Lyophilization of Biologics: Innovations, Challenges, and Future Directions in Stabilizing Next-Generation Therapeutics

Sabiha Khatoon[1], Shafiul Haque[2,3,*], Imran Saleem[4], Faizan Haider Khan[5*]

[1] Department of Physiology and Biochemistry, University of Oklahoma Health Sciences Center, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma, 73104, United States. sabiha.khatoon@ouhsc.edu https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8757-6584
[2] College of Nursing & Health Sciences, & Health Research Centre, Jazan University, Jazan-82911, Saudi Arabia; Email: shafiul.haque@hotmail.com https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2989-121X
[3] School of Medicine, Universidad Espiritu Santo, Samborondon, 091952, Ecuador
[4] Nanomedicine, Formulation & Delivery Research Group, School of Pharmacy and Biomolecular Sciences, Liverpool John Moores University, Liverpool L3 3AF, UK; I.Saleem@ljmu.ac.uk https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2382-6668
[5] Biosensia Ltd., Arena House, Arena Road, Sandyford Business Park, Dublin-18, D18 V8P6, Ireland. mbt.110@gmail.com https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3684-0135

*** Correspondence to:**

Dr. Shafiul Haque (shafiul.haque@hotmail.com)

Dr. Faizan Haider Khan (mbt.110@gmail.com)

Abstract

Biologics, such as monoclonal antibodies, therapeutic proteins, gene therapies, and vaccines, are revolutionizing treatments for cancer, autoimmune disorders, and infectious diseases. However, their inherent sensitivity to environmental factors like heat and moisture necessitates advanced stabilization techniques. Lyophilization, or freeze-drying, has emerged as a critical method to preserve biologics by removing water through sublimation, resulting in a stable, dry powder. This review examines recent advancements in lyophilization, including the integration of Quality by Design (QbD) and Process Analytical Techniques (PAT), which enhance process optimization and product consistency. Regulatory frameworks from the FDA and EMA, coupled with advanced analytical methods, ensure the safety and efficacy of lyophilized biologics. The review also explores emerging technologies and innovations poised to address current challenges, such as scalability, cost-efficiency, and long-term stability. By synthesizing scientific, technological, and regulatory perspectives, this article provides a comprehensive overview of lyophilization's role in biopharmaceutical development and its future potential to meet the growing demands of biologic therapeutics.

Keywords: Biologics, Lyophilization, Stability, Efficacy, Formulation, Process Optimization, Regulatory Compliance, Advanced Technologies, Challenges, Innovations.

1. Introduction

Biologics, including monoclonal antibodies, therapeutic proteins, gene therapies, and vaccines, are transforming treatments for diseases such as cancer, autoimmune disorders, and infectious diseases [1]. Their success and therapeutic potential have piloted in a new medical era, marked by highly effective and low side-effect treatments [2]. Unlike small-molecule drugs, biologics are derived from living organisms, making them inherently complex and sensitive to environmental factors such as temperature, humidity, light, and oxygen [3]. Exposure to these factors can trigger denaturation, aggregation, or chemical degradation, compromising product stability, potency, and patient safety [4]. Ensuring the long-term stability of biologics is therefore a major challenge throughout their lifecycle from manufacturing and storage to global distribution [5]. For instance, proteins may undergo conformational changes or form aggregates when exposed to heat or shear stress, while mRNA-based vaccines require ultra-cold storage to maintain their integrity [6]. Such requirements place heavy reliance on the cold chain, which can be costly, logistically complex, and difficult to sustain in resource-limited settings. As global demand for biologics accelerates, innovative stabilization strategies have become a critical focus in biopharmaceutical development [7].

A variety of technologies have been explored to mitigate instability, including liquid formulation, spray-drying, and lyophilization (freeze-drying) (Table 1) [8]. Liquid formulations are simple and cost-effective but generally offer limited stability, as water promotes hydrolysis, deamidation, and microbial growth, necessitating refrigerated or frozen storage [9]. Spray-drying, a scalable and energy-efficient alternative, can produce dry powders suitable for certain delivery routes such as inhalation, yet the high shear and thermal stresses involved may denature fragile molecules or complex biologics like viral vectors [10]. Within this landscape, lyophilization stands as the gold standard for preserving high-value, structurally delicate biologics [11]. By removing water through controlled sublimation, it significantly reduces degradation rates and enables stable storage at

ambient or refrigerated conditions for extended periods [12]. A schematic representation of the typical workflow for developing a lyophilized biologic, from formulation to the final filled product, is provided in the Graphical Abstract, illustrating the interconnected stages of this complex process. Although lyophilization is batch-based, energy-intensive, and requires reconstitution before administration, its unparalleled ability to maintain structural and functional integrity makes it indispensable for labile therapeutics particularly monoclonal antibodies, vaccines, and next-generation modalities where long-term stability and cold-chain independence are paramount [13].

Recent advances, including the integration of Quality by Design (QbD) principles and Process Analytical Technology (PAT), have refined lyophilization control and consistency, driving improvements in product quality and regulatory compliance [14]. As biologic modalities continue to diversify and increase in complexity, the strategic use of lyophilization remains central to ensuring their stability, accessibility, and global impact [15]. This manuscript offers a comprehensive overview of lyophilization in biologics, including principles, vulnerabilities, optimization, trends, case studies, emerging technology, regulations, challenges, and innovations. It emphasizes lyophilization's importance in preserving and advancing biologics, vital for researchers, developers, regulators, and healthcare providers in the evolving biopharmaceutical field.

