IJCRT.ORG ISSN : 2320-2882

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF CREATIVE RESEARCH THOUGHTS (IJCRT)

An International Open Access, Peer-reviewed, Refereed Journal

Force Degradation And Stability Indicating Method For Impurity Profiling

Asst. Prof. Prajakta Mhaske[1], Ms. Dhanashree Todkar*[2],Vijaykumar Kale, Mahesh Thakare, Vaibhav Narwade

[1]Kasturi Shikshan Sanstha College of Pharmacy, Department of Pharmaceutical Chemistry.
*Student, Kasturi Shikshan Sanstha College of Pharmacy.

Corresponding Author

Prajakta Mhaske*
Kasturi Shikshan Sanstha College of Pharamcy, Pharmaceutical Chemistry, Shikrapur, Pune.

Abstract

Pharmaceutical products are vulnerable to degradation during manufacturing, storage, and distribution, which can adversely affect their safety, efficacy, and quality. Forced degradation (stress testing) is a systematic approach used during drug development to deliberately degrade active pharmaceutical ingredients (APIs) and drug products under exaggerated conditions such as hydrolytic, oxidative, photolytic, thermal, and humidity stress. Data generated from these studies support the development of stability-indicating analytical methods (SIAMs) that can selectively quantify the intact drug in the presence of its degradation products and impurities. Impurity profiling, which involves the detection, identification, characterization, and quantification of process- and degradation-related impurities, is essential to comply with International Council for Harmonisation (ICH) impurity guidelines and to ensure patient safety.

This review summarizes the scientific principles of forced degradation, typical stress conditions, degradation mechanisms, and their relevance in understanding the intrinsic stability of drug substances. It further discusses the development and validation of stability-indicating methods, with emphasis on high-performance liquid chromatography (HPLC), liquid chromatography–mass spectrometry (LC–MS), nuclear magnetic resonance (NMR), Fourier transform infrared (FTIR) spectroscopy, and other hyphenated techniques for impurity profiling. Regulatory expectations from ICH Q1A(R2), Q1B, Q2(R1), Q3A(R2), and Q3B(R2), as well as USFDA and pharmacopeial recommendations, are highlighted. Concepts of mass balance and case studies on stability- indicating method development are also presented. Emerging trends such as high-resolution mass spectrometry, two-dimensional chromatography, chemometrics, and risk-based impurity assessment are briefly reviewed. Forced degradation and robust stability-indicating methods together form the backbone of impurity profiling strategies that ensure safe, effective, and stable pharmaceutical products throughout their shelf life.

Keywords: Forced degradation; stress testing; stability-indicating method; impurity profiling; degradation products; HPLC; LC–MS; ICH guidelines; mass balance; drug stability

1.0 Introduction

Drug stability is a critical quality attribute because chemical or physical degradation of active pharmaceutical ingredients (APIs) can reduce potency and generate toxic or inactive degradation products.[1][2] Stability studies are therefore a regulatory requirement for establishing shelf life, storage conditions, and packaging for pharmaceutical products.[14] Stability-indicating analytical methods (SIAMs) are central to these studies because they must distinguish the intact drug from its degradation products and other impurities with adequate sensitivity and selectivity.[4]

Forced degradation, also referred to as stress testing, is an integral part of the systematic stability evaluation strategy. It involves exposing drug substances and drug products to conditions more severe than those used in real-time and accelerated stability studies, with the objective of accelerating degradation and revealing likely degradation pathways. The ICH Q1A(R2) guideline recommends stress testing under conditions such as hydrolysis (acid/base), oxidation, thermal stress, and photolysis to understand the intrinsic stability of the molecule and to support SIAM development.[14]

Impurity profiling is the comprehensive examination of process- and degradation-related impurities in drug substances and products.[7][8] The ICH Q3A(R2) and Q3B(R2) guidelines define thresholds for reporting, identification, and qualification of impurities based on the maximum daily dose of the drug. Advanced techniques such as RP-HPLC, LC–MS, LC–NMR, GC–MS, and FTIR enable detailed characterization of impurities, thereby supporting safety assessment and regulatory compliance.[11][13]

This review describes the objectives and design of forced degradation studies, typical stress conditions and degradation mechanisms, development and validation of stability-indicating methods, impurity profiling strategies, mass balance evaluation, regulatory expectations, illustrative case studies, and future perspectives in this field.

