

HAMILTON QUALITY LLC

U.S. Quality Intelligence Brief

Week Ended October 24, 2026 | Published October 26, 2026

This was an unusually enforcement-heavy week. This week's brief examines five FDA warning letters newly posted on October 20, together with updated medical-device resources on Predetermined Change Control Plans.

The enforcement cases address different products and operations, but share a practical theme: quality decisions need reliable evidence, scientifically justified investigation boundaries, and demonstrated corrective-action effectiveness.

Reading note: The warning-letter issue dates appear below; their public posting date was October 20, 2026. Findings and company responses are summarized from the cited FDA records and reflect the agency's assessments at the time of those documents. Subsequent correspondence or corrective actions may change the regulatory status of the matters described. "Why It Matters" and "Carry Forward" provide Hamilton Quality's analysis, not additional FDA findings.

1. Baxter: FDA Questions the Evidence Supporting Contamination Controls and Batch Disposition

Warning letter issued September 29, 2026

FDA's letter to Baxter International concerns Baxter Healthcare's injectable-drug manufacturing facility in Round Lake, Illinois.

According to FDA, environmental monitoring repeatedly detected cephalosporin contamination in multiple areas of the facility beginning in January 2025. The agency identified limitations in sampling coverage, low-level recovery, sample handling, and finished-product testing. These included testing samples beyond established solution-stability periods and relying on a single finished-product unit regardless of batch size.

FDA emphasized that contamination may be nonuniform and that no safe level of beta-lactam contamination has been established.

The letter also identified concerns involving:

- Biological-indicator growth during requalification without adequate investigation.

HAMILTON QUALITY LLC

- Media fills that did not adequately represent production-intervention frequency.
- Environmental monitoring and airflow-visualization studies.
- Visual-inspection qualification using excessively large challenge particles and inspection speeds FDA considered too fast.
- Increasing container-closure leak rates despite fewer associated nonconformance reports.

In a separate sterility-test investigation, FDA stated that Baxter invalidated a failing result without adequate scientific justification and released the affected cefazolin lot in July 2025. The agency highlighted an unresolved conflict between the investigation's explanation and signed, contemporaneous records indicating that test-container integrity had initially been verified.

The letter acknowledges Baxter's commitments to improve monitoring, visual inspection, investigations, and other controls. FDA nevertheless found the responses insufficient in the areas discussed and requested independent assessments and broader remediation.

[Read the Baxter Warning Letter](#)

Why It Matters

A negative result supports a quality decision only to the extent that the method and sampling strategy can detect the relevant hazard.

Sampling coverage, recovery capability, sample stability, and contamination distribution all affect the strength of a "no product impact" conclusion. Increasing the number of tests does not necessarily resolve deficiencies in the underlying detection system.

The sterility investigation illustrates a related issue: when a proposed laboratory cause conflicts with contemporaneous records, the discrepancy needs investigation and a scientifically supported resolution. A later explanation does not, by itself, invalidate the original result.

Carry Forward

Before accepting a contamination-risk assessment or batch-disposition rationale, establish that:

- The method was suitable for detecting the hazard at relevant levels.
- The sampling strategy addressed potentially nonuniform contamination.

HAMILTON QUALITY LLC

- Sample handling preserved the validity of the results.
- Contrary evidence and documentation discrepancies were resolved.
- Interim controls adequately address risk while long-term remediation proceeds.

Risk assessments should state the limitations of the evidence, not treat those limitations as evidence that risk is absent.

2. Olympus: FDA Highlights CAPA Effectiveness, Recall Scope, and Global Accountability

Warning letter issued October 7, 2026

FDA's Olympus warning letter presents findings from six inspected facilities in Japan, Germany, and Minnesota. The cited deficiencies span design controls, process validation, corrective and preventive action, supplier controls, complaint handling, and medical-device reporting.