Table 1. A Comparative Analysis of Primary Stabilization Technologies for Biologics

Technology	Key Principle	Advantages	Disadvantages	Ideal Use Cases	Ref
Liquid Formulation	Stabilization in aqueous solution.	Simple, low-cost, immediate administration, patient-friendly.	Limited shelf-life, requires cold chain, prone to chemical	Stable mAbs, some vaccines with robust adjuvants, short-	[9]

Technology	Key Principle	Advantages	Disadvantages	Ideal Use Cases	Ref
			degradation (hydrolysis, deamidation) and microbial growth.	term use in-hospital products.	
Spray-Drying	Rapid solvent evaporation via atomization into hot gas.	Continuous process, fast, more energy-efficient than lyophilization, good for particle engineering.	High shear and thermal stress can denature proteins, less suitable for very large or complex structures (e.g., viral vectors, LNPs).	Peptides, some enzymes, inhaled biologics, where a dry powder is required but extreme sensitivity is not a concern.	[10]
Lyophilization (Freeze-Drying)	Sublimation of ice under vacuum.	**Excellent long-term stability**, enables ambient temperature storage, preserves structure of highly sensitive molecules (proteins, mRNA, viral vectors), widely accepted by regulators.	Batch process, time-consuming, high energy cost, requires reconstitution, risk of freezing and drying stresses (aggregation, collapse).	High-value, sensitive therapeutics: mAbs, mRNA vaccines, gene therapies, plasma products, live microbes (probiotics/LBPs).	[11]

2. Integrated Design and Operational Principles of a Lyophilizer

A lyophilizer or freeze-dryer, is a precisely engineered system designed to remove water from sensitive materials, especially biologics while preserving their structural and functional integrity [16]. Its performance relies on a synergistic integration of mechanical components and

thermodynamic principles, enabling controlled dehydration through the sequential stages of freezing, primary drying (sublimation), and secondary drying (desorption) [17].

2.1. System Configuration and Major Components

The core components of a lyophilizer include the chamber, condenser, vacuum system, refrigeration unit, and control system (Figure 1). The product chamber is the central environment where freezing and drying occur. It typically contains temperature-controlled shelves that ensure uniform cooling and heating across all product containers, whether vials or trays. Adjacent to the chamber is the condenser, maintained at temperatures lower than the product to capture and solidify water vapor released during sublimation.

The vacuum system plays a pivotal role by lowering chamber pressure to promote sublimation of ice directly into vapor, while the refrigeration system provides the necessary cooling for both the chamber and condenser, often reaching temperatures below −80 °C. The control system, typically managed by programmable logic controllers (PLCs) and sensor arrays, continuously monitors parameters such as pressure, shelf temperature, and moisture levels, ensuring a stable and reproducible process [17]. Modern units often integrate tunable diode laser absorption spectroscopy (TDLAS) or similar tools for real-time vapor and moisture analysis, enhancing control and regulatory compliance [18].

2.2. Fundamental Principles of Operation

The lyophilization process operates on thermodynamic and kinetic principles that govern heat and mass transfer under reduced pressure. It progresses through three distinct but interdependent stages—freezing, primary drying, and secondary drying (Figure 2), each demanding precise environmental control [19,20].

2.2.1. Freezing Stage

The product is first cooled below its eutectic (for crystalline substances) or glass transition temperature (Tg') (for amorphous materials) (Figure 3) [21]. During this phase, water

crystallizes into an ice matrix that defines the porous structure of the final dried product [22]. The cooling rate strongly influences ice morphology: rapid freezing produces finer crystals (reducing pore size and slowing sublimation), while slower cooling creates larger crystals, facilitating vapor escape but risking solute segregation [23]. Techniques such as annealing controlled warming and refreezing, can be applied to optimize ice uniformity and reduce subsequent drying time [24].

2.2.2. Primary Drying (Sublimation)

Once frozen, the system pressure is reduced (typically to 0.03–1 mbar), and heat is gently applied to initiate sublimation of ice without melting. The chamber shelves are maintained below the product's collapse temperature (Tc) to preserve structural integrity [25]. The water vapor migrates through the dry layer and is captured by the condenser, which operates at much lower temperatures (−80 °C or below) [26]. The efficiency of this phase depends on the balance between heat transfer to the sublimation front and mass transfer of vapor through the porous cake [27].

2.2.3. Secondary Drying (Desorption)

After the bulk of ice is removed, residual bound water remains adsorbed within the product matrix. Controlled heating (typically 20–40 °C) under sustained vacuum desorbs this moisture until the residual content falls below 1%, ensuring long-term stability [28,29]. Excessive heating must be avoided to prevent denaturation or degradation of the product [30].

2.3. Coupled Heat and Mass Transfer Dynamics

Throughout the process, the interaction between heat input and vapor removal governs efficiency [31]. Heat must penetrate the frozen layer to sustain sublimation, while vapor must diffuse through the porous structure to the condenser [32]. The resistance of the dried layer (Rp) represents the barrier to vapor flow and depends on pore morphology and cake structure [33]. The relationship between these variables can be described by:

$$\frac{dQ}{dt} = \left(\frac{dm}{dt}\right).\Delta HS \ + ms.Cv\left(\frac{dT}{dt}\right)$$

Where, dQ/dt – Flow to heat in product, dm/dt – sublimation rate (g/s), ΔHS – heat of sublimation (cal/g), ms – sample mass (g), Cv - specific heat capacity (cal/K·g) and dT/dt – change of product temperature (K/s).

Effective lyophilization thus requires precise synchronization of the chamber's thermal and pressure conditions, condenser capacity, and mass transfer pathways. Advanced sensors and control algorithms dynamically adjust process parameters in real time, ensuring uniform drying, reduced cycle time, and preservation of product integrity [18].

3. Advanced Process Optimization and Quality Control

Formulation scientists often prioritize lyophilization as the preferred technique in formulation development. The choice of formulation attributes varies based on the route of administration, requiring formulators to account for different factors, such as the volume needed for intravenous, intramuscular, or subcutaneous delivery in the reconstituted dispersion [34]. The synergistic application of Quality by Design (QbD) and Process Analytical Technology (PAT moves beyond basic parameter control to establish a holistic understanding of how formulation attributes and process dynamics dictate final product quality [35].

