Syner·G

WHITE PAPER

The CMC Trap: How Chemistry, Manufacturing, and Controls Failures Derail Drug Development

Ray Forslund, Ph.D., MBA.
Executive Vice President,
Product Development

Executive Summary

In the high-stakes environment of drug development, Chemistry, Manufacturing, and Controls (CMC) is too often viewed as a regulatory hurdle to clear rather than a core strategic function. This misperception has led to costly delays, clinical holds, and even outright refusals to file. In this white paper, we explore how the "CMC trap" continues to derail promising therapies and outline how organizations can shift their mindset to integrate CMC thinking early and intentionally.

Introduction

Ask any drug developer where their primary focus lies, and you're likely to hear about clinical trials, regulatory strategy, or commercial potential. Rarely does CMC earn a top spot in early conversations—and therein lies the trap. The "CMC trap" refers to a recurring and damaging pattern: sponsors delay investment in CMC until late in the development cycle, only to find themselves scrambling when regulators highlight gaps that should have been addressed much earlier.

This issue is not new, but it remains stubbornly persistent. As the FDA and other global agencies increase scrutiny on manufacturing processes, product quality, and control strategies, the consequences of underestimating CMC have become more pronounced. For companies aiming to move efficiently from lab to market, avoiding this trap is not optional, it's essential.

The Cost of Getting it Wrong

Regulatory data underscores the risks. In recent years, up to 40% of New Drug Applications (NDAs) and Biologics License Applications (BLAs) have received Complete Response Letters (CRLs) on the first review cycle, and CMC issues are frequently among the cited deficiencies. According to McKinsey, more than half of regulatory delays for new molecular entities stem from CMC-related problems. These include insufficient process validation, inconsistent product quality, and inadequate analytical methods.

Real-world examples make this even more tangible. Consider the case of a mid-sized biotech developing a gene therapy that had demonstrated exceptional clinical promise. Despite these results, the FDA issued a Refuse-to-File letter in 2021, citing the lack of process validation data at the intended commercial scale and insufficient comparability data. The setback delayed approval by more than a year, costing the company not only time but also investor confidence and competitive advantage.

And this is not an isolated case. Across the industry, stories abound of therapies with strong clinical data that have stumbled or stalled because of poor CMC planning. Whether it's a biologic product with variability issues, an oral drug with unvalidated dissolution methods, or a cell therapy with inconsistent chain of identity protocols, the outcome is the same: a promising treatment is kept from patients, and value is eroded for the sponsor.

How the Trap is Set

One of the most common missteps is delaying CMC integration until after proof-of-concept has been achieved. Companies justify this by citing limited budgets or the uncertainty of early-stage programs. While understandable, this approach often leads to rushed process development, gaps in analytical maturity, and incomplete regulatory documentation.

Another factor is the overreliance on contract development and manufacturing organizations (CDMOs). While outsourcing can be efficient, it doesn't absolve the sponsor of responsibility. Regulatory authorities hold the sponsor accountable for ensuring compliance and product quality, regardless of who manufactures the product. When oversight is lacking, deficiencies in GMP compliance, control strategy, or data integrity often come to light too late in the process.

Even companies with experienced technical teams fall into the trap of treating CMC as a checklist exercise. Instead of building a control strategy grounded in deep process understanding, they patch together documentation to meet minimum regulatory requirements. This short-term thinking can have long-term consequences, particularly when moving from clinical to commercial scale.

What compounds the issue further is that CMC problems are rarely solvable overnight. Unlike a clinical protocol amendment or a quick resubmission, fixing CMC issues often involves remanufacturing batches, revalidating processes, or collecting long-term stability data, all of which can introduce substantial delays. And in today's competitive landscape, delay is often synonymous with defeat.

Changing the Approach

So how do we break free from the CMC trap? It starts with a shift in mindset. CMC should not be viewed as a cost center or a box to check. Rather, it must be treated as a core strategic pillar, as fundamental to success as clinical efficacy or regulatory navigation.

This means involving CMC experts from the outset. It means aligning process development with clinical milestones so that each stage of development is supported by appropriate manufacturing and analytical maturity. It means ensuring that internal teams retain oversight and accountability even when tasks are outsourced. And perhaps most critically, it means planning for success, anticipating the rigor of regulatory review and preparing accordingly.

Global regulatory expectations are evolving, and the bar for CMC readiness continues to rise. Agencies like the FDA, EMA, and PMDA are increasingly focused on lifecycle management, quality-by-design principles, and data integrity. Companies that fail to keep pace risk finding themselves caught off guard, even if their clinical results are stellar.

It also means building a cross-functional culture where CMC professionals have a seat at the strategy table. Their insights into risk, scalability, and regulatory expectations are not only valuable, they are essential. Sponsors who integrate CMC planning into early product development will be better positioned to handle complexity, navigate regulators, and meet commercial timelines.

Conclusion

The path to regulatory approval is complex, and there are no shortcuts. But one thing is clear: the earlier and more strategically companies engage with CMC, the better their chances of success. The trap is real, but it is also avoidable. With the right mindset and the right partners, CMC can be transformed from a source of delay into a driver of speed, quality, and competitive differentiation. In an industry where every day counts and every delay carries real human and financial costs, investing in strategic CMC development is not just smart, it's imperative.

Ready to Partner? Talk to Syner-G

At Syner-G, we understand how to turn CMC from a regulatory risk into a strategic advantage. Our team of seasoned experts' partners with biopharma companies at every stage of development to design, implement, and defend CMC strategies that withstand regulatory scrutiny and enable speed to market.

Whether you're developing a small molecule, biologic, or advanced therapy, we can help you escape the CMC trap and move forward with confidence.

Contact us at www.synergbiopharma.com to learn more.

REFERENCES

1. McKinsey & Company. (2022). Unlocking the potential of CMC in pharma development. https://www.mckinsey.com/industries/life-sciences/our-insights/unlocking-the-potential-of-cmc-in-pharma-development
2. U.S. FDA. (2021). CDER Drug and Biologic Approval Reports. https://www.fda.gov/drugs/drug-approvals-and-databases/drug-approvals-cder
3. Deloitte. (2023). CMC Readiness: How manufacturing strategy shapes regulatory and commercial outcomes. https://www2.deloitte.com/us/en/pages/life-sciences-and-health-care/articles/cmc-readiness-in-biopharma.html