ISSN (Online): 2455-3662
EPRA International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research (IJMR) - Peer Reviewed Journal
Volume: 12| Issue: 5| May 2026|| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2013 ||SJIF Impact Factor 2026: 8.753 || ISI Value: 1.188

STABILITY-INDICATING RP-HPLC METHOD DEVELOPMENT AND VALIDATION: CONTEMPORARY ANALYTICAL STRATEGIES, REGULATORY EVOLUTION, AND RECENT ADVANCES

Divya Shivanath Deshmukh[1], Sachin Bhalekar[2], Omkar Rajaram Gosavi[3], Komal Naresh Aher[4], Ganesh Lamkhade[5], Kuldeep Ramteke[6]

[1,3,4]*Department of Quality Assurance, Samarth Institute of Pharmacy, Belhe, Maharashtra*
[2,5,6]*Department of Quality Assurance, Samarth Institute of Pharmacy, Belhe, Maharashtra*

Article DOI: https://doi.org/10.36713/epra27370
DOI No: 10.36713/epra27370

ABSTRACT

Stability-indicating reversed-phase high-performance liquid chromatography (RP-HPLC) methods are indispensable in pharmaceutical development, regulatory submissions, and quality control. These methods ensure accurate quantification of active pharmaceutical ingredients (APIs) in the presence of degradation products, process impurities, and formulation excipients. Recent years (2020–2025) have witnessed considerable advancements in chromatographic selectivity optimization, forced degradation design, impurity profiling, analytical Quality by Design (AQbD), and environmentally sustainable analytical practices. This review critically evaluates contemporary strategies in stability-indicating RP-HPLC method development, validation under ICH Q2 (R1/R2), degradation pathway assessment, regulatory expectations, and emerging trends including lifecycle management and green analytical chemistry. Emphasis is placed on practical implementation challenges and industry-oriented best practices.

KEYWORDS: *Stability-indicating method, RP-HPLC, Forced degradation, Impurity profiling, ICH Q2 (R2), Analytical QbD, Green chromatography.*

1.INTRODUCTION

The stability of pharmaceutical products is a fundamental determinant of their therapeutic efficacy, safety, and regulatory acceptability. Drug substances are inherently susceptible to chemical, physical, and environmental degradation during manufacturing, storage, and distribution. Degradation may lead not only to reduced potency but also to the formation of potentially toxic impurities. Consequently, regulatory authorities mandate comprehensive stability testing supported by validated analytical methodologies capable of distinguishing the active pharmaceutical ingredient (API) from its degradation products and related impurities (International Council for Harmonization (ICH, 2022).

Among analytical techniques employed in pharmaceutical quality control, high-performance liquid chromatography (HPLC) continues to dominate due to its versatility, sensitivity, and regulatory acceptance. Within this domain, reversed-phase HPLC (RP-HPLC) is the most extensively applied chromatographic mode for small-molecule drug analysis because of its compatibility with diverse physicochemical properties and its ability to provide high resolution across complex matrices (LoBrutto., 2021). The predominance of C18 stationary phases combined with aqueous–organic mobile phases enables effective retention and separation of analytes ranging from moderately polar to highly lipophilic compounds.

A stability-indicating method (SIM) is defined as a validated analytical procedure that accurately and specifically quantifies the API in the presence of its degradation products, process-related impurities, excipients, and other potential contaminants. Regulatory guidance emphasizes that such methods must demonstrate specificity through forced degradation studies designed to generate representative degradation pathways under stress conditions (acidic, basic, oxidative, thermal, and photolytic) (Mitesh Blessy, 2020). These stress studies serve a dual purpose: they confirm the discriminatory power of the method and provide insight into degradation mechanisms.

The role of stability-indicating RP-HPLC has expanded beyond conventional assay determination. Contemporary analytical expectations now include comprehensive impurity profiling, structural elucidation of unknown degradants, and lifecycle performance verification (Rao, 2021). Advances in detection systems such as photodiode array (PDA) detectors and hyphenated techniques including LC–MS have enhanced the ability to confirm peak purity and identify degradation products with greater structural certainty.

Regulatory evolution has further intensified analytical requirements. The revision of ICH Q2 guidelines (Q2 (R2)) emphasizes analytical procedure lifecycle management, robustness evaluation, and risk-based validation strategies (ICH, 2022). Modern method development is therefore increasingly aligned with Analytical Quality by Design (AQbD) principles, wherein critical method parameters (CMPs) are systematically

ISSN (Online): 2455-3662
EPRA International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research (IJMR) - Peer Reviewed Journal
Volume: 12| Issue: 5| May 2026|| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2013 ||SJIF Impact Factor 2026: 8.753 || ISI Value: 1.188

studied using experimental design tools to define a robust design space (Daniel Awotwe-Otoo, 2020). This paradigm shift reduces method variability and enhances reproducibility across laboratories and production sites.

The growing emphasis on environmentally sustainable analytical practices. Conventional RP-HPLC methods often rely heavily on organic solvents such as acetonitrile and methanol, raising environmental and occupational safety concerns. Recent research has explored greener alternatives, solvent minimization strategies, and chromatographic optimization to reduce ecological impact without compromising analytical performance (Andrzej Gałuszka, 2020). This trend aligns with the broader framework of green analytical chemistry.

2.THEORETICAL AND SCIENTIFIC BASIS OF STABILITY-INDICATING RP-HPLC:

Reversed-phase high-performance liquid chromatography (RP-HPLC) operates on the principle of hydrophobic interaction between analytes and a nonpolar stationary phase. The technique has become the backbone of pharmaceutical stability analysis because it allows efficient separation of structurally related degradation products from the parent compound under controlled chromatographic conditions (Dong, 2021). Its applicability across diverse physicochemical drug properties explains its continued regulatory dominance.

2.1 Chromatographic Retention Mechanism in Reversed Phase Systems

In RP-HPLC, the stationary phase typically consists of octadecylsilane (C18) bonded to silica particles, while the mobile phase comprises a polar aqueous buffer mixed with an organic modifier such as acetonitrile or methanol. Retention occurs due to partitioning of analytes between the mobile and stationary phases, influenced primarily by hydrophobic interactions, but also by hydrogen bonding and dipole interactions.

Retention behavior is quantitatively described by the retention factor (k′):

$$k' = tR - t0 / t0$$

Where tR represents analyte retention time and $t0$ is column dead time. Optimal separations generally occur when k′ values range between 2 and 10, ensuring sufficient retention without excessive run time (Douglas A. Skoog, 2021).

2.2 Selectivity, Resolution, and Efficiency in Stability-Indicating Methods

Selectivity (α) represents the relative separation between two analytes and is fundamental to establishing stability-indicating capability. It is defined as:

$$\alpha = k'2/'k'1$$

Where $k'2 > k'1$ Even small changes in mobile phase composition or stationary phase chemistry can significantly influence α values (McNair, 2021).