3.1. Quality by Design (QbD) Strategies in Lyophilization

The implementation of Quality by Design (QbD) in lyophilization represents a strategic shift from traditional, empirical 'quality by testing' approaches [36]. Unlike conventional methods, which rely on fixed parameters and extensive end-product testing, QbD emphasizes proactive understanding and control of Critical Quality Attributes (CQAs), Critical Process Parameters (CPPs), and Critical Material Attributes (CMAs) [37]. This approach enhances process understanding and control, enabling the design of robust lyophilization methods [38].

3.1.1. Critical Material Attributes (CMAs)

CMAs are the physical and chemical properties of the input materials that must be controlled to ensure the CQAs. These attributes directly influence the behavior of the product during freezing, drying, and storage, ultimately determining the quality, stability, and efficacy of the final lyophilized biologic [39]. Key CMAs include lyoprotectants, Bulking agents, buffer systems, Surfactants, fill volume, total solid content, ionic strength, and the configuration of the vial and stopper (Table 2), each playing a distinct role in process optimization.

3.1.1.1. Lyoprotectants (Stabilizers)

Lyoprotectants such as sucrose and trehalose play a vital role in preserving proteins during the drying process. According to the water replacement theory, these disaccharides substitute for water molecules by forming extensive hydrogen-bonding interactions with the polar groups on the protein surface [40]. This stabilizing effect helps maintain the protein's native structure even in the absence of water, as the sugars create a rigid, amorphous glassy matrix characterized by a high glass transition temperature (T_g) [41]. The effectiveness of this protection depends heavily on the mass ratio between the lyoprotectant and the protein—typically requiring a large molar excess, often ranging from 360:1 to 600:1, to ensure thorough surface coverage [39]. Among commonly used sugars, trehalose is often favored because it possesses a higher glass transition temperature (approximately 115°C compared to about 65°C for sucrose) and exhibits lower chemical reactivity, thereby minimizing the likelihood of Maillard-type reactions that can compromise protein stability [42].

3.1.1.2. Bulking Agents

Bulking agents, such as mannitol and glycine, play a crucial role in lyophilized formulations by providing structural support during the freezing or annealing stages [43]. These excipients undergo crystallization, which creates a solid framework that enhances the appearance of the lyophilized cake and lowers the proportion of hygroscopic amorphous material. It is essential that this

crystallization process is fully complete, as partial crystallization, particularly of mannitol, can result in the conversion of its metastable Form I to the more stable Form II during storage, potentially causing vial breakage or collapse of the cake [44]. To ensure thorough crystallization and promote the formation of larger ice crystals, the process often includes an annealing step, where the product is held at a carefully controlled temperature above the glass transition of the maximally freeze-concentrated solute (T_g') but below the eutectic melting point. This controlled step is a critical process parameter, helping to reduce resistance in the dried layer (R_p) and improve overall product stability [45].

3.1.1.3. Buffer Systems

Buffer systems maintain pH during process-induced concentration. As water freezes, all solutes concentrate in the unfrozen phase, which can lead to denaturation, aggregation, or loss of bioactivity [46]. A buffer that crystallizes (e.g., sodium phosphate) loses its buffering capacity, leading to drastic pH shifts (e.g., disodium phosphate crystallization can drop the pH by over 3 units) [47]. Histidine buffers (pH 6–7) are commonly preferred for protein formulations because they resist crystallization and maintain a stable pH even under freezing conditions [48]. The pKa of the buffer at the process temperature is crucial; a buffer with a pKa close to the target pH and minimal change with temperature (dpKa/dT) is ideal [49].

3.1.1.4. Surfactants:

Surfactants such as Polysorbate 20 and Polysorbate 80 play a crucial role in reducing interfacial stresses that occur at the boundaries between ice and liquid or air and liquid during the freezing and primary drying stages of lyophilization [50]. By doing so, they help prevent protein aggregation that can be triggered by surface interactions. However, these surfactants are prone to oxidative degradation, which can lead to the formation of peroxides and fatty acid by-products. These reactive species may oxidize methionine residues or even cause cleavage of the protein

backbone [51]. Therefore, maintaining control over critical material attributes such as the oxygen level within the vial's headspace, along with the inclusion of antioxidants like methionine, is essential to minimize these degradation pathways [52].

Table 2. Key Excipients in Lyophilized Biologic Formulations: Mechanisms and Applications

Excipient Category	***Examples***	***Primary Mechanism of Action***	***Critical Considerations & Empirical Effects***	***Ref***
Lyoprotectants (Sugars)	*Sucrose, Trehalose*	*Water replacement hypothesis; form hydrogen bonds with proteins, vitrification to form a stable amorphous glassy matrix.*	*Amorphous state is crucial for stability. Tend to increase collapse temperature (T_c). High concentrations can increase viscosity and prolong primary drying. Trehalose has higher T_g than sucrose.*	[40] [41] [42]
Bulking Agents	*Mannitol, Glycine*	*Crystallize upon freezing, providing mechanical strength and elegant cake structure.*	*Crystalline form provides no protein stabilization. Must be fully crystallized (via annealing) to prevent crystallization during storage. Mannitol crystallization can cause pH shifts.*	[43]
Surfactants	*Polysorbate 20, Polysorbate 80*	*Minimize surface-induced aggregation at interfaces (air-liquid, ice-liquid) during freezing and drying.*	*Can undergo oxidative degradation, generating reactive species. Optimal concentration is a balance between protection and potential destabilization.*	[50] [52]
Buffers	*Histidine, Succinate, Citrate*	*Maintain pH stability during process-induced concentration shifts.*	*Must resist crystallization (e.g., Histidine is preferred over phosphate). Buffer*	[46] [47] [48]

Excipient Category	*Examples*	*Primary Mechanism of Action*	*Critical Considerations & Empirical Effects*	*Ref*
			capacity and pKa at various temperatures are critical.	

