons emphasized deficiencies in the quality system and data integrity and called for a comprehensive investigation into inaccurate and inconsistent data, including consideration of current and former employees and broader operations.

3.13.4 Auriga Research

FDA's August 2026 Warning Letter to Auriga Research involved a contract testing laboratory and significant cGMP concerns, demonstrating that regulatory risk extends beyond traditional manufacturers to outsourced testing organizations.

4. MAJOR CATEGORIES OF FDA DEFICIENCIES

4.1 Data Integrity

Data integrity has emerged as one of the most important themes in FDA regulatory actions.

Common deficiencies include:

- *Deletion of electronic data*
- *Unofficial injections*
- *Incomplete laboratory records*
- *Altered chromatograms*
- *Inadequate audit trails*
- *Shared passwords*
- *Excessive administrator privileges*
- *Non-contemporaneous documentation*
- *Destruction of original records*
- *Incomplete retrospective review*

FDA's current data-integrity framework emphasizes the reliability and integrity of data supporting drug quality and regulatory decisions. Recent FDA cases continue to demonstrate this emphasis.

4.2 Quality Unit Failures

A recurring theme is inadequate Quality Unit involvement.

The Quality Unit should have sufficient authority and resources to:

- *Approve/reject materials*
- *Review batch records*
- *Investigate deviations*
- *Review laboratory data*
- *Approve CAPA*
- *Evaluate changes*
- *Oversee validation*
- *Assess data integrity*
- *Support product-release decisions*

The Intas, Dabur and Unexo cases demonstrate how deficiencies in quality-unit oversight can become central elements of FDA enforcement.

4.3 Laboratory Control Deficiencies

Laboratory-related deficiencies frequently involve:

- *Incomplete records*
- *Unofficial testing*
- *Inadequate OOS investigations*
- *Inappropriate data deletion*
- *Poor audit-trail review*
- *Uncontrolled software access*
- *Failure to perform required testing*
- *Manipulation or replacement of microbiological samples*

The Windlas, Adamson, Sichuan Deebio and Brassica cases provide representative examples.

4.4 CAPA and Investigation Deficiencies

A recurring regulatory lesson is that correction is not equivalent to CAPA.

A strong investigation should answer:

- *What happened?*
- *Why did it happen?*
- *Why was the problem not detected?*
- *What products or batches could be affected?*
- *Does the problem exist elsewhere?*
- *What systemic changes are required?*
- *How will effectiveness be demonstrated?*

FDA's cases involving Pfizer and other manufacturers illustrate the importance of determining root causes and implementing effective corrective and preventive measures rather than merely addressing the immediate event.

4.5 Documentation as a Regulatory Control

The reviewed cases demonstrate that documentation is not an administrative burden.

Documentation provides the evidence required to establish that:

the process was performed → the process was controlled → the result was genuine → the deviation was investigated → the batch decision was scientifically justified.

Therefore:

Poor documentation → weak evidence → weak quality decision → regulatory vulnerability.

5. SUMMARY OF REPRESENTATIVE CASES

Table 2. Summary of representative FDA Warning Letters reviewed (2017-2026)

Year	Organization	Major regulatory theme	Principal lesson
2017	Med-Pharmex	Sterile manufacturing/cGMP	Contamination-control system
2019	Izeen Pharma	Data integrity	Retrospective data assessment
2020	Windlas Healthcare	Laboratory data	Complete analytical records
2020	Pfizer Healthcare India	Investigation/CAPA	Effective root-cause investigation
2021	Adamson Analytical	Computerized systems	Access and audit-trail controls
2022	Centrient Pharmaceuticals	Document/data controls	Attribution and document governance
2023	Intas Pharmaceuticals	Data integrity/QMS	Management responsibility
2023	Cipla	Data integrity/QMS	Comprehensive remediation
2024	Sichuan Deebio	Microbiology/data integrity	Contemporaneous documentation
2024	Brassica Pharma	Sterility/data integrity	Authentic microbiological records
2024	Unexo Lifesciences	Documentation/QA	Record control and QA oversight
2025	Granules India	cGMP	Robust manufacturing systems
2026	Reliance Life Sciences	cGMP	Sustained compliance
2026	Dabur India	QA/data integrity	Quality-unit accountability
2026	Huons	Data integrity	Enterprise-wide investigation
2026	Auriga Research	Contract laboratory compliance	Outsourcing does not remove responsibility

