

HAMILTON QUALITY LLC

U.S. Quality Intelligence Brief

Week Ended October 11, 2026

Independent analysis of consequential U.S. pharmaceutical and medical-device quality developments, with practical implications for investigations, CAPA, remediation, and product disposition.

By Robert Holley, Principal Consultant, Hamilton Quality LLC

Published October 13, 2026

FDA's final guidance on postapproval biosimilar manufacturing changes leads this edition, followed by newly posted warning letters addressing sterile-product investigations, contract-manufacturing controls, and device-quality systems.

The enforcement coverage examines Pine Pharmaceuticals and TCI BioCosme, whose letters FDA posted on October 6. A Nova Biomedical field-correction update and the newly posted Unilam letter provide additional lessons in patient-data integrity, validation, and supplier oversight. This edition also covers the FDA's September 18 Curia letter as a retrospective data-integrity case study.

Across these developments, the central question is whether the evidence supports the quality decision—not simply whether a procedure was followed, a test passed, or a corrective-action task was closed.

1. FDA Finalizes Guidance on Postapproval Biosimilar Manufacturing Changes

What changed

On October 9, FDA issued final guidance addressing postapproval manufacturing changes to licensed biosimilar and interchangeable biosimilar products.

The document finalizes the July 2024 draft and supersedes the manufacturing-change recommendations in Q&A I.20 of FDA's broader biosimilar-development guidance.

HAMILTON QUALITY LLC

Its scope includes:

- Prior Approval Supplement, CBE-30, CBE-0, and annual-report reporting categories
- Risk-based comparability assessments
- Selection of prechange and postchange lots
- Comparative stability studies
- Analytical-method bridging
- Well-qualified in-house reference material
- Multiproduct manufacturing areas and contract facilities
- Dosage forms or strengths not previously licensed under the biosimilar's application

The guidance provides nonbinding recommendations. Existing statutory and regulatory obligations, including applicable requirements under 21 CFR 601.12, remain binding.

FDA recommends tailoring comparability assessments to the change and its potential effects. Evaluation may need to encompass intermediates, drug substance, and finished product. Historical analytical data may be sufficient when comparability is demonstrated; selected subsets and changed analytical methods require appropriate justification or bridging.

A dosage form or strength new to the biosimilar's application must still match the reference product's dosage form and strength. Such changes generally warrant a Prior Approval Supplement.

[Read FDA's final guidance](#)

[View FDA's guidance issuance listing](#)

Why it matters

A manufacturing change should not begin as an engineering or technology-transfer project and acquire its comparability and regulatory strategy later.

Reporting category, quality-attribute risk, analytical comparability, lot selection, stability design, process validation, assay bridging, and submission strategy should be integrated into the change plan from the beginning.

HAMILTON QUALITY LLC

This is especially important for:

- New manufacturing sites or contract manufacturers
- Major equipment or process changes
- Movement into multiproduct facilities
- Changes to analytical methods
- New dosage forms or strengths
- Changes affecting protein structure or impurity clearance

The multiproduct discussion deserves particular attention. Where highly similar products share manufacturing areas, identity testing may not reliably distinguish every product. Facility, personnel, material, and process controls must address that limitation.

Contract manufacturing also does not remove the applicant's responsibility for product quality or the quality unit's applicable approval and rejection responsibilities.

Carry forward

Before implementing a significant biosimilar manufacturing change, require the change-control package to answer:

1. What is the appropriate regulatory reporting category?
2. Which quality attributes could reasonably be affected?
3. Why are the selected lots and historical data scientifically representative?
4. At which manufacturing stages would an effect be most detectable?
5. How will unexpected differences affect implementation, validation, stability commitments, and product disposition?

Where highly similar products share a manufacturing area, explicitly challenge the ability of identity tests to distinguish them. Design line-clearance and contamination-control measures around both the capabilities and limitations of those methods.

HAMILTON QUALITY LLC

2. Pine Pharmaceuticals: Reinspection and Risk Assessment Cannot Replace Investigation

What changed

FDA posted its August 7 warning letter to Pine Pharmaceuticals on October 6.

The letter describes repeated aseptic lapses and inadequate monitoring, alongside significant investigation and disposition concerns:

- Particulate complaints lacked adequate root-cause investigation.
- Batches exceeding critical-defect limits were released, with responses relying on reinspection and retrospective risk assessments.
- Revised reject calculations identified six batches exceeding thresholds without demonstrated formal investigations.
- Visual-inspector qualification changes lacked timely requalification.
- Process validation was treated as conditional on future potency variability or OOS events.