Examples described by FDA include:

- A supplier-performance CAPA closed without corrective or preventive action, with the associated performance indicator eliminated without addressing the underlying quality problems.
- A Powerseal recall whose scope was not expanded after the identified cause changed from a supplier-component problem to an assembly error.
- Three CAPAs addressing sterile-barrier seal defects over approximately three years without correcting the underlying validation-methodology deficiency.
- Root-cause-related actions classified as corrections without verification of effectiveness.
- Fifty-four open quality plans at the Brooklyn Park facility, including plans addressing complaint and reporting backlogs, without adequate procedural criteria distinguishing quality plans from CAPA.
- A Hamburg complaint-trending example that excluded non-reportable complaints.
- Insufficient evidence of product-specific training for contract personnel performing complaint work.

HAMILTON QUALITY LLC

The letter describes Olympus's revised procedures, ongoing investigations, and local and global CAPAs. For numerous findings, FDA stated that it could not determine the adequacy of the response because corrective work remained ongoing or evidence of completion and effectiveness had not been provided.

FDA also emphasized that corrective actions proposed or implemented now must meet the Quality Management System Regulation, effective February 2, 2026, although the underlying inspections were conducted under the preceding Quality System Regulation.

Separately, FDA's October 20 communication expanded its list of specified Olympus devices subject to an import alert. This is not a blanket recall or instruction to stop using all Olympus devices. FDA advised that devices already in use may continue to be used if they are not experiencing problems, subject to the communication's precautions and any applicable recall instructions.

[Read the Olympus Warning Letter](#)

[Read FDA's Olympus Import-Alert Update](#)

Why It Matters

Quality plans, local CAPAs, global CAPAs, and linked nonconformances can support effective remediation—but only when their relationships, responsibilities, and completion criteria are clear.

The label on a record should not determine whether root-cause correction and effectiveness verification occur. Moving work into another record or organizational function does not establish that the underlying problem has been resolved.

The recall example also demonstrates why scope assessment must remain responsive to new evidence. A field-action boundary based on one failure mechanism may no longer be appropriate when the investigation identifies another.

Carry Forward

When an investigation changes the identified root cause or failure mechanism, reassess:

- The potentially affected product population.
- Health-hazard and product-risk assessments.
- Ship holds, recalls, and other field actions.
- Other sites, products, suppliers, and processes exposed to the revised cause.

HAMILTON QUALITY LLC

- Earlier conclusions about corrective-action effectiveness.

Global remediation programs should identify who owns execution, who retains responsibility for site-specific risk, and who verifies that the local deficiency has actually been corrected.

3. Rohto: FDA Finds Data Falsification and Rejects Reliance on Compromised Monitoring Records

Warning letter issued October 14, 2026

FDA's letter to Rohto Pharmaceutical describes what the agency characterized as systemic data falsification at the Rohto-Mentholatum manufacturing facility in Vietnam, which manufactures ophthalmic drugs using aseptic processing.

According to the letter, unexposed environmental- and personnel-monitoring plates were submitted to the laboratory as though sampling had occurred. FDA also described sampling at incorrect locations with records indicating the required locations, and cleaning records documenting activities that management confirmed had not been performed.

FDA reported that the affected historical monitoring records showed zero colony-forming units except for one deviation associated with a water leak. Plate readings conducted during the inspection subsequently showed numerous microbial recoveries, including approximately 25 ISO 5 excursions.

The letter acknowledges Rohto's reported suspension of drug production for the U.S. market, notification to its U.S. distributor to halt distribution, personnel suspensions, and engagement of an independent third party.

However, FDA found the initial product-impact assessment unsupported because it continued to rely on historical environmental-monitoring data confirmed to be unreliable. The agency characterized the problem as a systemic quality and senior-management failure extending beyond individual misconduct.

[Read the Rohto Warning Letter](#)

Why It Matters

Records affected by falsification must be preserved and investigated, but they cannot simply be accepted as evidence that operations were controlled.

HAMILTON QUALITY LLC

An absence of recorded adverse trends is not reassuring when the underlying sampling or documentation did not reliably represent actual operations. The first task is to determine which records and systems remain trustworthy—and where uncertainty prevents a defensible product-impact conclusion.