Resolution (Rs) is given by:

$$Rs = 2(tR2 - tR1) / W1 + W2$$

Regulatory guidelines generally consider Rs ≥ 2.0 as acceptable to confirm baseline separation between API and degradation products (Miller, 2021).

Column efficiency is expressed by the number of theoretical plates (N):

$$N = 16(TR/ W) 2$$

Advancements in particle technology, particularly core-shell and sub-2 µm particles, have enhanced efficiency while reducing analysis time, a feature increasingly adopted in post-2020 stability studies (Guiochon, 2020).

2.3 Influence of Stationary Phase Chemistry:

Although C18 remains the most commonly used stationary phase, modern pharmaceutical analysis increasingly explores alternative chemistries to resolve structurally similar degradants. Phenyl-hexyl columns provide π–π interaction selectivity useful for aromatic drugs, while polar-embedded phases reduce tailing for basic compounds (Lesellier, 2022).

Residual silanol groups on silica surfaces may interact with basic drugs, leading to peak tailing. End-capping techniques and hybrid silica technologies have reduced such interactions, improving peak symmetry and reproducibility (Nobuo Tanaka, 2020).

2.4 Mobile Phase Composition and pH Control:

Mobile phase selection is a decisive parameter in stability-indicating method development. Organic modifiers influence solvent strength, viscosity, and UV transparency. Acetonitrile produces sharper peaks due to lower viscosity, whereas methanol may enhance selectivity in certain separations (Poole, 2020).

Buffer selection is critical for maintaining pH stability and minimizing retention drift. Phosphate buffers are widely used for UV detection due to strong buffering capacity; however, volatile buffers such as ammonium formate are preferred when LC-MS compatibility is required for degradant identification (Niessen, 2021).

Temperature also influences analyte partitioning. Elevated column temperatures (30–40°C) often improve peak shape and reduce backpressure, but excessive temperatures may accelerate on-column degradation of labile compounds (Marcelo D. Dolzan, 2022).

2.5 Degradation Chemistry and Its Chromatographic Implications

Understanding degradation pathways is central to designing a stability-indicating method. Drug degradation may occur via hydrolysis, oxidation, photolysis, or thermal breakdown. Each mechanism produces degradation products with distinct polarity and chromatographic behavior (David W. Reynolds, 2020).

For example:

- Acidic hydrolysis often yields more polar fragments.
- Oxidative degradation may increase polarity due to hydroxylation.
- Photolysis can generate structural isomers.

These variations demand sufficient chromatographic window width to resolve early-eluting polar degradants and late-eluting

ISSN (Online): 2455-3662
EPRA International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research (IJMR) - Peer Reviewed Journal
Volume: 12| Issue: 5| May 2026|| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2013 ||SJIF Impact Factor 2026: 8.753 || ISI Value: 1.188

nonpolar products within a single method (Steven W. Baertschi, 2021).

2.6 Detection Techniques in Stability-Indicating RP-HPLC:
UV and photodiode array (PDA) detection remain primary tools in routine QC. PDA detectors enable spectral comparison across peaks, assisting in peak purity evaluation and confirming absence of co-eluting impurities (Krull, 2020).
However, recent studies increasingly combine RP-HPLC with mass spectrometry (LC-MS) for structural elucidation of unknown degradants. This approach enhances specificity and allows identification of trace-level impurities that may not be fully characterized by UV detection alone (Niessen, 2021).

2.7 System Suitability and Method Performance Indicators:
System suitability testing ensures chromatographic performance before sample analysis. Typical parameters include:

- Theoretical plates (N > 2000)
- Tailing factor (<1.5)
- Resolution (≥2.0)
- %RSD of peak area (<2%)

Modern regulatory expectations require demonstration of method capability under slightly varied conditions, emphasizing analytical robustness rather than single-point validation (Huber, 2020).

3.SYSTEMATIC STRATEGY FOR STABILITY-INDICATING RP-HPLC METHOD DEVELOPMENT

The development of a stability-indicating RP-HPLC method is a structured scientific process rather than an empirical exercise. Contemporary regulatory expectations require that analytical methods demonstrate robustness, specificity, and reproducibility under real stability conditions. Modern approaches integrate physicochemical characterization, chromatographic screening, forced degradation mapping, and risk-based optimization strategies (Jayant N. Sangshetti, 2020).

3.1 Preliminary Analytical Assessment of the API:
Method development begins with a comprehensive understanding of the physicochemical characteristics of the drug molecule. Critical attributes include:

- Molecular weight
- Structural functional groups
- Ionization constant (pKa)
- Partition coefficient (logP)
- UV absorption maxima (λmax)
- Solubility profile

Drugs containing ester or amide functionalities are typically susceptible to hydrolysis, whereas aromatic amines may undergo oxidative degradation (Tiwari, 2021). Knowledge of these structural vulnerabilities allows prediction of likely degradants and informs chromatographic window design.

UV spectral scanning is generally performed between 200–400 nm to identify optimal detection wavelength. Selection of λmax enhances sensitivity and minimizes interference from excipients (Snehal Gandhi, 2020).

3.2 Selection of Chromatographic Mode and Column Screening:
Although reversed-phase chromatography is most commonly employed, initial scouting may include evaluation of different stationary phases to optimize selectivity. Contemporary studies emphasize systematic column screening using multiple chemistries rather than relying solely on conventional C18 phases (Watson, 2021).

3.2.1 Stationary Phase Considerations:
Parameters influencing column selection include:

- Carbon load
- Surface area
- Pore size
- End-capping efficiency

Highly basic drugs often exhibit peak tailing due to silanol interactions; therefore, hybrid silica or base-deactivated columns are preferred.

Core-shell particle technology has demonstrated improved efficiency and reduced band broadening compared to fully porous particles, allowing faster separations without compromising resolution (Szabolcs Fekete, 2021).

3.3 Mobile Phase Development Strategy:
Mobile phase optimization is central to achieving separation between API and degradation products. The selection of aqueous buffer and organic modifier significantly influences retention, selectivity, and peak symmetry.

The buffer must:

- Maintain consistent pH throughout analysis
- Be compatible with detection system
- Avoid precipitation in high organic content

Phosphate buffers are widely used in UV-based methods due to buffering strength; however, volatile buffers such as ammonium acetate are preferred for LC-MS compatible stability studies (Graham Harris, 2022).

pH adjustment is typically optimized using scouting runs at ±1 unit around the analyte pKa to evaluate retention behavior. Even a 0.2-unit pH change may significantly affect selectivity for ionizable compounds.

3.3.2 Organic Modifier Selection
Acetonitrile provides lower viscosity and sharper peaks compared to methanol, resulting in reduced system backpressure and improved efficiency. However, methanol may improve selectivity for aromatic or hydrogen-bonding analytes.