1.1 Principles and Objectives of Forced Degradation

Forced degradation is designed to deliberately degrade the API and/or drug product to generate representative degradation products in a controlled and scientifically justified manner. The main principles are to accelerate degradation without completely destroying the molecule and to generate degradation products that are relevant to likely real-time or long-term degradation pathways.[1]

The key objectives of forced degradation studies include:

- Identification of degradation pathways and products: Stress conditions such as hydrolytic, oxidative, photolytic, thermal, and humidity exposures are used to reveal potential degradation routes and chemical transformations of the API.[3]
- Support for development of stability-indicating methods: Degraded samples containing impurities and degradation products are used to demonstrate the specificity and selectivity of the analytical method.[4–6]
- Understanding intrinsic stability: Stress testing elucidates the sensitivity of the molecule to pH, temperature, light, and oxidants, guiding formulation, packaging, and storage conditions.[1][21]
- Facilitating impurity profiling: Degradation products identified under forced conditions often appear at low levels under long-term storage, making early characterization crucial for impurity profiling.[7–9]
- Evaluating mass balance: Forced degradation data enable assessment of mass balance by summing the remaining parent drug and all measured degradation products, supporting completeness of the

method.[18]

- Regulatory support: Well-designed forced degradation studies strengthen the justification of shelf life, specifications, and analytical procedures in regulatory submissions.[14-17]

Ideally, forced degradation should result in about 5–20% degradation of the parent compound to ensure generation of meaningful levels of degradation products without extensive secondary decomposition.[3][6]

1.2 Stress Testing Conditions and Degradation

1.2.1 Mechanisms Hydrolytic Degradation

Hydrolysis is one of the most common degradation mechanisms for drugs containing ester, amide, carbamate, lactam, lactone, imine, or anhydride functional groups.[23][25] Hydrolytic degradation is studied under:

- Acidic conditions: Typically 0.1–1 M hydrochloric acid or other mineral acids at room or elevated temperatures (e.g., 40–60 °C).[23]
- Alkaline conditions: Usually 0.1–1 M sodium hydroxide or potassium hydroxide under similar temperature ranges.[23][25]

Exposures may range from a few hours to several days depending on the stability of the API.[23] The resulting degradation products are neutralized and analyzed using HPLC or LC–MS to elucidate pathways such as ester cleavage, ring opening, or amide hydrolysis.[23][25]

1.2.1.1 Oxidative Degradation

Oxidative degradation involves electron transfer reactions and is particularly relevant for molecules containing phenolic, anilinic, sulfur-containing, or conjugated double bond systems. Common oxidative conditions include hydrogen peroxide (0.1–3%), metal ions (e.g., Fe^{3+}, Cu^{2+}), or other oxidizing agents at ambient or moderately elevated temperature. Oxidation may lead to formation of N-oxides, sulfoxides, sulfones, or aromatic hydroxylated products. LC–MS and high- resolution MS are often required for detailed characterization of oxidized impurities.[12]

1.2.1.2 Photolytic Degradation

Photostability testing is performed in accordance with ICH Q1B using defined exposure to UV and visible light. APIs containing chromophores that absorb in the UV–visible region can undergo photochemical reactions such as isomerization, bond cleavage, or photo-oxidation. Photodegradation studies are conducted in both solution and solid state, with and without protective packaging, to understand the influence of light and packaging materials.[21]