[Read the Pine Pharmaceuticals warning letter](#)

Why it matters

The decision system itself warrants investigation when defect classifications, calculations, or acceptance criteria prevent meaningful escalation.

A later passing inspection does not explain the original failure. Nor does absence of complaints establish that production controls were adequate.

Carry forward

Review:

- Whether defect categories preserve appropriate investigation triggers
- Whether reject calculations capture the relevant population
- Whether reinspection addresses the original failure mechanism
- Whether revised qualification criteria require reassessment of existing personnel
- Whether validation commitments have defined completion criteria

HAMILTON QUALITY LLC

For each released batch with atypical defects, separate three questions: what failed, what was affected, and what evidence supports disposition?

3. TCI BioCosme: Testing, Validation, and Change Control Must Agree

What changed

FDA posted its September 2 warning letter to TCI Co., Ltd. BioCosme PABP Branch on October 6.

Findings included:

- OTC drug release without appropriate API assay testing
- Inadequately defined testing responsibilities between manufacturer and customer
- Incomplete component testing and unverified reliance on supplier certificates
- Validation that did not represent actual manufacturing
- Process-parameter adjustments outside established change control
- Incomplete batch documentation and absence of a written stability-testing program

FDA sought broader assessment of unapproved changes and remediation of quality-unit oversight.

[Read the TCI BioCosme warning letter](#)

Why it matters

Approved documents can create false assurance when specifications, validation, batch instructions, and actual execution describe different processes.

Contractual ambiguity compounds that problem if each party assumes the other has completed necessary testing.

Carry forward

For a representative product, trace:

1. Required specifications and tests
2. Assigned responsibility and available results
3. Validated process and approved instructions

HAMILTON QUALITY LLC

4. Actual execution and parameter changes
5. Quality-unit approval and disposition

Investigate mismatches across related products and batches. A promise to follow change control going forward does not establish the impact of earlier undocumented adjustments.

4. Nova StatStrip: Patient Identification Remains Part of Result Integrity

What changed

On October 6, FDA posted Nova Biomedical's October 5 announcement concerning its Gen 2.0 StatStrip hospital glucose meters.

The underlying correction began July 24 and was covered in Hamilton Quality's September 13 brief. This is an update on an existing field action.

A software issue can leave a previous patient's information displayed after a new barcode scan. Accepting that information can associate a glucose result with the wrong patient.

Nova reported receiving one U.S. adverse-event report on July 17 involving inappropriate insulin administration. No serious adverse events related to the issue had been reported as of the announcement.

The company described a shipment hold and a planned phased software rollout beginning in November 2026.

Interim instructions include checking patient identity after scanning and again when the result appears. Users **should stop using affected devices if an alternative device is available**. If no alternative is available, users must continue mitigation steps until the software fix becomes available. Incorrect patient assignments should be reported immediately to the administrator.

[Read Nova's announcement posted by FDA](#)

Why it matters

Analytical accuracy is only one component of result integrity.

A correct glucose value assigned to the wrong patient is an incorrect—and potentially dangerous—system output. Validation and risk management should therefore address the entire information chain:

HAMILTON QUALITY LLC

- Patient identification
- Sample collection
- Measurement
- Result association
- Data transmission
- Medical-record assignment
- Clinical interpretation

The interim identity checks depend on consistent execution under real clinical conditions. Distribution of a notification does not establish that customers received, understood, and implemented its instructions.

Likewise, a planned software release does not establish that the affected field population has been corrected.

Carry forward

A robust effectiveness assessment should address:

- Customer receipt and understanding of instructions
- Practicality of interim controls
- Identification and reconciliation of affected devices
- Deployment across the affected installed base
- Residual risk after correction
- Potential new workflow or data-transfer failures

Validation should challenge relevant transitions: consecutive patients, interrupted workflows, repeated scans, network delays, operator logout, timeouts, retransmission, and session recovery.

Technical correction and field implementation require separate evidence.

HAMILTON QUALITY LLC

5. Unilam: Calibration and Supplier Controls Must Support Actual Use

What changed

FDA posted its September 22 warning letter to UV-sunlamp manufacturer Unilam on October 6.

Findings extended beyond incomplete risk assessments:

- Calibration acceptance criteria omitted ultraviolet ranges used for product testing.
- Lifetime-emission validation was insufficient.
- Supplier approval records were contradictory or ambiguous.
- Added purchase-order language did not establish the mutual change-notification agreement FDA sought.
- Product-test sampling lacked adequate justification.