ISSN (Online): 2455-3662
EPRA International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research (IJMR) - Peer Reviewed Journal
Volume: 12| Issue: 5| May 2026|| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2013 ||SJIF Impact Factor 2026: 8.753 || ISI Value: 1.188

Recent green chemistry efforts promote ethanol as an alternative organic solvent, demonstrating acceptable chromatographic performance with reduced environmental impact (Joanna Płotka-Wasylka, 2021).

3.4 Gradient vs Isocratic Elution:
Selection between gradient and isocratic modes depends on impurity complexity.

Feature	Isocratic	Gradient
Simplicity	High	Moderate
Suitability	Single API, few impurities	Multiple degradants
Run time	Short	Variable
Selectivity control	Limited	Flexible

Gradient elution is particularly advantageous when degradation products exhibit wide polarity distribution (Vishal Kumar, 2022). Modern pharmaceutical formulations often require gradient methods to resolve early-eluting polar degradants and late-eluting lipophilic impurities in a single run.

3.5 Optimization of Chromatographic Parameters:
After preliminary scouting, fine optimization is conducted.

3.5.1 Flow Rate Optimization
Typical flow rates range from 0.8–1.5 mL/min for 4.6 mm columns. Decreasing flow rate improves resolution but increases run time. Optimized balance is achieved using resolution modeling approaches (Sebastian Bocian, 2020).

3.5.2 Column Temperature
Temperature affects viscosity, mass transfer, and selectivity. Increasing column temperature (30–40°C) reduces solvent viscosity and improves peak shape but may accelerate degradation of labile compounds during analysis (Yong Zhang, 2021).

3.5.3 Injection Volume and Sample
Solvent Compatibility:
Mismatch between sample solvent and mobile phase may cause peak distortion. Stability-indicating methods often require sample dilution in initial mobile phase composition to maintain peak integrity (Luciana Cruz, 2022).

3.6 Forced Degradation-Integrated Method Development:
Unlike routine assay methods, stability-indicating development integrates forced degradation early in the process.

3.6.1 Sequential Workflow
- Develop preliminary separation for API
- Conduct stress studies
- Inject degraded samples
- Identify co-elution risks
- Modify gradient or pH
- Re-evaluate resolution

Forced degradation profiles guide chromatographic adjustments to ensure all degradants are resolved (K. Kishore Hotha, 2020).

3.6.2 Target Degradation Level
Regulatory recommendations suggest achieving 5–20% degradation to meaningfully demonstrate specificity (Subrata Chowdhury, 2021). Excessive degradation may produce secondary degradants complicating separation.

3.7 Peak Purity Assessment:
Photodiode array (PDA) detection is used to compare UV spectra across peak apex and shoulders. Purity angle must be lower than purity threshold to confirm absence of co-eluting impurities.
When ambiguity persists, LC-MS confirmation may be required to ensure degradant resolution (R. Nagarajan Rao, 2022).

3.8 System Suitability Establishment:
Before routine use, system suitability parameters must be defined:
- Theoretical plates (N > 3000 in many modern methods)
- Tailing factor (<1.5)
- Resolution (>2.0)
- %RSD of replicate injections (<2%)

Acceptance criteria are typically derived from validation data and statistical analysis (Prasanta K. Sahu, 2021).

3.9 Robustness Assessment During Development:
Robustness testing ensures that minor variations do not compromise separation.
Common deliberate variations:
- Flow rate ±0.1 mL/min
- pH ±0.2
- Organic composition ±2%
- Temperature ±5°C

Multivariate robustness evaluation using factorial design has become increasingly common (Nethercote, 2020).

4.FORCED DEGRADATION STUDIES IN STABILITY-INDICATING RP-HPLC
4.1 Purpose and Regulatory Importance:
Forced degradation studies constitute a fundamental component of stability-indicating method development. Their primary objective is to deliberately degrade the active pharmaceutical ingredient (API) under controlled stress conditions to generate potential degradation products and thereby demonstrate the specificity and discriminatory capability of the analytical method. Regulatory authorities explicitly require forced degradation data to support the claim that an analytical method is stability-indicating ((FDA), 2023).

ICH guidelines emphasize that stress testing should elucidate intrinsic stability characteristics of the molecule and establish

ISSN (Online): 2455-3662
EPRA International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research (IJMR) - Peer Reviewed Journal
Volume: 12| Issue: 5| May 2026|| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2013 ||SJIF Impact Factor 2026: 8.753 || ISI Value: 1.188

degradation pathways (ICH, 2022). Unlike routine stability studies, which evaluate products under long-term and accelerated storage conditions, forced degradation intentionally applies harsher conditions to induce 5–20% degradation. This degradation window is widely accepted because it is sufficient to generate meaningful degradation products without completely destroying the parent compound (David W. Reynolds, 2020).
From a scientific standpoint, forced degradation provides insight into:

- Mechanistic degradation pathways
- Identification of labile functional groups
- Selection of chromatographic conditions
- Development of impurity profiles
- Structural elucidation of unknown degradants

Recent studies have emphasized that forced degradation is not merely regulatory formality but a predictive tool for formulation development and packaging decisions (Seyed Hosseini, 2021).

4.2 Stress Conditions Employed in Forced Degradation:
Forced degradation protocols typically include hydrolytic (acidic and basic), oxidative, thermal, photolytic, and humidity stress. Selection of stress intensity depends on drug physicochemical properties, such as pKa, solubility, and functional groups.

4.2.1 Acidic and Basic Hydrolysis:
Hydrolytic degradation is common in drugs containing ester, amide, lactam, or imine functionalities. Acidic hydrolysis is generally performed using 0.1–1 M hydrochloric acid at temperatures ranging from 40°C to 80°C for 1–24 hours. Basic hydrolysis typically employs sodium hydroxide at similar molar concentrations (Alejandro Alvarez-Lueje, 2021).

Recent reports suggest that basic hydrolysis often causes more rapid degradation than acidic stress, especially in β-lactam antibiotics and ester-containing drugs (K. V. Gowda, 2022). Chromatographic separation under these conditions must ensure baseline resolution between API and hydrolytic degradants.

4.2.2 Oxidative Degradation:
Oxidative degradation is frequently induced using hydrogen peroxide (0.3–3%). Drugs containing phenolic, tertiary amine, or sulfur moieties are particularly susceptible. Oxidative stress may produce N-oxides, sulfoxides, or quinone derivatives (Yong Zhang, 2021).
Recent analytical strategies incorporate LC–MS coupling during oxidative stress evaluation to confirm molecular mass changes of degradation products (M. A. Khan, 2023). Such approaches strengthen structural characterization and enhance impurity profiling accuracy.

4.2.3 Thermal Degradation
Thermal stress evaluates the intrinsic stability of the API at elevated temperatures (typically 60–105°C). Solid-state degradation may differ significantly from solution-state degradation due to molecular mobility differences (J. Martins, 2021).
Thermal degradation studies are especially important for drugs intended for tropical climatic zones (Zone IVb: 30°C/75% RH), where stability challenges are more pronounced.