230

231 **3.1.1.5. Fill Volume and Solid Content**

232 The volume of liquid filled in each vial and the total solid content of the formulation are important
233 CMAs that influence freezing, drying rates, and cake uniformity [53]. Drying time is more closely
234 related to fill height than total volume due to the path vapor must traverse. High solid content
235 increases resistance to vapor flow, raising internal pressure and temperature, which can cause
236 collapse or cracks in the cake [54]. Proper optimization ensures consistent drying, desirable cake
237 morphology, and rapid reconstitution.

238 **3.1.1.6. Ionic Strength**

239 The ionic strength of the formulation affects protein stability during freezing and drying. High
240 ionic strength can cause salting-out, aggregation, or precipitation as the unfrozen phase
241 concentrates [55]. Local pH changes and salt-induced denaturation may also occur during freezing,
242 making careful control of ionic strength essential for preserving protein integrity [56].

243 **3.1.1.7. Configuration of Vial and Stopper**

244 The vial/stopper configurations that influence heat transfer efficiency and moisture retention. The
245 physical characteristics of primary packaging components, including vial geometry and stopper
246 design, play a critical role in determining heat transfer rates and maintaining proper moisture
247 barriers during storage [57].

248 **3.1.2. Critical Process Parameters (CPPs)**

The success of lyophilization depends heavily on precise control of Critical Process Parameters (CPPs), which are key variables that directly influence the Critical Quality Attributes (CQAs) of the final product. These parameters must be carefully optimized to ensure the biological activity, stability, and physical characteristics of the lyophilized product meet stringent pharmaceutical standards. Each CPP interacts with the others in complex ways, requiring a thorough understanding of their individual and combined effects on the lyophilization process [58].

3.1.2.1. Freezing Rate

Freezing Rate plays a fundamental role in determining the ice crystal structure that forms during the initial phase of lyophilization. The rate at which a product is frozen significantly impacts the size and morphology of ice crystals, which in turn affects the porosity and surface area of the dried product matrix [59]. Rapid freezing, often achieved through immersion in liquid nitrogen or specialized freezing techniques, produces small, numerous ice crystals that create a dense network of pores. While this can help preserve delicate protein structures by minimizing mechanical stress, it may also lead to longer primary drying times due to increased resistance to vapor flow [60]. Conversely, slow freezing results in larger ice crystals that form more open channels in the product matrix, facilitating faster sublimation during primary drying but potentially causing damage to sensitive biologics through cryo-concentration effects, which refer to the localized increase in solute concentration in the unfrozen phase as water freezes. This concentration of salts, proteins, or other excipients can lead to pH shifts, protein denaturation, or aggregation, compromising the stability of the biologic [61]. The optimal freezing rate must be determined empirically for each formulation, balancing the need for product protection with efficient drying kinetics [62,63]. Modern approaches often employ controlled nucleation techniques to ensure consistent ice crystal formation across all vials in a batch, reducing heterogeneity in the final product [64].

3.1.2.2. Primary Drying Temperature and Pressure

Primary Drying Temperature and Pressure represent perhaps the most critical parameters in determining both process efficiency and product quality. Most conservative protocols maintain product temperature below collapse temperature (Tc), while certain advanced cycles allow operation near or slightly above collapse temperature for efficiency [65]. The collapse temperature is a characteristic of the formulation, representing the point at which the freeze-dried matrix loses its structural integrity, potentially leading to cake collapse, meltback, or protein denaturation. Exceeding this temperature, even momentarily, can compromise the stability and reconstitution properties of the final product [66]. Simultaneously, the comparative pressure measurement, such as Pirani vs. capacitance manometers, is used to determine the end of primary drying. Typical operating pressures range from 0.03 to 1 mbar, with lower pressures generally increasing sublimation rates but potentially reducing heat transfer efficiency [67]. The interplay between shelf temperature and chamber pressure creates a delicate balance - increasing shelf temperature accelerates drying but risks approaching the collapse temperature, while adjusting pressure affects both the heat transfer characteristics and the driving force for sublimation [68]. Advanced lyophilizers now incorporate sophisticated control algorithms that dynamically adjust these parameters based on real-time product temperature measurements, ensuring optimal drying conditions throughout the process [69].

3.1.2.3. Secondary Drying Temperature

Secondary Drying Temperature becomes crucial after most free water has been removed during primary drying. This phase targets the removal of bound water molecules that are adsorbed to the product matrix or trapped within the amorphous structure of stabilizers [70]. The temperature during secondary drying is typically raised significantly compared to primary drying, often to 20-40°C, to provide the energy needed to break these water-matrix interactions [71]. However, the temperature must be carefully controlled to avoid damaging the active pharmaceutical ingredient, particularly for heat-sensitive biologics. The rate of temperature increase (ramp rate) is equally

important, as too rapid a temperature rise can cause localized overheating or create moisture gradients within the product cake [72]. The endpoint of secondary drying is typically determined by achieving a target residual moisture content, usually less than 1%, which is critical for long-term stability [73]. Accurate endpoint detection in lyophilization is crucial to avoid under- or over-drying, both of which can compromise product stability. Under-drying leaves excess moisture, promoting degradation, microbial growth, and chemical reactions. Over-drying removes essential bound water, destabilizing proteins and altering the product's glass transition temperature, which can lead to denaturation and structural instability. Techniques like comparative pressure measurement and mass spectrometry help precisely identify the drying endpoint, ensuring optimal product quality and shelf life [74].

