The Dissolution Specification Trap: Why the FDA's Tighter Spec Was Actually the Best Thing That Happened to This Product

Jean-Marie Geoffroy
May 12th, 2026

There is a moment every CMC team dreads.

You have spent months developing your dissolution method, generating batch data, and proposing specifications you believe are scientifically sound. Then the FDA responds. They want tighter limits.

The room goes quiet, scientist scurry about trying to figure out what to do next. Legal starts talking about timelines. Commercial starts talking about revenue. And somewhere in that conversation, the scientific question that actually matters gets lost entirely.

I've been in that room. And I want to tell you what happened when we asked a different question.

The Standard Response, and Why It's the Wrong One

When FDA pushes back on dissolution specifications, most companies face what feels like a binary choice. Fight the specification and risk the relationship, the timeline, and the approval. Or accept it and hope the batches keep passing.

Neither of those is a strategy. The first is a gamble on goodwill. The second is a gamble on luck.

What almost nobody does is step back and ask the question that actually changes the outcome:

> *If we accept your specification, what has to change in our method to make it consistently achievable?*

That question only becomes possible if you have done your homework before you ever walk into the negotiation.

What Made This Case Different: The DOE Foundation

Before we filed our application, we had completed a comprehensive Design of Experiments program on our dissolution method. We understood our method the way an engineer understands a machine. We knew which variables drove release rate, which were noise, and how much each lever moved the needle.

RPM. Media pH. Surfactant concentration. Sinker configuration. We had mapped the response surface. We could dial dissolution release rate up or down with precision, and we had the data to prove it.

This is what Quality by Design looks like before anyone called it that. It is not a regulatory exercise. It is a strategic investment that changes the nature of every conversation you have with the Agency.

Because when FDA proposed their tighter specification, we were not starting from zero. We already knew our design space. We already knew which method conditions would reduce analytical noise enough to make their specification not just achievable, but robustly achievable, meaning our predicted batch failure rate would actually go down under their tighter spec, not up, provided we made the right method adjustments.

> *That is a fundamentally different negotiating position than "we hope you'll reconsider."*

The Four Questions You Need to Answer Before the FDA Does

This experience taught me that there are four questions every CMC team should be able to answer before they receive an information request, not after. Together they form a complete strategic framework for specification negotiation.

Question 1: Should we push back at all?

This is the question nobody formally asks. The instinct when FDA proposes a tighter specification is either defensive resistance or immediate concession. Both are reactions, not decisions. The right starting point is a clear-eyed assessment of whether the Agency's proposed limit is actually incompatible with your process, or whether it simply feels uncomfortable. Those are very different situations requiring very different responses.

Question 2: If we accept their specification, what does our predicted batch failure rate actually look like?

This is where the statistics matter. Using Monte Carlo simulation, you can translate your process mean and standard deviation into a predicted probability of failing Stage 1, Stage 2, or Stage 3 of USP dissolution testing. You can show what happens to that probability under the FDA's proposed tighter limits. And you can show what happens if you adjust your method conditions to reduce analytical noise.

This is not a theoretical exercise. It produces a number. And a number changes the conversation in ways that a qualitative argument never can.

Question 3: What is the true cost of accepting this specification without intervention?

This is the question leadership needs to hear, and almost never does. A specification you cannot consistently meet does not just create batch failure risk in the lab. It creates investigation costs, supply disruption risk, potential field action exposure, and the cost of renegotiating the specification post-approval, which is significantly harder and more expensive than getting it right during the filing.

When you show leadership a ten-year commercial supply model with a 2% batch failure rate baked in, "just accept it and get the approval" suddenly has a price tag. That changes the decision.

Question 4: If we accept their specification, can we adjust our method to make it robustly achievable?

This is the question that resolves the dilemma. And it is only answerable if you have done the experimental work in advance. Our DOE data told us exactly which method conditions to adjust and by how much. We went to the FDA not with a complaint but with a proposal. We will accept your specification. In exchange, we would like to update our method conditions as follows, supported by this experimental evidence, to ensure we can meet it consistently.

They agreed.

Our batch failure risk went down. The Agency's concern about process control was addressed. And we walked away with an approval and a specification we could actually live with commercially.

What This Looks Like With Modern Tools

This case happened over a decade before the Analytical Target Profile framework was formalized in ICH Q14. We were doing intuitively what the guidance now formalizes systematically.

Today, the same strategy is available with far greater precision. A properly designed ATP defines the acceptable performance criteria for the analytical method itself, not just the product. Combined with modern Monte Carlo simulation, you can quantify the predicted batch failure rate under any combination of specification limits and method conditions before you commit to either.

This means you can walk into a specification negotiation with a simulation already run. You can show the FDA not just what your method does, but what it would do under their proposed limits, and what it would do if you adjusted conditions X and Y by amounts supported by your DOE data.

> *That is not a defensive position. That is a demonstration of exactly the process understanding the Agency is looking for.*

The Broader Lesson

The companies that struggle most with FDA specification negotiations aren't the ones with bad science. They're the ones who treated method development, regulatory strategy, and commercial risk as three separate conversations, and only connected them after something went wrong.

When those three things are integrated from the beginning, the FDA's tighter specification stops being a threat. It becomes a solvable engineering problem with a known answer.

The dissolution case described here is not unusual. What was unusual is that we had done the experimental and analytical work before the negotiation forced our hand. That preparation is a conscious choice, and it is available to any CMC team willing to make it.

What Your Predicted Batch Failure Rate Actually Is

Before you accept or contest a specification, you should know one number: your predicted probability of failing USP dissolution Stage 1, Stage 2, and Stage 3 under the FDA's proposed limits, and how that number changes if you adjust method conditions your DOE data already supports.

That simulation is not theoretical. It produces a number that changes conversations with leadership, with legal, and with the Agency itself.

If you're preparing for a filing or currently navigating a dissolution specification negotiation, I will run that simulation with you. One focused session. A number you can actually use.

→ Book a diagnostic session: cachetpharm.com/contact

→ Read the portfolio optimization case: cachetpharm.com/development_tools

---

#PharmaConsulting #CMC #CachetPharm #DrugProductDevelopment #QualityByDesign #RegulatoryStrategy #Dissolution #AnalyticalTargetProfile #DOE #MonteCarlo #ManagementOfScience