4.2.4 Photolytic Degradation
Photostability testing follows ICH Q1B guidelines and typically involves exposure to 1.2 million lux hours of visible light and 200 Wh/m² UV energy. Molecules containing conjugated double bonds or aromatic systems are highly photosensitive ((EMA), 2022).
Modern RP-HPLC methods incorporate photodiode array (PDA) detectors to evaluate peak purity during photodegradation, ensuring co-eluting impurities are detected.

4.2.5 Humidity Stress
Moisture-induced degradation is particularly relevant for hygroscopic drugs and hydrolytically unstable compounds. High humidity conditions (75–90% RH) are applied to evaluate moisture sensitivity (B. V. Reddy, 2021).

4.3 Design Considerations for Forced Degradation:
4.3.1 Target Degradation Level:
Most literature recommends 5–20% degradation to validate stability-indicating capability (D. W. Reynolds, 2020). Degradation below 5% may not generate sufficient impurity peaks, whereas degradation exceeding 30% may complicate interpretation.

4.3.2 Mass Balance Evaluation:
Mass balance assessment ensures that total assay plus degradation products approximates 100%. Acceptable mass balance typically ranges between 95–105% (V. Chaudhari, 2022). Deviations may indicate volatile degradation products or incomplete detection.

4.3.3 Peak Purity Assessment:
Peak purity analysis using PDA detection confirms absence of co-eluting degradants. A purity angle lower than purity threshold indicates spectral homogeneity (M. R. Siddiqui, 2023).

4.4 Chromatographic Optimization During Forced Degradation:
Stress studies often necessitate chromatographic refinement. Critical parameters adjusted include:

- Mobile phase pH
- Organic solvent proportion
- Buffer molarity
- Column chemistry (C18 vs phenyl vs C8)
- Gradient profile

Recent work has shown that gradient elution significantly improves separation of structurally similar degradants compared to isocratic systems.
Ultra-high-performance liquid chromatography (UHPLC) with sub-2 µm particles has further enhanced resolution while reducing run time below 10 minutes, improving throughput (P. Bora, 2022).

ISSN (Online): 2455-3662
EPRA International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research (IJMR) - Peer Reviewed Journal
Volume: 12| Issue: 5| May 2026|| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2013 ||SJIF Impact Factor 2026: 8.753 || ISI Value: 1.188

4.5 Hyphenated Techniques in Degradation Product Identification:

RP-HPLC coupled with mass spectrometry (LC–MS/MS) has become a powerful tool for degradation pathway elucidation. Accurate mass determination and fragmentation analysis enable structural assignment of unknown degradants (Y. Wang, 2024).
High-resolution MS combined with forced degradation provides mechanistic insight into oxidative and hydrolytic pathways, facilitating regulatory submissions (S. Mishra, 2023).

5.ANALYTICAL QUALITY BY DESIGN (AQBD) IN STABILITY-INDICATING RP-HPLC METHOD DEVELOPMENT

5.1 Evolution from Traditional Method Development to AQbD:

Conventional RP-HPLC method development historically relied on trial-and-error optimization, where chromatographic parameters such as mobile phase composition, pH, and flow rate were adjusted sequentially until acceptable separation was achieved. Although this approach may yield a functional method, it rarely provides deep understanding of method variability or robustness (Jitendra Sangshetti, 2020).

The implementation of AQbD aligns with ICH Q14 (analytical procedure development) and the revised ICH Q2 (R2), both of which advocate a structured approach to method development and continuous performance verification ((ICH), 2023). For stability-indicating RP-HPLC methods, AQbD ensures reliable separation of API and degradation products under variable operational conditions.

5.2 Defining the Analytical Target Profile (ATP):

The foundation of AQbD lies in defining the Analytical Target Profile (ATP). The ATP specifies what the method must measure and the required performance criteria. For a stability-indicating RP-HPLC method, ATP typically includes:
Accurate quantification of API (e.g., 98–102% recovery)
Resolution ≥ 2.0 between API and nearest degradant
Relative standard deviation (RSD) ≤ 2%
Limit of detection (LOD) below impurity reporting threshold
Clear ATP definition reduces ambiguity during regulatory review and facilitates lifecycle flexibility.
Recent publications emphasize that ATP should be statistically defined rather than qualitatively described, incorporating acceptance criteria for resolution, tailing factor, and theoretical plates (Manish Dixit, 2024).

5.3 Identification of Critical Quality Attributes (CQAs):

In chromatographic methods, Critical Quality Attributes (CQAs) refer to measurable characteristics that directly affect method performance. For stability-indicating RP-HPLC, common CQAs include:

- Peak resolution
- Retention time
- Peak symmetry (tailing factor)
- Signal-to-noise ratio
- Selectivity factor

Multivariate statistical evaluation has demonstrated that resolution and peak purity are the most sensitive indicators of method failure during degradation studies (Tanuja Velpandian, 2021).

5.4 Risk Assessment Strategies:

AQbD incorporates systematic risk assessment tools to identify Critical Method Parameters (CMPs) that influence CQAs. Frequently applied tools include:

- Ishikawa (fishbone) diagrams
- Failure Mode and Effects Analysis (FMEA)
- Risk priority number (RPN) ranking

Recent literature highlights the integration of risk ranking with preliminary screening experiments to eliminate insignificant factors early in development (Anil Menon, 2023).

5.5 Design of Experiments (DoE) in RP-HPLC Optimization:

One of the most transformative aspects of AQbD is the application of Design of Experiments (DoE). Unlike one-factor-at-a-time experimentation, DoE evaluates multiple variables simultaneously and models interaction effects.

5.5.1 Screening Designs:

Screening designs such as fractional factorial and Plackett–Burman designs are used to identify significant parameters among many candidates. These designs reduce experimental burden while maintaining statistical validity.

5.5.2 Optimization Designs:

After identifying critical parameters, response surface methodologies (RSM) such as:

- Central Composite Design (CCD)
- Box–Behnken Design (BBD)

Are employed to define optimal parameter ranges.
In stability-indicating methods, typical responses modeled include:

- Resolution between API and degradant
- Peak symmetry
- Run time

Response surface contour plots enable visualization of method performance across multidimensional parameter space.

5.6 Establishment of Method Operable Design Region (MODR)

The Method Operable Design Region (MODR) represents a multidimensional combination of CMPs where the method consistently meets ATP requirements. Unlike a single optimized condition, MODR provides flexibility for routine operation.

Regulatory agencies increasingly recognize MODR as a tool for post-approval flexibility, reducing the need for regulatory re-submission when minor parameter adjustments are made within the approved design space (Ananya Joseph, 2023).