3.1.2.4. Shelf Temperature Ramp Rates

The rate at which shelf temperature changes affect heat transfer to the product and consequently influences the uniformity of drying across all vials in the batch. Non-uniform heating rates across shelves can lead to spatial temperature gradients, which in turn affect product drying uniformity and stability [65]. Too rapid heating during primary drying can cause partial melting at the sublimation front, while insufficient heating prolongs the process unnecessarily [75]. During freezing, controlled ramp rates help ensure consistent ice crystal formation throughout the batch. Between primary and secondary drying, gradual temperature transitions prevent sudden changes that might stress the delicate dried matrix [25]. Modern lyophilization controllers employ sophisticated algorithms to optimize these ramp rates based on real-time process monitoring, adjusting for variables like batch size, fill volume, and product characteristics [76]. The development of these temperature profiles often requires extensive experimentation and modeling to identify the optimal balance between process efficiency and product quality [77].

3.1.2.5. Sealing of lyophilized products:

The sealing of lyophilized products is a critical final step in the freeze-drying process, ensuring long-term stability and protection against environmental factors such as moisture, oxygen, and microbial contamination [78]. The container-closure system is critical for maintaining an airtight seal. Options include glass or polymer vials sealed with rubber stoppers and secured by crimped aluminium caps or screw threads to preserve product integrity [79]. Glass remains the preferred material due to its inert properties and superior hermeticity, though plastic alternatives are increasingly used for their durability and lighter weight, particularly in high-volume or transport-sensitive applications [80].

Ensuring seal integrity requires rigorous testing, including visual inspections for defects, dye ingress tests to detect leaks, and microbial challenge studies to validate sterility [81]. A compromised seal can lead to degradation of sensitive biologics due to moisture absorption, oxidation, or microbial contamination, posing significant risks to drug efficacy and patient safety [82]. Thus, selecting the appropriate container-closure system and verifying its performance through robust quality control measures are essential for maintaining the stability and shelf life of lyophilized pharmaceuticals.

3.1.3. Critical Quality Attributes (CQAs)

The Critical Quality Attributes (CQAs), derived from Quality Target Product Profile (QTPP) are key physicochemical, biological, or microbiological characteristics that ensures the desired safety and efficacy such as dosage form (lyophilized cake for reconstitution), dosage strength, container closure system, sterility, apyrogenicity, reconstitution time, and stability shelf-life. [83,84]. Each of these attributes plays a vital role in determining the final product quality and must be rigorously monitored to meet regulatory standards.

3.1.3.1. Residual Moisture Content

Residual moisture is a critical CQA for lyophilized biologics and is generally maintained below ~1% w/w to ensure long-term stability. Elevated moisture reduces the glass transition temperature of the dried matrix, promoting chemical and physical degradation, loss of structure, aggregation, and loss of activity [85]. Because of this direct impact on potency and shelf life, manufacturers treat moisture as an essential release specification. For this reason, regulatory agencies such as the FDA and EMA require clear justification of moisture specifications, supportive stability data, and validated control strategies during process development and commercial manufacture [86-88]. Secondary drying is central to moisture control, as it removes bound water by desorption; however, inadequate drying can impair shelf life, while over-drying may lead to mechanical fragility [89]. Industry commonly applies Karl Fischer titration and non-destructive spectroscopic tools such as NIR to verify moisture levels and demonstrate regulatory compliance. Current research trends include rapid in-line sensing and model-based control to optimize drying efficiency [90].

3.1.3.2. Reconstitution Time

Lyophilized biologics such as pembrolizumab, nivolumab, trastuzumab, alteplase, and several mRNA-based vaccines rely on fast and complete reconstitution to ensure safe administration [91]. Although not always an official release test, regulators routinely review reconstitution data because long dispersion times can delay dosing in critical care and may indicate cake collapse, excipient crystallization, or poor porosity [92]. Industry therefore treats reconstitution time as a performance metric, especially for products supplied to hospitals or home-injection settings. Formulations with crystalline bulking agents (e.g., mannitol) typically dissolve faster than amorphous stabilizers like sucrose, and cycle optimization is required to achieve a porous, stable cake [93]. Current research focuses on predictive models linking pore structure, residual moisture (<1% w/w), and protein stability to rehydration behavior [94]. These data support FDA/EMA expectations for validated control strategies and justify specification limits in regulatory filings [86-88].

3.1.3.3. Cake Appearance

The physical appearance of the lyophilized cake serves as a key indicator of process consistency and product quality. An ideal cake should be uniform, structurally intact, and free from defects such as collapse, meltback, or shrinkage [95]. Collapse occurs when the product temperature exceeds its collapse temperature during primary drying, leading to a loss of porous structure and potential damage to the active ingredient [96]. Meltback, on the other hand, results from insufficient sublimation, causing localized melting and phase separation [97]. Visual inspection, supported by advanced imaging techniques, is used to assess cake morphology, ensuring that the final product meets aesthetic and functional requirements [98].

3.1.3.4. Biological Activity

Maintaining the biological activity of the therapeutic molecule post-lyophilization is paramount, as any loss of potency could compromise clinical efficacy. Proteins, vaccines, and cell-based therapies are particularly susceptible to conformational changes, aggregation, or chemical degradation during freezing and drying [99]. Stabilizing excipients such as sugars (trehalose, sucrose) or surfactants (polysorbate 80) are often incorporated to protect the biologic's native structure [41]. Analytical methods like size-exclusion chromatography (SEC), dynamic light scattering (DLS), and bioassays are employed to verify that the lyophilized product retains its intended biological function [100].

3.1.3.5. Sterility

Ensuring sterility is a non-negotiable CQA for injectable biologics, as contamination could lead to severe patient harm. The aseptic processing of lyophilized products involves stringent environmental controls, including ISO 5 cleanrooms, sterilized containers, and validated depyrogenation procedures [101]. Vial sealing under vacuum or nitrogen overlay further prevents microbial ingress during storage. Sterility testing, conducted according to Pharmacopeial

standards (USP <71>, EP 2.6.1), confirms the absence of viable microorganisms before product release [102-104].