[Read the Unilam warning letter](#)

Why it matters

A current calibration certificate does not establish suitability for every measurement made with an instrument. A supplier evaluation likewise provides little assurance if approval status or the evaluated entity is unclear.

Carry forward

Trace each critical product requirement through its measurement method, operating range, acceptance criteria, calibration evidence, and sampling rationale.

For critical suppliers, verify:

- The approved legal entity and supplied material
- Clear approval status
- Agreed change-notification obligations
- Assessment before affected material enters production

Where equipment suitability is uncertain, include previously generated results and associated product in the impact assessment.

6. Curia: Unexplained Injections and Missing Records Require Retrospective Assessment

Retrospective enforcement case

What changed

FDA's September 18 warning letter concerns Curia New York's API-manufacturing facility in Rensselaer, inspected from January 28 through February 5, 2026.

The letter describes:

- Thousands of unexplained chromatographic injections
- Use of the Developer role for nearly 20% of Empower trial injections
- Nine injections lacking sufficient justification in Curia's retrospective review
- Original laboratory records found in shred bins
- Review of photocopies without adequate verification of original records
- Inability to associate discarded records with specific analyses or batches
- Shared login credentials

FDA requested investigation of all trial injections, documentation establishing that they were not sample injections, and assessment of distributed-API impact where sample injections were identified.

The requested remediation included assessments across facilities and CGMP computerized systems, a three-year assessment of GMP-integrated systems, and review of equipment and associated testing for distributed products within expiry on the U.S. market.

FDA also sought confirmation that Curia would hire an empowered data-integrity compliance officer. The agency concluded that the APIs were adulterated because of CGMP deficiencies.

[Read the Curia warning letter](#)

Why it matters

Restricting access, controlling document destruction, and retraining personnel can form part of effective CAPA. They do not, by themselves, establish:

- Why the practices developed

HAMILTON QUALITY LLC

- How long they existed
- Whether supervision tolerated them
- Which products and records were affected
- Whether released API was supported by complete and reliable data

An unsupported “negligible impact” conclusion remains inadequate even when a particular batch has not been shown to fail a chemical specification.

The retrospective investigation should follow the potential failure mechanism across relevant electronic records, paper records, instruments, personnel, products, and review periods.

Carry forward

Establish the purpose of each unexplained injection and whether it involved a product sample.

Where the evidence cannot resolve that question, our recommended approach is to retain the uncertainty in the product-impact assessment and evaluate potentially affected batches accordingly.

“Unable to determine” is not equivalent to “no impact.”

A credible review should include system inventories, privilege mapping, audit trails, sequence reconstruction, supporting laboratory records, product association, and documented justification for exclusions.

The objective is to distinguish what can be established from what remains uncertain—and make disposition and remediation decisions that account for both.

The Week in Context

This edition prioritizes newly issued guidance and newly posted enforcement information. Letter dates and FDA posting dates are distinguished because an earlier-issued letter can become publicly available during a later reporting week. Curia is included separately as a retrospective case.

The practical lessons extend across product categories:

- Plan the evidence needed before implementing a change.

HAMILTON QUALITY LLC

- Investigate the original failure before relying on a later passing result.
- Reconcile contractual responsibilities with actual testing and release controls.
- Ensure validation represents the process or workflow used in practice.
- Treat unresolved data gaps as uncertainty requiring assessment.
- Verify that corrective action reaches both the technical system and the affected product population.

A useful quality-review question is:

What evidence supports this decision, and what would cause us to reconsider it?

A defensible answer should identify the relevant data, acknowledge their limitations, and explain how remaining uncertainty is controlled.

Worth Reading

1. [FDA's final guidance on postapproval biosimilar manufacturing changes](#)
Comparability planning, reporting categories, analytical bridging, and multiproduct manufacturing.
2. [Pine Pharmaceuticals warning letter](#)
3. [TCI BioCosme warning letter](#)
4. [Nova StatStrip correction announcement](#)
Patient-identification risk, customer instructions, and the planned correction.
5. [Unilam warning letter](#)
6. [Curia warning letter](#)
Retrospective investigation of laboratory data, missing records, and product impact.

[FDA warning-letter index: issuance and posting dates](#)

Hamilton Quality Intelligence Brief provides independent commentary on publicly available information. It is intended for general informational purposes and does not constitute legal or regulatory advice.

Hamilton Quality LLC

Experience. Judgment. Practical Results.

hamiltonquality.com