Unexpectedly favorable data are not, by themselves, proof of misconduct. They can nevertheless warrant investigation when inconsistent with process knowledge, other observations, or independently generated results.

Carry Forward

For a compromised dataset:

- Preserve original records, metadata, and audit trails.
- Establish the affected systems, record types, products, and time periods.
- Independently assess the reliability of proposed alternative evidence.
- Evaluate batch records, complaints, testing, maintenance history, distribution records, and other relevant information.
- Identify unresolved gaps and their implications for product disposition.
- Verify that remediation addresses oversight and management controls, not only individual conduct.

Neither passing retain tests nor an absence of complaints can automatically establish the quality of every affected unit.

4. SnugZ: Passing Retests Did Not Resolve Uninvestigated OOS Results

Warning letter issued September 28, 2026

FDA's letter to SnugZ USA concerns its drug manufacturing facility in West Jordan, Utah.

According to FDA, the company routinely failed to investigate chemical and microbiological out-of-specification results. Failing samples were retested, or new samples prepared and tested, until passing results were obtained. Those results were then used to release products without appropriate investigations of the original failures.

HAMILTON QUALITY LLC

FDA also questioned procedures permitting repeated testing and, for certain microbiological failures, use of a second instrument without adequate scientific support for the approach.

The letter acknowledges an interim stop upon an initial OOS result and commitments to retrospective review and procedural changes. FDA found that the response lacked sufficient detail to establish sustainable remediation.

Requested actions included independent review of invalidated OOS results for U.S.-marketed products within expiry, appropriate investigation of potential manufacturing causes, and full chemical and microbiological testing of retain samples from distributed batches still within expiry.

[Read the SnugZ Warning Letter](#)

Why It Matters

Passing retest results alone do not invalidate an original OOS result.

When laboratory error cannot be conclusively established, the investigation must address potential manufacturing causes. That review may involve raw materials, equipment, facilities, process capability, batch history, deviations, complaints, and related failures.

Additional testing can help characterize an event. It should not be used to replace an unresolved result simply because the later outcome is more favorable.

Carry Forward

OOS procedures should distinguish among:

- Conclusively demonstrated laboratory error.
- Inconclusive laboratory findings requiring broader investigation.
- Confirmed manufacturing or product failure.
- Additional testing undertaken to understand the event.

The disposition rationale should explain how all relevant results—including the original failure—were evaluated. Retesting should follow a scientifically justified plan with appropriate quality-unit oversight.

HAMILTON QUALITY LLC

5. Signature Formulations: FDA Identifies Cross-Contamination Across All Sampled Lots

Warning letter issued October 1, 2026

FDA reported detecting undeclared contaminants in every randomly sampled lot included in its analysis of specified Signature Formulations drug products.

The public letter redacts important details, including product and contaminant identities and the number of lots tested. Its findings should therefore not be expanded into claims about particular substances or products that the public record does not identify.

FDA linked the findings to shared manufacturing areas and equipment, discussed a previous contamination recall, and referenced an earlier warning letter issued January 21, 2026.

The agency concluded that the results indicated a systemic failure that could not be resolved through retrospective testing. It emphasized the nonuniform distribution of contamination and uncertainty about its full extent across marketed products.

The letter records FDA's September 15 recommendation for voluntary recall of all drug products then in U.S. distribution. It also acknowledges the company's commitments to halt manufacturing and distribution and undertake a voluntary recall, with aspects of the product scope redacted. Those commitments should not be read as confirmation that all recall activities had been completed.

FDA strongly advised engaging a consultant experienced in highly potent materials and implementing systemic corrective actions before resuming manufacturing.

[Read the Signature Formulations Warning Letter](#)

Why It Matters

The distinction is important: FDA found contamination in every lot it sampled; that is not the same as individually testing and confirming contamination in every marketed lot.

Nevertheless, broad contamination findings combined with inadequate segregation can make it difficult to justify a narrow affected-product boundary. Where contamination is nonuniform, negative results from additional samples may offer limited assurance about untested units.