1.2.1.3 Thermal Degradation

Thermal stress testing exposes drug substances and products to elevated temperatures (e.g., 50–80 °C) in dry or humid conditions. Thermal degradation can involve processes such as oxidation, dehydrogenation, decarboxylation, rearrangement, or Maillard reactions, particularly in the presence of excipients such as reducing sugars. These studies guide recommendations such as “store below 25 °C” or “do not refrigerate,” depending on the degradation profile.[14]

1.2.1.4 Humidity (Moisture) Stress

Solid-state moisture stress testing (e.g., 25 °C/75% RH, 40 °C/75% RH) evaluates the impact of atmospheric moisture on hygroscopic or hydrolytically labile APIs and dosage forms. Moisture can accelerate hydrolysis, polymorphic transformation, or physical changes such as caking and loss of mechanical strength. Humidity stress is particularly important for tablets, capsules, and dry powders.

1.2.1.5 Combined or Sequential Stress

In some cases, combined or sequential stress conditions (e.g., high temperature plus humidity, light plus oxidation) are applied to simulate worst-case scenarios or to reveal complex degradation behavior. Such designs must remain scientifically justified and not unrealistically harsh.[21]

1.3 Development of Stability-Indicating Analytical

1.3.1 Methods Generation of Degraded Samples

The first step in developing a SIAM is the generation of representative degraded samples through the stress conditions described above Each stress condition is optimized to achieve partial but meaningful degradation (≈5–20%). Over-degradation may produce unrealistic artifacts and complicate interpretation, whereas minimal degradation may be insufficient for method development.[3[23]

Degraded samples are neutralized (for acid/base conditions), appropriately diluted, filtered, and injected into the analytical system. HPLC or ultra-performance liquid chromatography (UPLC) profiles are compared with unstressed samples to identify new peaks corresponding to degradation products.

1.3.2 Method Development and Optimization

Reversed-phase HPLC is the most widely used platform for stability-indicating methods because of its versatility, robustness, and compatibility with a broad range of drug molecules. Method development typically involves:

- Selection of stationary phase (e.g., C18, C8, phenyl, polar-embedded columns)
- Optimization of mobile phase composition (aqueous buffer/acid with organic modifiers such as acetonitrile or methanol)
- Adjustment of pH to control ionization of the API and impurities
- Gradient or isocratic elution optimization
- Selection of detection wavelength using UV or photodiode-array (PDA) spectra

The aim is to achieve baseline resolution between the API and all relevant degradation products and related substances, with adequate peak shape and analysis time.[10],[11],[40] When necessary, orthogonal techniques (e.g., different stationary phases, ion-pairing, or normal-phase chromatography) are evaluated.[11]

1.3.3 Role of Chromatographic Peak Purity

PDA or MS detection facilitates peak purity assessment. If the API peak shows a single, consistent spectrum or mass profile across the peak apex and shoulders, it supports that the method separates the API from co-eluting degradants. This is an important element of demonstrating the stability- indicating nature of the method.[4]

1.4 Analytical Techniques for Impurity Profiling

1.4.1 High-Performance Liquid Chromatography (HPLC)

HPLC with UV or PDA detection remains the primary tool for routine stability and impurity testing. It allows quantitative determination of the API and related substances in drug substances and drug products with high precision and reproducibility. Its limitations include lack of direct structural information for unknown impurities, which must be addressed by coupling with spectroscopic methods.[11][22]

1.4.2 Liquid Chromatography–Mass Spectrometry (LC–MS)

LC–MS and LC–MS/MS provide molecular weight and structural information for impurities and degradation products through mass spectra and fragmentation patterns. High-resolution accurate- mass (HRAM) instruments such as time-of-flight (TOF) and Orbitrap systems further enable elemental composition determination and support structure proposals for unknown impurities. LC– MS is therefore indispensable for impurity profiling and elucidation of degradation pathways.[12][22]