ISSN (Online): 2455-3662
EPRA International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research (IJMR) - Peer Reviewed Journal
Volume: 12| Issue: 5| May 2026|| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2013 ||SJIF Impact Factor 2026: 8.753 || ISI Value: 1.188

5.7 Robustness and Lifecycle Management:
Robustness testing under AQbD differs from traditional ±2% variation experiments. Instead, robustness is mathematically predicted through multivariate modeling and verified experimentally.
Lifecycle management involves:

- Continuous system suitability monitoring
- Trend analysis
- Periodic revalidation

5.8 Integration of AQbD with Forced Degradation:
In stability-indicating method development, AQbD is particularly valuable when degradation products exhibit similar polarity to the parent drug. Statistical modeling helps identify pH–organic composition combinations that maximize resolution between structurally related degradants (Ankit Giri, 2020).

Furthermore, degradation pathways can be incorporated as response variables during DoE optimization, ensuring that stress-generated impurities remain resolved across method variations.

6.VALIDATION OF STABILITY-INDICATING RP-HPLC METHODS

6.1 Regulatory Framework for Analytical Validation:
Validation of stability-indicating RP-HPLC methods ensures that the analytical procedure is fit for its intended purpose throughout the product lifecycle. Recent regulatory developments, particularly the implementation of ICH Q2 (R2) and ICH Q14, have modernized validation philosophy by integrating lifecycle management, risk-based evaluation, and statistical justification of performance characteristics ((ICH), 2023) ((EMA), 2022).

6.2 Specificity and Selectivity:
Specificity is the most critical parameter for a stability-indicating method. It refers to the ability of the RP-HPLC method to measure the analyte unequivocally in the presence of degradation products, excipients, impurities, and matrix components.
Modern validation practice requires:

- Chromatographic separation (resolution ≥ 2.0)
- Peak purity analysis using PDA detection
- Orthogonal confirmation, when necessary (e.g., LC–MS)

For complex formulations, selectivity may also require placebo interference testing and spiked degradation mixture evaluation (Rakesh Verma, 2022).

6.3 Linearity and Range
Linearity establishes the proportional relationship between analyte concentration and detector response. For assay methods, linearity is typically evaluated across 80–120% of target concentration, whereas impurity methods may require linearity from LOQ to 150% of specification limit.
Statistical assessment includes:

- Correlation coefficient ($r \geq 0.999$ preferred for assay)
- Slope and intercept evaluation
- Residual analysis
- Analysis of variance (ANOVA)

6.4 Accuracy (Recovery Studies):
Accuracy reflects the closeness of measured values to true values. It is typically assessed through recovery studies by spiking known quantities of standard into matrix.
Acceptance criteria generally include:

- 98–102% recovery for assay
- 95–105% for impurities (depending on concentration level)

Recent validation strategies incorporate triplicate recovery at three concentration levels (50%, 100%, and 150%) to ensure robustness across range.
Statistical confidence intervals are increasingly reported to strengthen regulatory acceptance (Robert Baker, 2021).

6.5 Precision
Precision evaluates reproducibility under specified conditions.

6.5.1 Repeatability (Intra-day Precision):
Repeatability is assessed by analyzing multiple replicates ($n \geq 6$) at target concentration within a single day. RSD values ≤ 2% are typically acceptable for assay methods.

6.5.2 Intermediate Precision (Inter-day / Analyst Variation):
Intermediate precision examines variability across days, analysts, instruments, or columns.
Multifactor precision studies using ANOVA have become standard in recent regulatory submissions.
For impurity methods, RSD ≤ 5% is often acceptable depending on concentration level (Mohammad Rahman, 2023).

6.6 Limit of Detection (LOD) and Limit of Quantification (LOQ):
LOD and LOQ are particularly critical for impurity profiling in stability-indicating methods.
Common determination approaches include:

- Signal-to-noise ratio (3:1 for LOD, 10:1 for LOQ)
- Standard deviation of response and slope method
- Calibration curve residual method

6.7 Robustness:
Robustness evaluates method reliability under small deliberate variations.
Typical variations include:

- ±0.2 pH units
- ±10% organic composition
- ±0.1 mL/min flow rate
- ±5°C column temperature

Recent validation philosophy integrates multivariate robustness modeling instead of isolated parameter testing. This approach predicts method failure probability and strengthens regulatory defensibility.

ISSN (Online): 2455-3662
EPRA International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research (IJMR) - Peer Reviewed Journal
Volume: 12| Issue: 5| May 2026|| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2013 ||SJIF Impact Factor 2026: 8.753 || ISI Value: 1.188

System suitability parameters such as theoretical plates (N > 2000), tailing factor (< 2.0), and resolution are monitored during robustness assessment ((USP), United States Pharmacopeia 47 – National Formulary 42, 2024).

6.8 System Suitability Testing:

System suitability ensures chromatographic system performance prior to sample analysis.

Parameters typically include:

- Retention time consistency
- Theoretical plates
- Tailing factor
- Resolution between critical peaks

Automated system suitability algorithms integrated within chromatography software have enhanced detection of early column deterioration (Yan Chen, 2023).

6.9 Stability of Analytical Solutions:

Solution stability studies confirm that standard and sample preparations remain stable during analysis.

Typical evaluation includes:

- Short-term stability (24–48 hours at room temperature)
- Refrigerated stability (2–8°C)
- Autosampler stability

Degradation exceeding ±2% during solution stability testing may indicate method vulnerability (Salman Iqbal, 2021).

6.10 Statistical Considerations in Modern Validation:

Analytical validation has increasingly incorporated statistical rigor.

Key statistical tools include:

- Confidence interval estimation
- Capability index (Cpk)
- Total error concept
- Tolerance interval calculation

Total analytical error (systematic + random error) provides a holistic measure of method performance.

Regulatory reviewers increasingly expect statistical justification rather than descriptive summaries ((EMA), 2022).

7.RECENT APPLICATIONS AND CASE STUDIES OF STABILITY-INDICATING RP-HPLC

Stability-indicating RP-HPLC methods have been extensively developed across diverse therapeutic categories, driven by regulatory scrutiny, accelerated drug development pipelines, and increased emphasis on impurity profiling. Recent literature demonstrates improvements in resolution efficiency, run-time reduction, and integration with hyphenated detection systems for degradation pathway elucidation.

The increasing complexity of pharmaceutical formulations including fixed-dose combinations (FDCs), nanocarriers, and modified-release systems has necessitated highly selective analytical methods capable of resolving multiple degradation products within constrained chromatographic windows (Ritu Jain, 2022).

7.1 Antiviral Agents

A study by (Samar El-Gizawy, 2021) reported a stability-indicating RP-HPLC method for remdesivir capable of separating six degradation products within 12 minutes using gradient elution. Oxidative degradation was found to be the most critical pathway.

Similarly, (Kunal Patel, 2022) developed a method for favipiravir with detection limits below 0.05%, meeting ICH impurity thresholds. Their forced degradation data demonstrated acid-labile characteristics.

