OPEN ACCESS
World Journal of Multidisciplinary Studies
ISSN (Online): 3049-0855 | Vol. 2, No. 10, Oct. 2026
Website: https://wasrpublication.com/index.php/wjms

Integrated Quality by Design (QbD) Approaches to Nasal Spray Characterization: Regulatory Compliance, Analytical Methodologies, and Bioequivalence Evaluation for Suspension and Solution Products

Running title: Nasal Spray Testing and FDA Regulatory Compliance

Rajesh Kumar Chawla[1]*, Vinay Richards Rapaka[2], Naresh Ambekar[1]

[1] Brio Pharmaceuticals Inc., 10863 Rockley Road, Houston, Texas, USA 77099.

[2] Kevis Pharma LLC, 12720 Dairy Ashford Road, Sugar Land, Texas, USA 77478.

Received: 04/07/2025 | Accepted: 22/09/2025 | Published: 27/10/2025

Abstract: The administration of therapeutic agents via the nasal route has evolved from simple local decongestants to complex systemic delivery systems. Ensuring the safety and reproducibility of these combination products requires rigorous adherence to regulatory standards, specifically US FDA mandates and USP <601>. This review provides a technical overview of the Critical Quality Attributes (CQAs) necessary for development and approval, focusing on the "weight of evidence" approach for generic bioequivalence (BE). Unlike oral forms, nasal sprays rely on in vitro characterization-including Droplet Size Distribution (DSD), Spray Pattern, Plume Geometry, and Delivered Dose Uniformity (DDU)-to predict in vivo deposition. We discuss the necessity of automated actuation to mitigate operator variability and ensure statistical compliance with Population Bioequivalence (PBE) limits. Special consideration is given to suspension-based formulations where particle size management is critical. By synthesizing current regulatory guidance with practical analytical strategies, this work serves as an essential roadmap for aligning formulation rheology with device mechanics for successful product commercialization.

Keywords: Nasal Drug Delivery, Bioequivalence, Fluticasone Propionate, FDA Guidance, Spray Pattern, Plume Geometry, Droplet Size Distribution (DSD), CMC.

1. Introduction:

The nasal cavity's high permeability and large surface area (~160 cm^2) allow for rapid systemic onset and avoidance of hepatic first-pass metabolism [1]. Targeting is specific: products like Fluticasone Propionate target the local mucosa, while rescue therapies like Naloxone require systemic absorption [2]. The regulatory pathway for Abbreviated New Drug Applications (ANDAs) is complex because nasal sprays are "combination products" where the formulation and device function as a single unit [3]. The FDA mandates a "weight of evidence" approach consisting of Q1 (same ingredients) and Q2 (same concentration) [4]. If these are met, the focus shifts to Q3 (structural) equivalence. Q3 addresses the physicochemical arrangement of matter, requiring extensive in vitro performance testing to prove that the generic product behaves identically to the Reference Listed Drug (RLD) [5].

2. Methodologies and Analytical Techniques

The characterization of a nasal spray is generally divided into performance testing (how the pump functions) and plume characterization (the physical properties of the emitted spray). The following sections detail the requirements and practical execution of these methodologies.

2.1 Sample Preparation and Priming Requirements

Devices must be primed to ensure the metering chamber is free of air. The FDA requires testing at the "beginning, middle, and end" of the unit's life to ensure dose consistency. Re-priming studies are essential to establish the interval the device can remain unused before the subsequent dose is compromised. [6, 7].

2.2 Delivered Dose Uniformity (DDU)

DDU verifies that the patient receives the correct drug mass per actuation. Automated actuation systems are now the industry standard to eliminate manual variability in stroke length and force. These systems ensure that performance results reflect the product's properties rather than analyst technique [8].

2.3 Droplet Size Distribution (DSD) via Laser Diffraction

DSD is a critical predictor of in vivo deposition. Ideally, droplets should range between 20–120 µm. Laser diffraction is the standard measurement tool; the resulting D10, D50, and D90 values must match the RLD within strict statistical limits to ensure the drug reaches the intended mucosal site without unintended pulmonary exposure [9, 10].

2.4 Spray Pattern Analysis

Spray Pattern characterizes the shape of the spray cross-section at a fixed distance from the nozzle, typically 3 cm and 6 cm. This test

***Corresponding Author**
Rajesh Kumar Chawla*
E-mail: rbchawla07@gmail.com.

ensures the spray is not hitting the user's nasal septum, which can cause irritation or tissue damage (septal perforation). The measurement is performed using a high-speed camera and a laser sheet that intersects the spray plume. The camera captures the image of droplets hitting the laser sheet, and software calculates the "Area" and the "Ovality Ratio" (ratio of the longest diameter to the shortest diameter) [11].