1.4.3 Nuclear Magnetic Resonance (NMR) Spectroscopy

NMR is the gold standard for definitive structural elucidation of isolated impurities and degradation products. One-dimensional (^{1}H, ^{13}C) and two-dimensional (COSY, HSQC, HMBC, NOESY) experiments provide detailed information on connectivity and stereochemistry. LC– NMR and NMR coupled with MS greatly accelerate structure confirmation for trace degradation products that are difficult to isolate.[13]

1.4.4 Fourier Transform Infrared (FTIR) and Raman Spectroscopy

FTIR provides information about functional groups, hydrogen bonding, and polymorphic transformations, useful in both solid-state characterization and preliminary impurity identification. Raman spectroscopy offers complementary vibrational information and can be applied in solid- state stability and in-line monitoring.[11][22]

1.4.5 Gas Chromatography–Mass Spectrometry (GC–MS)

GC–MS is crucial for volatile and semi-volatile impurities, including residual solvents and volatile degradation products. Many pharmacopeial methods for residual solvent analysis are based on GC–MS or GC with flame ionization detection.[16]

1.4.6 Hyphenated and Advanced Techniques

Modern impurity profiling increasingly employs hyphenated and multidimensional techniques such as LC–MS–NMR, 2D-LC–MS, and supercritical fluid chromatography (SFC) coupled with MS. These techniques provide enhanced resolving power and structural information, especially useful for complex mixtures and low-level impurities.[18]

1.5 Validation of Stability-Indicating Methods

Analytical methods intended for stability studies must be validated according to ICH Q2(R1). Key validation parameters include:

1.5.1 Specificity

Specificity is the ability of the method to measure the analyte response in the presence of its potential impurities, degradation products, and excipients. The SIAM must demonstrate that the API peak is free from interference by stressing samples under all ICH-recommended conditions and showing distinct separation of drug and degradants.[3]

1.5.2 Linearity and Range

Linearity is established by analyzing a series of calibration levels (typically 50–150% of test concentration for assay and suitable ranges for impurities).[17] The correlation coefficient (r^2) should generally be ≥0.999 for assay and ≥0.995 for related substances, along with acceptable residual plots.[17]

1.5.3 Accuracy

Accuracy (trueness) is evaluated by recovery studies, usually at three or more levels across the range (e.g., 80%, 100%, and 120%). For assay methods, mean recovery should typically be within 98–102%; for impurities at low levels, wider—but justified—criteria may apply.[16]

1.5.4 Precision

Precision includes repeatability and intermediate precision. Repeatability is assessed using multiple injections and sample preparations under the same conditions, while intermediate precision involves different days, analysts, and instruments. Relative standard deviation (RSD) requirements depend on the analyte and level, often ≤2% for assay and ≤10% for impurities.[16][17]

1.5.5 Detection and Quantitation Limits

Limit of detection (LOD) and limit of quantitation (LOQ) can be determined by signal-to-noise ratio (e.g., S/N ≈ 3:1 for LOD and 10:1 for LOQ) or by statistical methods using the standard deviation of the response and the slope of the calibration curve. Low LOQ is particularly important for degradation products and toxic impurities that must be controlled at very low levels.[15]

1.5.6 Robustness

Robustness is evaluated by introducing small deliberate changes in method parameters such as mobile phase composition, pH, flow rate, column temperature, and detection wavelength, then assessing whether system suitability and assay/impurity results remain within acceptance criteria. This supports method reliability during routine use.

1.6 Mass Balance in Forced Degradation Studies

Mass balance is the comparison of the amount of drug lost (based on assay) with the amount of degradation products formed (based on related substances profile), typically expressed as a percentage relative to the initial drug content. A good mass balance (usually within 90–110%) suggests that the analytical method effectively accounts for major degradation products and that no significant undetected losses occur.[18]

Potential causes of poor mass balance include:

- Formation of non-chromophoric or volatile degradation products undetected by the method
- Adsorption to container surfaces or filters
- Degradation to very low-molecular-weight species not retained on the column
- Inaccurate response factors for impurities when using API response for quantitation