Testing can inform an investigation. It cannot replace facility and process controls capable of preventing cross-contamination.

HAMILTON QUALITY LLC

Carry Forward

A cross-contamination response should address:

- Facility segregation and containment.
- Dedicated equipment, HVAC, or production areas where warranted.
- Personnel and material flows.
- Cleaning capability and residue characteristics.
- Scientifically justified product-impact boundaries.
- Distributed-product disposition and necessary field actions.
- Conditions that must be satisfied before operations resume.

Explicitly document what the sampling results establish—and what they cannot establish.

6. FDA Adds Practical Resources for Predetermined Change Control Plans

What Changed

FDA's October 20 medical-device updates highlighted a consolidated Predetermined Change Control Plan resource and hypothetical case examples.

A PCCP describes specified future device modifications, the methods for developing and implementing them, and the assessment of their impact. When FDA authorizes a PCCP, changes included in and implemented according to that plan may be made without a separate marketing submission for each change.

FDA identifies the 510(k), De Novo, and premarket approval pathways as routes through which PCCPs may be reviewed, including for device-led combination products.

The new materials are informational resources and illustrative examples—not a new regulation or blanket authorization for future modifications.

[FDA Predetermined Change Control Plan Resource](#)

[FDA's Hypothetical PCCP Case Examples](#)

HAMILTON QUALITY LLC

Why It Matters

A PCCP provides a defined, authorized framework for future changes. It does not remove the need for quality-system controls, verification, validation, risk assessment, or appropriate documentation.

Manufacturers need to establish that each modification fits the authorized description, follows the modification protocol, and meets applicable acceptance criteria. Interactions and cumulative effects also require consideration.

A modification outside the authorized PCCP must be assessed under the applicable change and submission requirements. Being outside the plan does not, by itself, mean that a new submission is always required.

Carry Forward

Integrate PCCP assessment into change control by identifying:

- Whether the proposed modification is covered by the authorized plan.
- The applicable protocol and acceptance criteria.
- Required verification, validation, risk-management, and labeling activities.
- Potential interactions with earlier modifications.
- The regulatory assessment and submission decision for changes outside the plan.

Treat the PCCP as a controlled part of the product's regulatory and quality documentation.

The Week in Context

These selected FDA records reinforce several practical questions for quality leaders:

- Are negative results supported by capable methods and appropriate sampling?
- Have investigations resolved contradictory evidence?
- Are product-impact conclusions based on trustworthy records?
- Have new findings triggered reassessment of scope and field actions?
- Is corrective-action effectiveness demonstrated rather than assumed?
- Do prevention controls adequately address risks that testing alone cannot resolve?

HAMILTON QUALITY LLC

The common lesson is not that every uncertainty proves product failure. It is that uncertainty must be recognized, investigated, and addressed in the decision—not silently converted into assurance.

Worth Reading

1. [Baxter Warning Letter](#) — Contamination monitoring, visual inspection, sterility investigations, and batch disposition.
 2. [Olympus Warning Letter](#) — CAPA effectiveness, recall scope, supplier controls, and global accountability.
 3. [Rohto Warning Letter](#) — Data integrity, management oversight, and product-impact assessment.
 4. [SnugZ Warning Letter](#) — OOS investigations, retesting, and retrospective review.
 5. [Signature Formulations Warning Letter](#) — Cross-contamination controls and the limitations of retrospective testing.
 6. [FDA PCCP Resources](#) — Planning and controlling authorized future device modifications.
-

HAMILTON QUALITY LLC

A weekly publication of Hamilton Quality LLC

Editor: Robert Holley

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

Disclaimer

This publication provides general quality and regulatory information and professional commentary. It does not constitute legal advice or replace a product- or facility-specific assessment. Consult the linked source documents for complete findings, affected-product details, and applicable instructions.

Hamilton Quality LLC

Experience. Judgment. Practical Results.

hamiltonquality.com