7.2 Anticancer Agents

Oncology drugs often exhibit structural complexity and high potency, requiring ultra-sensitive impurity detection.

(Priya Shah, 2020) Developed a stability-indicating RP-HPLC method for lenvatinib with resolution >2.5 between API and oxidative degradants. The study emphasized thermal degradation susceptibility.

More recently, (Farhan Ahmad, 2024) reported a UHPLC-based stability-indicating method for palbociclib, achieving sub-0.02% LOQ for impurities, demonstrating the shift toward high-resolution systems.

7.3 Cardiovascular Drugs

Cardiovascular drugs remain among the most widely studied therapeutic categories for stability-indicating analysis.

(Rao, 2021)Developed a method for sacubitril–valsartan combination tablets, successfully resolving degradation peaks arising from alkaline hydrolysis.

In another study, (Suresh Nair, 2023) evaluated degradation pathways of apixaban under photolytic stress and demonstrated that resolution was significantly influenced by mobile phase buffer concentration.

7.4 Antidiabetic Agents

Antidiabetic drugs, including metformin combinations and DPP-4 inhibitors, have been extensively studied for degradation profiling.

(Sameer Chowhan, 2020) Reported a stability-indicating RP-HPLC method for sitagliptin with acid-induced degradation products separated using phenyl stationary phase.

7.5 Central Nervous System (CNS) Drugs:

CNS drugs often contain heterocyclic structures prone to oxidative degradation.

A stability-indicating method for duloxetine developed by (Neha Bhatia, 2021) demonstrated oxidative degradant formation at 0.5% hydrogen peroxide exposure.

ISSN (Online): 2455-3662
EPRA International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research (IJMR) - Peer Reviewed Journal
Volume: 12| Issue: 5| May 2026|| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2013 ||SJIF Impact Factor 2026: 8.753 || ISI Value: 1.188

Similarly, aripiprazole degradation studies indicated photolytic sensitivity, requiring light-protective sample handling (Sunil Kamble, 2023).

7.6 Antibiotics and Anti-Infective Agents:

Antibiotics, especially β-lactams and macrolides, exhibit hydrolytic instability.

A study by (Mohammad Rahim, 2022) demonstrated rapid alkaline degradation of cefixime, requiring low-pH mobile phase to maintain stability during analysis.

Azithromycin degradation profiling has shown thermal and oxidative sensitivity, with gradient RP-HPLC necessary for impurity resolution (Rajesh Singh, 2023).

References:

1. *(EMA), E. M. (2022). Guideline on photostability testing of new drug substances and products. European Medicines Agency.*
2. *(FDA), U. F. (2023). Analytical procedures and methods validation for drugs and biologics: Guidance for industry. U.S. Food and Drug Administration.*
3. *(ICH), I. C. (2023). ICH Q14: Analytical procedure development. International Council for Harmonisation of Technical Requirements for Pharmaceuticals for Human Use (ICH).*
4. *(ISO), I. O. (2020). ISO 11843: Capability of detection. International Organization for Standardization.*
5. *(USP), U. S. (2024). United States Pharmacopeia 47 – National Formulary 42. United States Pharmacopeial Convention.*
6. *(USP), U. S. (2024). United States Pharmacopeia 47 – National Formulary 42. United States Pharmacopeial Convention.*
7. *Alejandro Alvarez-Lueje, N. P. (2021). Hydrolytic degradation profiling of pharmaceutical compounds using RP-HPLC. Journal of Pharmaceutical Analysis, 11(5), 620–629.*
8. *Alejandro Morales, J. C. (2024). Advanced chromatographic evaluation of CNS drug degradation. Journal of Chromatography A, 1705, Article number: 464145.*
9. *Ananya Joseph, V. R. (2023). Regulatory perspectives on method operable design region (MODR). Regulatory Toxicology and Pharmacology, 141, 105423.*
10. *Andrzej Gałuszka, Z. M. (2020). The 12 principles of green analytical chemistry and their significance in pharmaceutical analysis. TrAC Trends in Analytical Chemistry, 130, Article number 115981.*
11. *Anil Menon, K. S. (2023). Integrated risk ranking and screening design in AQbD. Journal of Pharmaceutical Analysis, 13(4), 358–367.*
12. *Anil Prakash, S. G. (2024). Empagliflozin degradation and impurity profiling. Arabian Journal of Chemistry, 17(1), Article number: 105221.*
13. *Anjali Gadgil, S. P. (2021). Application of DoE in analytical method optimization. Journal of Chromatographic Science, 59(6), 529–538.*
14. *Ankit Giri, P. S. (2020). Application of response surface methodology in stability-indicating method optimization. Journal of Applied Pharmaceutical Science, 10(11), 110–118.*
15. *Anurag S. Rathore, P. S. (2021). Analytical quality by design: A review of current regulatory expectations. TrAC Trends in Analytical Chemistry, 136, 116207.*
16. *B. V. Reddy, N. G. (2021). Moisture-induced degradation of hygroscopic drugs. International Journal of Pharmaceutical Sciences and Research, 12(8), 4201–4210.*
17. *Borman, D. P. (2022). Analytical lifecycle management in pharmaceutical analysis. Journal of Validation Technology, 28(2), 15–27.*
18. *Broeckhoven, G. D. (2022). Advances in particle technology for pharmaceutical HPLC analysis. Journal of Chromatography A, 1673, Article number 463122.*
19. *Carmen Martínez-Pérez, M. R. (2021). Stability assessment of liposomal formulations by RP-HPLC. Colloids and Surfaces B: Biointerfaces, 208, rticle number: 112054.*
20. *D. W. Reynolds, K. L. (2020). Recommendations for forced degradation studies in pharmaceutical analysis. Pharmaceutical Technology, 44(5), 32–40.*
21. *Daniel Awotwe-Otoo, C. A. (2020). Application of quality by design principles to analytical method development and validation. Journal of Pharmaceutical and Biomedical Analysis, 179, Article number 112913.*
22. *Daniel Hernandez, K. P. (2024). Weighted regression models in impurity analysis. Journal of Chromatographic Science, 62(3), 201–210.*
23. *David W. Reynolds, K. L. (2020). Strategies for forced degradation studies. Pharmaceutical Technology, 44(7), 28–34.*
24. *Dong, M. W. (2021). Modern HPLC for practicing scientists (2nd edition). Wiley.*
25. *Douglas A. Skoog, F. J. (2021). Principles of instrumental analysis (7th edition). Cengage Learning.*
26. *Eric Rozet, P. L. (2021). Analytical Quality by Design in pharmaceutical method development. TrAC Trends in Analytical Chemistry, 143, Article number 116352.*
27. *Eric Rozet, P. L. (2021). Analytical Quality by Design in pharmaceutical method development. TrAC Trends in Analytical Chemistry, 143, Article number 116352.*
28. *Farhan Ahmad, M. R. (2024). UHPLC stability-indicating method for palbociclib. Journal of Chromatographic Science, 62(5), 412–421.*
29. *Graham Harris, D. V. (2022). Buffer systems in pharmaceutical HPLC. LCGC North America, 3, 132–140.*
30. *Guiochon, F. G. (2020). Mass transfer kinetics in modern core-shell columns. Journal of Chromatography A, 1613, Article number 460682.*
31. *Huber, L. (2020). Validation and qualification in analytical laboratories. LCGC North America, 38(5), 248–254.*
32. *ICH, I. C. (2022). ICH Q2(R2): Validation of analytical procedures. ICH Harmonised Guideline.*
33. *J. Martins, C. S. (2021). Solid-state degradation kinetics of pharmaceutical compounds. European Journal of Pharmaceutics and Biopharmaceutics, 164, 56–64.*
34. *Jayant N. Sangshetti, M. D. (2020). Stability-indicating method development in pharmaceutical analysis. Journal of Pharmaceutical Analysis, 10(6), 577–589.*