The adoption of QbD represents a paradigm shift from the traditional, empirical 'quality by testing' (QbT) approach. While QbT relies on fixed process parameters and extensive end-product testing, QbD emphasizes proactive process understanding and control [105]. The primary advantage of QbD is the establishment of a flexible 'design space,' allowing for real-time adjustments within predefined boundaries without requiring regulatory post-approval submissions, thereby enhancing operational agility [106]. The main disadvantage is the significant upfront investment in resources, time, and expertise required for the extensive Design of Experiments (DoE) studies [107]. While regulatory agencies like the FDA and EMA strongly encourage QbD, its adoption is more advanced in large biopharmaceutical companies; smaller firms often face resource constraints, leading to a slower, more phased implementation, particularly in non-US/EU jurisdictions where regulatory expectations may be less explicit.

3.2. Application of Process Analytical Technology (PAT) in lyophilization

PAT is the system that implements the QbD control strategy by providing real-time, often non-destructive, measurement of critical parameters [108]. The seamless integration of these PAT tools across lyophilization stages enables real-time decision-making, reducing reliance on offline testing and minimizing batch failures [109]. By linking measurement data to control parameters (e.g., adjusting shelf temperature based on NIR moisture readings), PAT enhances process robustness and compliance with regulatory standards like ICH–Q10 [110]. Furthermore, PAT supports continuous process verification, a cornerstone of modern Quality by Design (QbD) frameworks, ensuring consistent production of high-quality lyophilized biologics [111]. The following discussion elaborates on how different analytical methods are applied across key stages,

freezing, primary drying, secondary drying, and post-lyophilization, along with their respective control parameters (Table 3).

3.2.1. Freezing Stage

During freezing, precise temperature control is critical to ensure uniform ice crystal formation, which directly impacts drying efficiency and product stability. While thermocouples provide useful data, they are semi-invasive and may not reflect bulk behavior. Optical or wireless sensors are more representative but less commonly used [112]. However, temperature measurements alone cannot reliably confirm complete freezing, especially in metastable or supercooled states. Additionally, differential scanning calorimetry (DSC) is not traditionally considered a PAT tool, but it provides valuable pre-formulation insights that inform PAT implementation [113]. By analyzing thermal transitions, DSC aids in optimizing annealing steps, which can reduce drying heterogeneity and improve cake structure.

3.2.2. Primary Drying Stage

Primary drying involves sublimating ice under vacuum, requiring tight control over pressure and heat input. Comparative pressure measurements (e.g., Pirani vs capacitance) are increasingly integrated into PAT frameworks for real-time cycle monitoring [114]. Concurrently, near-infrared spectroscopy (NIR) and tunable diode laser absorption spectroscopy (TDLAS) are deployed to measure residual moisture in the product, ensuring that drying proceeds uniformly without exceeding collapse temperatures [18]. For endpoint detection, manometric temperature measurement (MTM) analyzes pressure fluctuations to determine the sublimation rate and confirm the completion of primary drying [115]. These methods collectively prevent over-drying or insufficient drying, both of which can compromise product quality.

3.2.3. Secondary Drying Stage

In secondary drying, bound water is removed through desorption, necessitating careful control of temperature and drying time. Gas chromatography (GC) and mass spectrometry (MS) are utilized to detect residual solvents, ensuring their levels fall within acceptable limits [116]. While near-infrared (NIR) spectroscopy enables real-time monitoring of final moisture content, Karl Fischer titration is an offline analytical method that provides highly accurate endpoint measurements [117]. Together, these techniques support effective control of drying parameters, with NIR facilitating in-process adjustments and Karl Fischer titration confirming moisture levels post-process to ensure long-term stability of sensitive biologics.

3.2.4. Post-Lyophilization Analysis

After lyophilization, assessing product stability is essential to guarantee shelf-life and performance. Dynamic vapor sorption (DVS) measures hygroscopicity by exposing the product to controlled humidity cycles, while X-ray powder diffraction (XRPD) analyzes crystallinity, which can affect reconstitution and bioavailability [118]. Finally, manual or automated reconstitution tests evaluate the reconstitution time, a key indicator of product usability. Slow reconstitution may suggest poor cake structure or excessive moisture, necessitating process refinements [119].

The implementation of PAT, while transformative, is not without its challenges. The pros include real-time release testing, reduced batch failures, and deeper process understanding, aligning perfectly with QbD principles. However, the cons involve high capital investment for advanced sensors (e.g., TDLAS, NIR), the complexity of data management and model validation, and a need for specialized personnel [120]. Regulatory acceptance of PAT-derived data for batch release is now well-established in ICH regions (USA, EU, Japan), but requires rigorous validation to demonstrate that the PAT method is equivalent or superior to the traditional offline test [121]. The industry is increasingly moving towards PAT, but its full potential is often realized only for high-volume, blockbuster biologics where the investment is justified.

463 **Table 3: Application of PAT in Lyophilization Process**

Stage	Measurement Type	Method Used	Control Parameter	Ref.
Freezing	Temperature	Thermocouples, Resistance Thermometers	Shelf Temperature, Product Temperature	[112]
	Ice Formation	Differential Scanning Calorimetry (DSC)	Freezing Rate, Nucleation Temperature	[113]
Primary Drying	Pressure	Capacitance Manometers, Pirani Gauges	Chamber Pressure, Shelf Temperature	[114].
	Residual Moisture	Near-Infrared Spectroscopy (NIR), Tunable Diode Laser Absorption Spectroscopy (TDLAS)	Product Temperature, Drying Rate	[18]
	Sublimation Rate	Manometric Temperature Measurement (MTM)	Chamber Pressure, Shelf Temperature	[115]
Secondary Drying	Residual Solvent	Gas Chromatography (GC), Mass Spectrometry (MS)	Product Temperature, Drying Time	[116]
	Final Moisture Content	Karl Fischer Titration, NIR Spectroscopy	Product Temperature, Drying Time	[117]
Post-Lyophilization	Product Stability	Dynamic Vapor Sorption (DVS), X-Ray Powder Diffraction (XRPD)	Storage Conditions, Residual Moisture Content	[118]

	Reconstitution Time	Manual or Automated Reconstitution Tests	Moisture Content, Product Quality	[119]

4. Challenges in Lyophilization Process

Lyophilization faces key challenges, including high energy demands, complex biologic stability, and strict sterility needs [122]. These issues affect cost, efficiency, and quality, requiring advanced technologies, process refinement, and innovative engineering to ensure effective freeze-drying of biologics.