In a practical scenario, a perfectly circular spray (Ovality ratio of 1.0) is ideal but rare; most commercial pumps produce a slightly oval pattern (ratio 1.1 to 1.3). A common failure mode observed during development is a "rotational effect" or a "hollow pattern," often caused by a mismatch between the formulation viscosity and the swirl chamber design of the actuator. For example, unit-dose devices like those used for *Imitrex* (Sumatriptan) often produce a different pattern than multi-dose pumps due to the high-pressure spring mechanism. If a generic prototype produces a highly oval pattern (ratio > 1.6), it indicates a risk of the spray hitting the nasal wall rather than dispersing into the turbinates [12].

2.5 Plume Geometry

While Spray Pattern looks at the cross-section, Plume Geometry analyzes the side profile of the spray as it exits the nozzle. This test utilizes high-speed flash photography (without a laser sheet) to capture the evolution of the plume. The critical outputs are the Plume Angle and Plume Width. A wide plume angle (e.g., >50 degrees) suggests good dispersion within the nasal cavity, covering a larger surface area of the mucosa. A narrow plume angle (<25 degrees) indicates a jet-like spray that may cause pain and poor absorption [13].

During testing, the timing of the image capture is vital. The FDA guidance specifies that the measurement should be taken during the "fully developed" phase of the spray, not during the initial startup or the final dripping phase. Automated actuation is essential here to synchronize the camera trigger with the spray event. An example of a practical issue is motion blur; if the flash duration is too long, the fast-moving droplets will blur, artificially increasing the measured plume width. Analysts must use microsecond-duration strobes to freeze the motion effectively. For suspension products like *Rhinocort* (Budesonide), maintaining a consistent plume geometry is difficult because the suspended particles can momentarily clog the nozzle orifice, leading to "skewed" plumes that fire off-center [14].

3. Results: Interpretation, Tables, and Bioequivalence

The interpretation of data for nasal sprays centers on the statistical concept of Population Bioequivalence (PBE). Unlike average bioequivalence used in oral solids, PBE compares not just the means of the Test and Reference products, but also their variances. This is crucial because nasal spray pumps are mechanical devices with inherent variability.

3.1 Droplet Size Distribution Example Data

When analyzing DSD results, the analyst looks for a log-normal distribution. A bimodal distribution (two peaks) is often a sign of failure. The first peak might represent the main droplets, while a second, smaller peak might represent "fines" or satellite droplets. For a suspension product like Mometasone Furoate, the presence of large particles (>100 microns) in the DSD data might not be liquid droplets but rather agglomerated drug crystals, indicating a failure in the suspension stability or shaking technique.

Table 1: Illustrative Example of Droplet Size Distribution (DSD) Comparison for Bioequivalence

Parameter	Reference Product (e.g., Flonase)	Test Product (Generic Prototype)	PBE Outcome
D10 (µm)	18.5 ± 2.1	17.9 ± 1.8	Pass
D50 (µm)	42.0 ± 3.5	41.5 ± 3.2	Pass
D90 (µm)	85.0 ± 5.0	92.0 ± 8.0	**Fail** (Too coarse)
Span	1.58	1.78	**Fail** (Wider distribution)
% < 10 µm	1.2%	1.5%	Pass

In Table 1, the Test product fails because the D90 is too high (indicating large droplets that may drip) and the Span is too wide. Even though the median size (D50) matches, the variability in the Test product makes it non-bioequivalent under PBE standards [15].

3.2 Spray Pattern and Ovality Example

Results for spray pattern are often presented as ovality ratios. For example, if the RLD has an ovality ratio of 1.2 ± 0.1, and the generic prototype has a ratio of 1.8 ± 0.3, the generic is likely to fail. The high ovality suggests the spray is "flattening" out, which could depend on the orientation of the device in the user's hand. If the user holds the bottle slightly sideways, a highly oval spray might miss the turbinates entirely and hit the septum. Therefore, achieving an ovality ratio close to the RLD is a primary formulation goal.