6. TEN-YEAR REGULATORY TREND

- *Inadequate quality-unit oversight*
- *Incomplete laboratory records*
- *Unreported or unofficial analytical testing*
- *Manipulation or deletion of electronic data*
- *Inadequate audit-trail controls*
- *Failure to investigate OOS results adequately*
- *Weak CAPA systems*
- *Poor documentation practices*
- *Microbiological contamination-control failures*
- *Inadequate computerized-system controls*
- *Failure to maintain original records*
- *Inadequate management oversight*
- *Incomplete retrospective data-integrity investigations*

7. RECOMMENDED TRAINING PROGRAM FOR PHARMACEUTICAL PERSONNEL

Table 3. Recommended training modules and target personnel

Training module	Target personnel
FDA inspection awareness	All GMP personnel
GDP	Production/QC/QA

Training module	Target personnel
Data integrity	All data-generating personnel
Audit trails	QC/IT/QA
OOS investigation	QC/QA
Deviation management	QA/Production/QC
CAPA	QA/Management
Computerized systems	QC/IT/Validation
Sterility assurance	Microbiology/Production
FDA Form 483 response	QA/Regulatory
Mock FDA inspection	Management + QA + departments

8. LESSONS FOR INDIAN PHARMACEUTICAL COMPANIES

The reviewed cases have particular relevance to Indian pharmaceutical manufacturers supplying products to the U.S. market.

Important lessons include:

- *FDA compliance should be considered continuously rather than immediately before inspection.*
- *Data integrity should be embedded into the Pharmaceutical Quality System.*
- *Laboratory computerized systems require controlled access.*
- *Original records should never be discarded to conceal an error.*
- *OOS and deviation investigations should be scientifically rigorous.*
- *QA should independently verify laboratory and manufacturing data.*
- *Employees should understand the regulatory significance of data manipulation.*
- *Contract laboratories should be subject to appropriate qualification and oversight.*
- *CAPA effectiveness should be demonstrated objectively.*
- *Senior management should actively monitor quality-system performance.*

9. EMERGING REGULATORY TREND: FROM COMPLIANCE TO DATA GOVERNANCE

The regulatory environment is moving toward an integrated concept:

GMP + GDP + Data Integrity + Computerized Systems + Quality Risk Management + Management Accountability

This means that a pharmaceutical organization should not consider data integrity to be exclusively an information-technology or laboratory issue.

It should be embedded within:

- *Quality Assurance*
- *Quality Control*
- *Production*
- *Engineering*
- *Validation*
- *Regulatory Affairs*
- *IT*
- *Supply Chain*
- *Clinical/biopharmaceutical operations*
- *Management*

10. PROPOSED INSPECTION-READINESS CHECKLIST

Table 4. Proposed inspection-readiness checklist

Question	Yes/No
Are all GMP records complete?	
Are original laboratory data available?	
Are audit trails enabled and reviewed?	
Are shared passwords prohibited?	
Are administrator privileges restricted?	
Are OOS investigations scientifically justified?	
Are deviations thoroughly investigated?	
Are CAPAs effectiveness-checked?	
Are batch records readily retrievable?	
Are destroyed records traceable and authorized?	
Are laboratory systems validated?	
Are data backups periodically verified?	
Is Quality Unit authority documented?	
Are previous observations effectively closed?	
Are employees trained in data integrity?	
Are management reviews documented?	