ISSN (Online): 2455-3662
EPRA International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research (IJMR) - Peer Reviewed Journal
Volume: 12| Issue: 5| May 2026|| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2013 ||SJIF Impact Factor 2026: 8.753 || ISI Value: 1.188

35. *Jitendra Sangshetti, A. C. (2020). Evolution of chromatographic method development strategies. Current Pharmaceutical Analysis, 16(5), 557–567.*
36. *Joanna Płotka-Wasylka, K. O. (2021). Green solvents in chromatographic analysis. TrAC Trends in Analytical Chemistry, 138, Article number 116223.*
37. *K. Kishore Hotha, S. P. (2020). Stress testing protocols in pharmaceutical analysis. Journal of Applied Pharmaceutical Science, 10(8), 143–150.*
38. *K. V. Gowda, U. M. (2022). Comparative hydrolytic degradation kinetics of ester-containing drugs. Current Pharmaceutical Analysis, 18(6), 548–559.*
39. *Kalpesh Patel, P. S. (2021). Analytical strategies for impurity profiling in pharmaceutical formulations. Biomedical Chromatography, 35(9), e5142.*
40. *Kathleen M. Alsante, A. A. (2021). The role of impurity profiling in pharmaceutical development. Organic Process Research & Development, 25(2), 456–468.*
41. *Kiran Joshi, P. V. (2023). Stability studies of nanoparticle drug formulations using RP-HPLC. European Journal of Pharmaceutical Sciences, 108, 106345.*
42. *Krull, M. E. (2020). Analytical method development and validation in pharmaceutical analysis. LCGC North America, 38(8), 370–378.*
43. *Kunal Patel, N. D. (2022). Stability-indicating assay of favipiravir. Journal of Pharmaceutical Analysis, 12(4), 415–424.*
44. *Lesellier, C. W. (2022). Phenyl and polar-embedded stationary phases in pharmaceutical analysis. Journal of Separation Science, 45(2), 204–218.*
45. *LoBrutto., Y. V. (2021). HPLC for pharmaceutical scientists (2nd edition). Wiley.*
46. *Luciana Cruz, A. S. (2022). Sample solvent compatibility in RP-HPLC analysis. Chromatographia, 85(9), 1001–1012.*
47. *M. A. Khan, Z. I. (2023). LC–MS based characterization of oxidative degradation products. Journal of Mass Spectrometry, 58(2), Article number: e4852.*
48. *M. Jadhav, S. K. (2022). Design of experiments for optimization of stress testing conditions. Journal of AOAC International, 105(4), 1032–1041.*
49. *M. R. Siddiqui, Z. A. (2023). Peak purity assessment in HPLC using PDA detection. Arabian Journal of Chemistry, 16(1), Article number: 104420.*
50. *Manish Dixit, A. K. (2024). Statistical definition of analytical target profile in chromatographic methods. Journal of Chromatographic Science, 62(1), 12–21.*
51. *Marcelo D. Dolzan, A. L. (2022). Influence of temperature in reversed-phase liquid chromatography separations. Chromatographia, 85(4), 425–438.*
52. *Mark Evans, R. T. (2022). Core-shell column technology in impurity profiling. Biomedical Chromatography, 36(7), e5384.*
53. *McNair, Y. K. (2021). Basic liquid chromatography (3rd edition). Wiley.*
54. *Miller, J. E. (2021). Method validation in pharmaceutical analysis: A guide to best practice (3rd edition). Wiley-VCH.*
55. *Mitesh Blessy, R. D. (2020). Development of forced degradation and stability indicating studies of drugs—A review. Journal of Pharmaceutical Analysis, 10(4), 275–289.*
56. *Mohammad Rahim, M. H. (2022). Hydrolytic degradation of cefixime by RP-HPLC. Journal of Separation Science, 45(6), 1120–1128.*
57. *Mohammad Rahman, S. I. (2023). Intermediate precision evaluation in impurity profiling methods. Arabian Journal of Chemistry, 16(4), 104987.*
58. *Nagesh Ramakrishna, V. V. (2023). Challenges in stability-indicating HPLC method development. International Journal of Pharmaceutical Analysis, 15(1), 21–34.*
59. *Neha Bhatia, R. M. (2021). Oxidative degradation study of duloxetine by RP-HPLC. International Journal of Pharmaceutical Analysis, 13(2), 98–106.*
60. *Nethercote, P. B. (2020). Robustness testing in analytical method development. LCGC Europe, 33(6), 312–318.*
61. *Neue, U. D. (2020). HPLC columns: Theory, technology, and practice. Journal of Separation Science, 43(1), 6–22.*
62. *Niessen, W. M. (2021). Liquid chromatography–mass spectrometry in pharmaceutical analysis. Journal of Chromatography A, 1641, Article number 461977.*
63. *Nobuo Tanaka, H. K. (2020). Silica-based stationary phase design for high-efficiency separations. Journal of Chromatography A, 1621.*
64. *P. Bora, M. S. (2022). Application of UHPLC in stability-indicating assay development. Journal of Chromatographic Science, 60(7), 645–653.*
65. *Peter Brown, J. T. (2024). Regulatory inspection trends in pharmaceutical chromatography. Regulatory Affairs Journal, 35(1), 22–30.*
66. *Poole, C. F. (2020). The essence of chromatographic selectivity. Journal of Chromatography A, 1629, Article number 461498.*
67. *Prasanta K. Sahu, N. R. (2021). An overview of experimental designs in analytical method development and validation. Journal of Pharmaceutical and Biomedical Analysis, 147, 590–611.*
68. *Praveen Reddy, G. N. (2022). Simultaneous stability-indicating method for antidiabetic combination drugs. Current Pharmaceutical Analysis, 18(5), 433–441.*
69. *Priya Deshmukh, S. P. (2023). Implementation challenges of AQbD in pharmaceutical industries. International Journal of Pharmaceutical Sciences Review and Research, 78(2), 45–52.*
70. *Priya Shah, D. P. (2020). Development of stability-indicating RP-HPLC for lenvatinib. Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International, 32(12), 45–54.*
71. *R. Gupta, P. M. (2024). Artificial intelligence approaches for predicting pharmaceutical degradation pathways. Computational Toxicology, 29, Article number: 100318.*
72. *R. Nagarajan Rao, P. M. (2022). LC-MS characterization of pharmaceutical degradants. Journal of Pharmaceutical and Biomedical Analysis, 212, Article number: 114652.*
73. *Rajesh Singh, V. Y. (2023). Stability-indicating analysis of azithromycin. Journal of Pharmaceutical and Biomedical Analysis, 225, Article number: 115205.*
74. *Rakesh Ghosh, A. M. (2022). Multi-wavelength detection in combination drug analysis. Analytical Methods, 14(12), 1234–1242.*
75. *Rakesh Verma, P. S. (2022). Placebo interference evaluation in chromatographic validation. Journal of Liquid Chromatography & Related Technologies, 45(6-7), 287–295.*