4.1 Product Variability

Lyophilizing biologics is challenging due to their structural complexity and sensitivity. Unlike small-molecule drugs, biologics—like monoclonal antibodies and mRNA vaccines—react unpredictably to freeze-drying, risking aggregation or instability [123]. Lipid nanoparticles may leak or fuse without proper lyoprotectants. Custom lyophilization protocols are crucial, guided by pre-formulation studies assessing factors like collapse temperature and moisture content. [112]. Variability in raw materials further complicates the process, often requiring real-time adjustments. Analytical tools such as DSC and TDLAS assist in monitoring critical parameters [18]. With no universal method available, developing biologic-specific lyophilization strategies remains essential for ensuring product stability and efficacy.

To overcome aggregation and activity loss, manufacturers employ a multi-pronged strategy rooted in pre-formulation studies. First, the formulation is optimized with stabilizers: sugars like sucrose shield the protein's native structure during drying, while surfactants like polysorbate 80 protect against interfacial stresses [39]. Second, the lyophilization cycle is meticulously designed using thermal analysis (e.g., DSC) to identify critical temperatures like T_g' and T_c. The primary drying shelf temperature is then set 2-5°C below T_c to prevent collapse, a major cause of aggregation and slow

reconstitution [124]. Techniques like controlled nucleation ensure batch homogeneity, minimizing vial-to-vial variability that can cause localized failure. Finally, a well-designed secondary drying phase reduces residual moisture to a level (<1%) that prevents hydrolysis and plasticization of the amorphous cake, thereby safeguarding long-term stability [102-104]. Current research focuses on high-throughput formulation screening and advanced PAT to define these parameters more efficiently for increasingly complex molecules [125].

4.2 Cost and Energy Use

Express energy consumption per kg of water removed (e.g., 1.2–1.5 kWh/kg water) to normalize across batch sizes [126]. The process relies on complex, failure-prone equipment with backup systems. As sustainability gains focus, alternatives like continuous lyophilization are emerging, using conveyor belts to cut energy use by 50% and shorten cycle times by 30%. Innovations such as solar-powered systems and heat recovery further boost efficiency [127]. However, adopting these greener methods is complex due to strict regulatory demands. Any process change requires extensive revalidation and testing, making the transition a careful balance between sustainability, cost-effectiveness, and compliance.

4.3 Aseptic Processing

Maintaining sterility during lyophilization is vital for injectable biologics due to contamination risks from prolonged handling and multiple vulnerable steps like vial loading and stoppering [73]. Strict cleanroom conditions and environmental monitoring are essential to prevent microbial or particulate contamination. Technologies such as isolators and automated systems reduce human contact, yet challenges remain in sterile transfers and stopper placement [128]. Equipment sterilization using autoclaves or Vaporised Hydrogen Peroxide (VHP) is common, but residuals may affect sensitive products [129]. Regulatory compliance with good manufacturing practice (GMP), including media fill tests, is mandatory. Innovations like

single-use systems and sterile gas filtration show promise but need validation for large-scale use [130].

5. Case Studies of Successful Lyophilized Biologics

Lyophilization has established itself as a critical unit operation in biopharmaceutical development, not merely as a drying method but as a strategic formulation choice to overcome the inherent instability of biologics. The following case studies illustrate how lyophilization is tailored to specific product classes, highlighting its pivotal role compared to alternative stabilization strategies. They demonstrate that the choice to lyophilize is a calculated decision, balancing the significant investment in process complexity and cost against the unparalleled gains in shelf-life, global accessibility, and therapeutic reliability [131].

5.1 Vaccines: Lyophilized COVID-19 mRNA-LNP Vaccines

The COVID-19 pandemic starkly revealed the limitations of liquid formulations for ultra-sensitive biologics. The first-generation mRNA-LNP vaccines from Pfizer-BioNTech and Moderna, while revolutionary, required a complex and expensive cold chain, stored at -70°C and -20°C respectively, due to the propensity of both the mRNA molecule and the lipid nanoparticle (LNP) to degrade in solution [132]. This logistical hurdle presented a critical choice: develop more stable liquid formulations or deploy a stabilization technology capable of decoupling the product from the cold chain. Lyophilization emerged as the definitive solution, enabling storage at 2–8°C and overcoming a major barrier to global distribution [133].

The development of lyophilized mRNA vaccines was a feat of formulation science. The primary challenge was to preserve the intricate LNP structure and protect the mRNA during the freezing and drying stresses. This was achieved by incorporating high concentrations of cryo- and lyo-protectants, primarily sucrose and trehalose. These disaccharides operate via the water replacement hypothesis, forming a rigid, amorphous glassy matrix that immobilizes the LNP and prevents mRNA degradation and LNP fusion [132]. This approach stands in stark contrast to the strategy

for liquid formulations, which relies on buffering agents and refrigerated storage to slow, but not halt, degradation kinetics. The lyophilization cycle itself was meticulously designed, with primary drying conducted under a precise vacuum to facilitate sublimation without exceeding the formulation's collapse temperature, and secondary drying rigorously reducing residual moisture to below 1%, a critical parameter for long-term stability that is irrelevant for liquid counterparts [65,73,133].