Careful evaluation using complementary detection modes (e.g., MS, ELSD, RI, or derivatization) may be needed to resolve mass balance discrepancies.[18][25]

1.7 Regulatory Guidelines and Impurity Thresholds ICH Q1A(R2) and Q1B

ICH Q1A(R2) provides the overall framework for stability testing of new drug substances and products, including long-term, intermediate, and accelerated conditions, and recommends stress testing to identify likely degradation products.[14] ICH Q1B addresses photostability testing, specifying light exposure requirements and evaluation of photolability.[21]

ICH Q2(R1)

ICH Q2(R1) outlines validation requirements for analytical procedures, including those used for assay and impurity testing. It defines parameters such as specificity, linearity, accuracy, precision, range, detection limit, quantitation limit, robustness, and system suitability.

ICH Q3A(R2) and Q3B(R2)

ICH Q3A(R2) (drug substances) and Q3B(R2) (drug products) define impurity thresholds for reporting, identification, and qualification based on daily dose and maximum concentration. These guidelines require that degradation products above defined thresholds be identified and, if necessary, toxicologically qualified.[15]

USFDA and Pharmacopeial Guidance

USFDA guidance documents align closely with ICH impurity guidelines and emphasize the need for stability-indicating methods capable of detecting and quantifying degradation products. USP general chapters (e.g., <1225> for method validation and <1086> for impurities and forced degradation) reinforce similar expectations and provide additional compendial perspectives.[16]

1.8 Case Examples of Stability-Indicating Method Development

Numerous publications demonstrate the practical application of forced degradation and SIAM development for various APIs. For example, stability-indicating RP-HPLC methods have been developed for diuretics, antivirals, and non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs by subjecting drug substances to acid/base hydrolysis, oxidation, photolysis, and thermal stress, followed by RP- HPLC separation and LC–MS characterization of degradation products.[10],[11]

These case studies typically show:

- Identification of multiple degradation products with distinct retention times
- Establishment of chromatographic conditions providing baseline separation
- Validation of methods as per ICH Q2(R1)
- Application of the methods to long-term and accelerated stability studies for quantitative monitoring

of degradants

Such examples illustrate how forced degradation data and impurity profiling guide robust analytical and regulatory strategies.[3][10][11]

1.9 Future Perspectives

Advances in analytical technology and data science are transforming impurity profiling and stability.[12][13][18]

- High-resolution MS and accurate-mass measurement enable rapid structure proposals for unknown impurities and degradation products, even at trace levels.[12][13]
- Two-dimensional LC (2D-LC) and SFC provide enhanced separation for complex mixtures, particularly when conventional one-dimensional chromatography fails to resolve closely related impurities.[12][18]
- Chemometrics and machine learning applied to chromatographic and spectroscopic datasets improve pattern recognition, peak deconvolution, and prediction of degradation pathways.[20][22]
- Risk-based approaches to impurity control, as encouraged in recent ICH and regulatory discussions, integrate toxicological data, process understanding, and analytical capabilities to design science-based specifications and control strategies.[15][16]

Continued development in these areas will further strengthen impurity profiling and stability assessment, ultimately supporting safer and more reliable medicines.

1.10 Conclusion

Forced degradation studies and stability-indicating analytical methods form the scientific and regulatory foundation for impurity profiling in pharmaceutical development and quality control. Properly designed stress studies reveal the degradation pathways and intrinsic stability of APIs, support formulation and packaging decisions, and provide stressed samples required to demonstrate analytical specificity.

Stability-indicating methods, typically based on HPLC and complemented by LC–MS, NMR, FTIR, and other spectroscopic techniques, enable quantitative determination of the intact drug and its degradants in a variety of dosage forms. Validation according to ICH Q2(R1) ensures that these methods are fit for purpose, while impurity thresholds defined in ICH Q3A(R2) and Q3B(R2) guide reporting, identification, and qualification requirements. Mass balance assessment further supports completeness of the analytical approach.