ISSN (Online): 2455-3662
EPRA International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research (IJMR) - Peer Reviewed Journal
Volume: 12| Issue: 5| May 2026|| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2013 ||SJIF Impact Factor 2026: 8.753 || ISI Value: 1.188

76. *Ramesh Tripathi, S. V. (2024). Monte Carlo simulation in chromatographic robustness evaluation. Analytical Chemistry Letters, 14(1), 15–28.*
77. *Rao, S. K. (2021). Stability-indicating methods in pharmaceutical analysis: Current trends and regulatory expectations. Journal of Chromatographic Science, 59(8), 707–718.*
78. *Rasha El-Shaheny, M. A. (2022). Green analytical quality by design in RP-HPLC method development. Microchemical Journal, 177, 107268.*
79. *Ritu Jain, V. S. (2022). Stability-indicating RP-HPLC for complex formulations. Journal of Pharmaceutical Innovation, 17(4), 1020–1032.*
80. *Robert Baker, J. D. (2021). Statistical evaluation of recovery studies in analytical validation. Analytical Methods, 13(28), 3142–3150.*
81. *S. Mishra, A. S. (2023). High-resolution mass spectrometry in degradation product analysis. TrAC Trends in Analytical Chemistry, 162, Article number: 117012.*
82. *S. Thakur, R. S. (2020). Embedded polar group stationary phases in pharmaceutical analysis. Journal of Separation Science, 43(18), 3538–3546.*
83. *Salman Iqbal, N. A. (2021). Evaluation of solution stability in chromatographic analysis. Current Pharmaceutical Analysis, 17(8), 1093–1101.*
84. *Samar El-Gizawy, M. W.-B. (2021). Stability-indicating determination of remdesivir by RP-HPLC. Microchemical Journal, 168, Article number: 106420.*
85. *Sameer Chowhan, H. P. (2020). Stability-indicating RP-HPLC method for sitagliptin. Journal of Pharmaceutical Research, 19(3), 150–158.*
86. *Sana Mahmood, U. F. (2021). Comparative evaluation of conventional and DoE-based RP-HPLC method development. Biomedical Chromatography, 35(6), e5074.*
87. *Sebastian Bocian, R. G.-K. (2020). Influence of flow rate and column dimensions on chromatographic resolution. Journal of Chromatography A, 1622, Article number: 461102.*
88. *Seyed Hosseini, A. S. (2021). Mechanistic insights into forced degradation studies in drug development. Pharmaceutical Development and Technology, 26(1), 1023–1034.*
89. *Shabir, G. A. (2021). Validation of high-performance liquid chromatography methods in pharmaceutical analysis: Understanding the new regulatory landscape. Journal of Liquid Chromatography & Related Technologies, 44(5-6), 187–198.*
90. *Snehal Gandhi, N. D. (2020). UV detection strategies in pharmaceutical HPLC methods. Asian Journal of Pharmaceutical Analysis, 10(4), 245–251.*
91. *Sofia Martinez, D. C. (2024). Data integrity in lifecycle analytical validation. Regulatory Toxicology and Pharmacology, 148, 105672.*
92. *Steven W. Baertschi, K. M. (2021). Pharmaceutical stress testing: Predicting drug degradation (2nd edition). CRC Press.*
93. *Subrata Chowdhury, e. (2021). Regulatory considerations in forced degradation studies. International Journal of Pharmaceutical Sciences Review and Research, 68(1), 112–118.*
94. *Sunil Kamble, P. K. (2023). Photolytic degradation of aripiprazole. Journal of Chromatographic Science, 61(7), 598–606.*
95. *Surendra Singh, T. H. (2023). Forced degradation studies to establish stability-indicating nature of analytical methods: Regulatory and practical perspectives. Current Pharmaceutical Analysis, 19(2), 145–160.*
96. *Suresh Nair, P. M. (2023). Photostability studies of apixaban. Biomedical Chromatography, 37(2), e5460.*
97. *Szabolcs Fekete, A. B.-L. (2021). Core-shell particle columns in pharmaceutical separations. TrAC Trends in Analytical Chemistry, 135, Article number 116165.*
98. *Tanuja Velpandian, S. S. (2021). Multivariate assessment of chromatographic critical quality attributes. Journal of Pharmaceutical and Biomedical Analysis, 198, 113965.*
99. *Tariq Khan, S. A. (2022). Stability-indicating RP-HPLC for triple combination therapy. Journal of Applied Pharmaceutical Science, 12(8), 89–98.*
100. *ari, G. T. (2021). Pharmaceutical degradation pathways and stability testing strategies. Journal of Drug Delivery Science and Technology, 61, Article number 102109.*
101. *V. Chaudhari, S. P. (2022). Mass balance considerations in forced degradation studies. Biomedical Chromatography, 36(3), Article number: e5291.*
102. *Vishal Kumar, R. S. (2022). Gradient elution strategies for impurity profiling. Biomedical Chromatography, 36(7), Article number: e5382.*
103. *Watson, R. E. (2021). Experimental design in chromatographic method development. Journal of Pharmaceutical and Biomedical Analysis, 197, Article number 113927.*
104. *Xiaohui Zhou, H. L. (2024). Neural network modeling for retention time prediction in RP-HPLC. Journal of Chromatography A, 1703, 464012.*
105. *Y. Wang, X. L. (2024). High-resolution LC–MS for degradation pathway elucidation. Analytical Chemistry, 96(4), 2154–2162.*
106. *Yan Chen, M. R. (2023). Automated system suitability evaluation in HPLC. Journal of Chromatography A, 1698, 463995.*
107. *Yong Zhang, X. L. (2021). Effect of temperature on chromatographic performance in RP-HPLC. Chromatographia, 84(11), 1135–1144.*