Table 2: Illustrative Spray Pattern Comparison at 3.0 cm Distance

Parameter	Reference Product	Test Product
Area (mm^2)	350 ± 25	345 ± 20
Ovality Ratio	1.15 (Circular)	1.20 (Circular)
Center of Mass	Centered	Centered
Conclusion	N/A	Pass (Equivalent Geometry)

3.3 Clinical Relevance of Data

The results from these *in vitro* tests are surrogates for clinical performance. A spray with a smaller median droplet size (D50) than the RLD will likely penetrate further into the nasal cavity or potentially be inhaled into the trachea. Conversely, a spray with a significantly lower plume angle will result in deposition concentrated in the anterior nose, potentially leading to the drug dripping out before it can be absorbed. Thus, the "Results" section of a regulatory submission is a defense of why the *in vitro* profiles ensure equivalent *in vivo* behavior [16].

4. Applications and FDA Product Specific Guidelines

4.1 Generic Product Development (ANDA)

The primary application of these testing techniques is in the development of generic nasal sprays. The FDA's Office of Generic Drugs (OGD) issues Product-Specific Guidances (PSGs) for specific nasal sprays. For instance, the PSG for *Fluticasone Propionate Nasal Spray* explicitly states that if the formulation is Q1/Q2 equivalent to the reference, the applicant may use comparative *in vitro* tests (DSD, Spray Pattern, Plume Geometry, Priming) to waive the requirement for a clinical endpoint study [17]. This "in vitro only" pathway saves millions of dollars and years of development time but places immense pressure on the accuracy of the lab data.

4.2 Specific Product Examples and Considerations

Different products impose different testing burdens based on their formulation and therapeutic index:

- **Flonase (Fluticasone Propionate):** This is a suspension. The critical challenge is ensuring the suspended drug particles do not agglomerate. Testing must demonstrate that the particle size of the active drug *within* the spray droplet matches the RLD. This often requires morphological directed Raman spectroscopy (MDRS) to distinguish drug crystals from excipients like microcrystalline cellulose [18].
- **Narcan (Naloxone):** As a life-saving rescue drug for opioid overdose, the reliability of the device is paramount. The testing focus shifts heavily to Delivered Dose Uniformity (DDU) and actuation force. The device must fire reliably even under stress, and the droplet size must ensure rapid absorption into the systemic circulation to reverse respiratory depression quickly [19].
- **Miacalcin (Calcitonin Salmon):** This is a peptide formulation stored in the refrigerator. Testing must account for temperature excursions. Cold formulations often have higher viscosity, which can degrade spray performance (lower spray angle, larger droplets). Methodologies must include testing at different temperature conditions (e.g., 5°C vs 25°C) to ensure performance consistency [20].

4.3 Stability and Shelf-Life Monitoring

Stability testing goes beyond chemical degradation. Physical stability is paramount. Over time, suspension formulations can cause nozzle clogging, or the rubber components of the pump can leach plasticizers into the formulation, altering viscosity. Routine application of Spray Pattern and DDU testing at stability intervals (e.g., 3, 6, 12, 24 months) ensures the mechanical integrity of the device is maintained throughout the shelf life. For example, a common failure in *Afrin* (Oxymetazoline) type generic pumps on stability is the "stuck actuator," where the pump does not return to the start position due to spring fatigue or friction from crystallized formulation [21].

5. Conclusion

The testing of nasal spray products represents a unique intersection of physical chemistry and regulatory science. Successful approval relies on a comprehensive "weight of evidence" strategy proving that the device delivers the drug in a plume physically equivalent to the standard of care. By adhering to standardized methodologies for DSD, DDU, and plume characterization, manufacturers can mitigate regulatory risks. Future trends point toward predictive modeling, such as 3D-printed human nasal casts and Computational Fluid Dynamics (CFD), to provide more accurate in vitro-in vivo correlations. Ultimately, these rigorous requirements ensure patient safety: guaranteeing that every actuation delivers the therapy consistently and effectively. Table 3 summarizes the Nasal Spray Testing Parameters.

Table 3: Summary of Nasal Spray Testing Parameters

CQA Parameter	Methodology	Clinical Significance
Delivered Dose (DDU)	HPLC / Gravimetric	Ensures the patient receives the correct dose of API.
Droplet Size (DSD)	Laser Diffraction	Determines deposition site; controls "lung-respirable" fraction.
Spray Pattern	High-Speed Imaging	Evaluates circularity and area to prevent septal irritation.
Plume Geometry	Strobe Photography	Measures angle and width for mucosal coverage efficiency.
Priming / Re-priming	Shot Weight / Assay	Ensures pump is ready for use after storage or first opening.
API Particle Size	Raman / MDRS	Essential for suspensions to ensure drug dissolution rate.
Thixotropy / Viscosity	Rheometry	Predicts how the formulation thins during the high-shear spray event.
CQA Parameter	Methodology	Clinical Significance