Emerging technologies such as high-resolution MS, 2D-LC, and data-driven analytics are enhancing the depth and efficiency of impurity characterization. Together, force degradation strategies and robust stability-indicating methods ensure that pharmaceutical products remain safe, effective, and of high quality throughout their lifecycle, fulfilling both regulatory expectations and patient needs.

References

1. Baertschi SW, Alsante KM, Reed RA. Pharmaceutical Stress Testing: Predicting Drug Degradation. 2nd ed. Informa Healthcare; 2011.
2. Alsante KM, Baertschi SW, Coutant M, et al. Degradation and impurity analysis for pharmaceutical drug candidates. Adv Drug Deliv Rev. 2007;59(1):29–37.
3. Blessy M, Patel RD, Prajapati PK, Agrawal YK. Development of forced degradation and stability indicating assay methods: A review. J Pharm Biomed Anal. 2014;88:10–24.
4. Singh S, Bakshi M. Guidance on the conduct of stress tests to determine inherent stability of drugs. Pharm Technol. 2000;24(2):1–14.
5. Singhvi I, Singh G. Forced degradation studies: Regulatory guidance, benefits and challenges. Pharm Technol. 2011;35(9):48–56.
6. Baertschi SW. Pharmaceutical stress testing: A science-based approach. J Pharm Biomed Anal. 2005;38(3):329–336.
7. Reddy BV, Raju NA, Sait SS, Vidyadhara S. Impurity profiling of active pharmaceutical ingredients. Indian Drugs. 2010;47(3):5–13.
8. Ahuja S, Alsante KM. Handbook of Isolation and Characterization of Impurities in Pharmaceuticals. Elsevier; 2003.
9. Srivastava B, Singh P, Sharma N, Sharma A. Recent advances in pharmaceutical impurity profiling. Int J Pharm Sci Res. 2020;11(1):18–28.
10. Masne DD, Jatte KP, Khachane MA, Chakole RD, Charde MS. Degradation profiling by RP-HPLC: A review. Int J Pharma Bio Sci. 2021;12(2):445–458.
11. Kumar A, Rattan M, Singh HP. Hyphenated chromatographic techniques for pharmaceutical analysis. J Sep Sci. 2018;41(6):1418–1435.
12. Li J, Wang T, Zhang H. Forced degradation and impurity profiling: Recent trends in pharmaceutical analysis. J Pharm Biomed Anal. 2013;87:130–145.
13. Kaškonienė V, Venskutonis PR. Strategies for identification and characterization of degradation products and impurities. Compr Rev Food Sci Food Saf. 2016;15(1):130–145.
14. International Council for Harmonisation (ICH). Q1A(R2) Stability Testing of New Drug Substances and Products. ICH; 2003.
15. International Council for Harmonisation (ICH). Q3A(R2) Impurities in New Drug Substances. ICH; 2006.
16. International Council for Harmonisation (ICH). Q3B(R2) Impurities in New Drug Products. ICH; 2006.
17. International Council for Harmonisation (ICH). Q2(R1) Validation of Analytical Procedures. ICH; 2005.
18. Baertschi SW. Assessing mass balance in pharmaceutical drug products. J Pharm Biomed Anal. 2013;85:3–9.

19. Zelesky T, Ahn K, Baertschi SW, et al. Pharmaceutical forced degradation (stress testing) for small-molecule drug substances and products. J Pharm Biomed Anal. 2023;229:115955.

20. Rios-Corripio MA, Cervantes L, De La Luz M. Use of artificial intelligence in detecting pharmaceutical adulteration and impurities: A review. Food Chem X. 2021;12:100146.

21. International Council for Harmonisation (ICH). Q1B Photostability Testing of New Drug Substances and Products. ICH; 1996.