11. INTEGRATED FDA COMPLIANCE RISK MODEL

Table 5. Integrated FDA compliance risk model

Risk domain	Typical failure	Potential consequence	Preventive strategy
Data integrity	Data deletion	Unreliable release decision	Audit trails/access control
Documentation	Missing records	Inability to reconstruct batch	GDP
Laboratory	Unofficial testing	False analytical evidence	Complete raw-data review
QA	Weak oversight	Systemic noncompliance	Independent Quality Unit
CAPA	No root cause	Recurrence	Effectiveness verification
Computerized system	Shared accounts	Loss of attribution	Unique user IDs
Microbiology	False records	Sterility risk	Independent verification

Risk domain	Typical failure	Potential consequence	Preventive strategy
OOS	Poor investigation	Potential defective product	Scientific investigation
Manufacturing	Process failure	Product-quality risk	Process validation
Management	Weak oversight	Persistent deficiencies	Management review

12. CONCLUSION

The findings may assist pharmaceutical manufacturers, quality professionals, academic institutions and pharmacy students in understanding how FDA inspection observations translate into broader expectations for pharmaceutical quality assurance and regulatory compliance. The objective is not to turn pharmacy students into programmers; it is to turn pharmaceutical professionals into scientifically competent users of computational technology.

The Form FDA 483 records inspectional observations that investigators consider objectionable; a Warning Letter is a subsequent regulatory communication concerning significant violations. FDA itself notes that a Form 483 is not a final agency determination and may not contain every objectionable condition found during an inspection. Information & data for this article collected from publicly available FDA records and are therefore appropriately cited.

REFERENCES

[1]. U.S. Food and Drug Administration, *FDA Form 483 Frequently Asked Questions*. FDA, 2020.
[2]. U.S. Food and Drug Administration, *Inspection Observations*. Office of Inspections and Investigations, FDA.
[3]. U.S. Food and Drug Administration, *Warning Letters*. FDA Compliance Actions and Activities.
[4]. U.S. Food and Drug Administration, *Warning & Notice of Violation Letters to Pharmaceutical Companies*. FDA.
[5]. U.S. Food and Drug Administration, *Data Integrity and Compliance With Drug CGMP: Questions and Answers*. FDA.
[6]. U.S. Food and Drug Administration, *Med-Pharmex Inc., Warning Letter 522676*, May 17, 2017.
[7]. U.S. Food and Drug Administration, *Izeen Pharma Inc., Warning Letter 565311*, May 16, 2019.
[8]. U.S. Food and Drug Administration, *Windlas Healthcare Private Limited, Warning Letter 595494*, March 10, 2020.
[9]. U.S. Food and Drug Administration, *Pfizer Healthcare India Private Limited, Warning Letter 594972*, March 25, 2020.
[10]. U.S. Food and Drug Administration, *Adamson Analytical Laboratories Inc., Warning Letter 614644*, August 17, 2021.
[11]. U.S. Food and Drug Administration, *Centrient Pharmaceuticals India Private Limited, Warning Letter 640196*, December 7, 2022.
[12]. U.S. Food and Drug Administration, *Intas Pharmaceuticals Limited, Warning Letter 652067*, July 28, 2023.
[13]. U.S. Food and Drug Administration, *Cipla Limited, Warning Letter 660904*, November 17, 2023.
[14]. U.S. Food and Drug Administration, *Sichuan Deebio Pharmaceutical Co. Ltd., Warning Letter 669808*, February 5, 2024.
[15]. U.S. Food and Drug Administration, *Brassica Pharma Pvt. Ltd., Warning Letter 679005*, July 11, 2024.
[16]. U.S. Food and Drug Administration, *Unexo Lifesciences Private Limited, Warning Letter 688163*, November 6, 2024.
[17]. U.S. Food and Drug Administration, *Granules India Limited, Warning Letter 697115*, February 26, 2025.
[18]. U.S. Food and Drug Administration, *Reliance Life Sciences Private Limited, Warning Letter 730801*, August 18, 2026.
[19]. U.S. Food and Drug Administration, *Dabur India Limited, Warning Letter 728828*, July 24, 2026.
[20]. U.S. Food and Drug Administration, *Huons Co., Ltd., Warning Letter 724650*, June 15, 2026.
[21]. U.S. Food and Drug Administration, *Auriga Research Pvt. Ltd., Warning Letter 730694*, August 12, 2026.
[22]. U.S. Food and Drug Administration, *OII FOIA Electronic Reading Room: Compliance Records and Inspection Data*. FDA.
[23]. U.S. Food and Drug Administration, *Notifications on Data Integrity*. FDA.