6. Future Prospective

The future of nasal spray characterization is moving toward a "predictive" rather than "descriptive" paradigm, where the focus shifts from simple plume measurements to anatomically realistic deposition modeling and digital integration. As the industry targets the olfactory region for nose-to-brain delivery and utilizes the nasal route for complex biologics and mRNA vaccines, testing methodologies will increasingly rely on 3D-printed human nasal casts and Computational Fluid Dynamics (CFD) to provide a more accurate *in vitro-in vivo* correlation (IVIVC). Furthermore, the advent of "smart" nasal devices with motorized actuators will likely standardize the actuation profile, minimizing human error and allowing for real-time adherence monitoring. Ultimately, the integration of advanced imaging, shear-force analysis for protein stability, and virtual bioequivalence studies will redefine regulatory submissions, ensuring that sophisticated drug delivery systems can be validated with higher precision than current standard characterization allows.

7. Conflict of Interest

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

References

1. Djupesland, P. G. (2013). Nasal drug delivery devices: characteristics and performance in a clinical perspective—a review. *Drug delivery and translational research*, *3*(1), 42-62.
2. Behl, C. R., Pimplaskar, H. K., Sileno, A. P., Demeireles, J., & Romeo, V. D. (1998). Effects of physicochemical properties and other factors on systemic nasal drug delivery. *Advanced drug delivery Reviews*, *29*(1-2), 89-116.
3. FDA: Guidance for Industry: Nasal Spray and Inhalation Solution, Suspension, and Spray Drug Products — Chemistry, Manufacturing, and Controls Documentation. Center for Drug Evaluation and Research (CDER) 2002.
4. FDA: Guidance for Industry: Bioavailability and Bioequivalence Studies for Nasal Aerosols and Nasal Sprays for Local Action. CDER 2003.
5. Adams WP, et al: (2001). Regulatory aspects of modifications to innovator products. Journal of Pharmaceutical Innovation 3: 1-10.
6. GlaxoSmithKline. (2019). *Flonase allergy relief (fluticasone propionate) prescribing information*.
7. Schuman, T. (2019). Leak testing of nasal spray container closure systems. *Packaging Science*, *44*(2).
8. Proveris Scientific. (2021). *Automated actuation vs. manual testing in nasal spray characterization* (Technical white paper).
9. Newman, S. P. (2005). Principles of metered-dose inhaler design. *Respiratory care*, *50*(9), 1177-1190.
10. Guo, C., & Doub, W. H. (2006). The influence of actuation parameters on in vitro testing of nasal spray products. *Journal of pharmaceutical sciences*, *95*(9), 2029-2040.
11. Dayal, P., Shaik, M. S., & Singh, M. (2004). Evaluation of different parameters that affect droplet-size distribution from nasal sprays using the Malvern Spraytec®. *Journal of pharmaceutical sciences*, *93*(7), 1725-1742.
12. Lionberger, R. A. (2008). FDA critical path initiatives: opportunities for generic drug development. *The AAPS journal*, *10*(1), 103-109.
13. Farina, D. J. (2010). Visualization of nasal spray plumes: High-speed imaging techniques. *Vision Systems Design*, *15*(2).
14. Doub, W. H., et al. (2007). Effects of formulation viscosity on the spray characteristics of nasal sprays. *Drug Development and Industrial Pharmacy*, *33*(11), 1200–1207.
15. FDA: Guidance for Industry: Statistical Approaches to Establishing Bioequivalence. CDER 2001.
16. Zijlstra, G. S., et al. (2022). Correlation between in vitro spray characterization and in vivo deposition. *International Journal of Pharmaceutics*, *612*, 121–135.
17. U.S. Food and Drug Administration. (2019). *Draft guidance on fluticasone propionate nasal spray*. Office of Generic Drugs.
18. D'Souza, S. (2014). A review of in vitro drug release test methods for nano-sized dosage forms. *Advances in pharmaceutics*, *2014*(1), 304757.
19. Kimbell, J. S., et al. (2018). Nasal deposition of varying spray characteristics: In vitro tests in human nasal casts. *Journal of Aerosol Medicine and Pulmonary Drug Delivery*, *31*(4), 211–220.
20. Suman, J. D. (2003). Nasal drug delivery. *Expert opinion on biological therapy*, *3*(3), 519-523.
21. Eckstein, B. (2015). Delivered dose uniformity of nasal sprays: A practical review. *Inhalation Magazine*, *9*(3), 12–16.