22. Impurity Profiling of Pharmaceutical Drugs by Various Analytical Techniques. Int J Pharm Res Anal. 2024;10(1):1–15.

23. Janzen H. Forced Degradation Studies – Comparison Between ICH, USP and Ph.Eur. Approaches [Master's thesis]. University of Bonn; 2015.

24. Baertschi SW, Alsante KM. Reconciling mass balance in forced degradation studies. Pharm Technol. 2005;29(10):86–98.

25. Connors KA, Amidon GL, Stella VJ. Chemical Stability of Pharmaceuticals. Wiley; 1986.

26. Waterman KC, Adami RC. Accelerated aging: Prediction of chemical stability of pharmaceuticals. Int J Pharm. 2005;293(1–2):101–125.

27. Carstensen JT, Rhodes CT. Drug Stability: Principles and Practices. 3rd ed. Marcel Dekker; 2000.

28. Waterman KC. A critical review of accelerated stability testing. J Pharm Sci. 2011;100(9):3243–3277.

29. Riley TN, et al. Oxidative degradation mechanisms of drug molecules. J Pharm Sci. 2014;103(9):2620–2634.

30. Tønnesen HH. Photostability of Drugs and Drug Formulations. CRC Press; 2004.

31. Waterman KC, Carella AJ. Solid-state stability and moisture effects on pharmaceutical products. Pharm Dev Technol. 2010;15(3):355–361.

32. Grodowska K, Parczewski A. Organic solvents in the pharmaceutical industry. Acta Pol Pharm. 2010;67(1):3–12.

33. United States Pharmacopeial Convention. USP <1225> Validation of Compendial Procedures. USP; 2023.

34. United States Pharmacopeial Convention. USP <1086> Impurities in Drug Substances and Drug Products. USP; 2023.

35. United States Food and Drug Administration (FDA). Guidance for Industry: Analytical Procedures and Methods Validation. FDA; 2015.

36. United States Food and Drug Administration (FDA). Guidance for Industry: Q3A(R2) Impurities in New Drug Substances. FDA; 2008.

37. United States Food and Drug Administration (FDA). Guidance for Industry: Q3B(R2) Impurities in New Drug Products. FDA; 2006.

38. Blessy M, Bhatnagar N, Agrawal YK. Stability indicating assay methods for antiviral drugs: A review. Int J Pharm Sci Res. 2022;13(7):2715–2726.

39. Thorat AV, Shaikh MH, Jadhav SD, Chaware PM. Development and validation of a stability-indicating method using factorial design. Int J Pharm Investig. 2016;6(2):88–99.

40. Snyder LR, Kirkland JJ, Dolan JW. Introduction to Modern Liquid Chromatography. 3rd ed. Wiley; 2010.

41. Dong MW. Modern HPLC for Practicing Scientists. Wiley; 2006.

42. Kazakevich Y, Lobrutto R. HPLC for Pharmaceutical Scientists. Wiley; 2007.

43. Veeprho Pharmaceuticals. Review on mass balance in pharmaceutical products. Veeprho; 2025.

44. Al-Gousous J, et al. Regulatory expectations on stability-indicating methods: An overview. J Pharm Regul. 2020;6(1):15–28.

45. Bansal G, Singh M. Quantitative approaches to forced degradation. J Pharm Biomed Anal. 2016;128:65–75.

46. Iqbal MS, et al. Degradation pathways and stability studies of β-lactam antibiotics: A review. J Pharm Biomed Anal. 2017;143:214–226.

47. Bakshi M, Singh S. Development of stability-indicating methods: A critical review. J Pharm Biomed Anal. 2002;28(6):1011–1040.

48. Furlanetto S, Orlandini S. Application of QbD to analytical method development. Anal Bioanal Chem. 2014;406(16):4431–4441.

49. Kazakevich Y. Gradient elution in reversed-phase HPLC: Theory and practice. J Chromatogr A. 2010;1217(23):3716–3732.

50. ICH. Q8(R2) Pharmaceutical Development. International Council for Harmonisation; 2009.