The success of this approach was validated clinically. Lyophilized mRNA-LNP vaccines targeting SARS-CoV-2 variants demonstrated immunogenicity equivalent to their liquid predecessors while offering a dramatically improved stability profile [134,135]. The key differentiator is not efficacy, but accessibility; by extending the shelf-life to over 18 months at refrigerated temperatures, lyophilization transforms mRNA vaccines from a logistical challenge into a distributable commodity [134]. While alternative technologies like spray-drying are being explored for their continuous processing advantages, they often impose greater shear and thermal stress on the delicate LNP structure, making lyophilization the preferred method for preserving the integrity of these complex nanoparticles [136]. This case solidifies lyophilization as the benchmark for stabilizing next-generation vaccine platforms for pandemic preparedness and routine use.

5.2 Monoclonal Antibodies: Rituximab and Trastuzumab

Monoclonal antibodies (mAbs) like rituximab (anti-CD20) and trastuzumab (anti-HER2) are biologic workhorses, but their large, complex protein structures are inherently prone to aggregation, fragmentation, and loss of binding affinity in solution [137]. he standard alternative to lyophilization is liquid formulation, which, while convenient, necessitates continuous cold-chain storage and typically offers a shelf-life of 12-24 months, even with optimized pH, buffers, and stabilizers like surfactants. For high-concentration mAbs or products destined for markets with unreliable infrastructure, this is often insufficient. [138].

The development of lyophilized rituximab and trastuzumab showcases a targeted approach to mitigating specific degradation pathways. Formulations were optimized with excipients like sucrose as a primary lyoprotectant to prevent protein unfolding, and surfactants like polysorbate 80 to minimize interfacial stress at the ice-water interface—a risk nonexistent in liquid forms [139,140]. The lyophilization cycle was designed to be conservative, operating well below the collapse temperature (Tc) to ensure a pharmaceutically elegant and stable cake [65]. This results in a product that is vastly more stable, with shelf-lives often exceeding 36 months at ambient or refrigerated temperatures, a key commercial and clinical advantage over liquid formats.

Trastuzumab presented a particular challenge due to its sensitivity to fragmentation. Studies comparing originator and biosimilar products highlighted that aggressive drying could subtly alter binding affinity [138]. The response was a "soft" freeze-drying cycle with controlled nucleation, ensuring minimal stress. This level of process control is a hallmark of lyophilization but is absent from liquid formulation development, where stability is primarily a function of the solution composition. While liquid formulations benefit from simpler manufacturing and administration, they cannot match the profound stability enhancement achieved by a well-designed lyophilized product [141].

These case studies illustrate the delicate balance required in mAb lyophilization. Small deviations in excipient selection or process parameters can impact stability, necessitating rigorous characterization techniques like Fourier-transform infrared spectroscopy (FTIR) for secondary structure analysis [142]. The lessons learned from rituximab and trastuzumab are now applied to next-generation mAbs, including bispecific antibodies, where lyophilization must preserve multiple binding domains.

5.3 Plasma-Derived Therapies: Lyophilized Plasma for Trauma Care

In trauma care, the choice between Fresh Frozen Plasma (FFP) and lyophilized plasma is a choice between logistical feasibility and clinical immediacy. FFP, the traditional standard, requires a permanent -18°C freezer and a 20-30 minute thawing process before use, making it impractical for pre-hospital or battlefield settings [143]. Lyophilized plasma directly addresses this limitation, not by altering the active components, but by transforming its physical state to eliminate the cold chain [144].

The manufacturing process is designed to preserve the delicate activity of coagulation factors like fibrinogen and Factor V. Pathogen-reduced plasma is freeze-dried using a cycle that carefully navigates primary and secondary drying to prevent meltback and reduce moisture to a level (<3%) that prevents enzymatic degradation during storage [145,146]. The result is a product that can be stored at room temperature for years and reconstituted in minutes, a capability that is simply impossible for any frozen blood product. Clinical trials have confirmed that lyophilized plasma retains approximately 86% of coagulation activity and significantly improves survival in hemorrhagic shock [147,148].

Clinical trials, such as those conducted by the U.S. Armed Forces, demonstrated that lyophilized plasma (e.g., French LYOPLAS) significantly improved survival in hemorrhagic shock by restoring blood volume and hemostasis [149]. Notably, the product's low water content (<1%) prevents ice crystal formation during storage, a common issue with FFP in fluctuating temperatures [143]. Future directions include optimizing reconstitution fluids (e.g., sterile water vs. balanced electrolytes) and expanding applications to civilian trauma centers. The success of lyophilized plasma underscores how freeze-drying can transform perishable biologics into field-ready therapeutics, saving lives in resource-limited environments [147].

5.4 Microbial-Based Biologics: Lyophilized Probiotics and Live Biotherapeutic Products (LBPs)

The stabilization of live microorganisms presents a unique challenge: preserving not just molecular structure but also cellular viability and metabolic function. The main alternatives to lyophilization are liquid formulations, spray-drying, and air-drying. Liquid formats are simplest but offer the poorest stability, requiring refrigerated storage and having shelf-lives of only a few weeks due to ongoing microbial metabolism and death [150]. Spray-drying is more scalable and cost-effective than lyophilization but exposes cells to extreme shear and thermal stress, leading to viability losses of 2-3 logs, which is unacceptable for many sensitive strains [151].

Lyophilization is the gold standard for high-value, sensitive probiotics and LBPs because it best preserves viability. The process relies on a protective formulation containing disaccharides like trehalose, which can be internalized by cells to protect intracellular structures, and external bulking agents that form a porous cake [152]. The controlled, low-temperature process minimizes damage to cell membranes and proteins. The critical trade-off is cost and time; lyophilization is a batch process that is more expensive and slower than spray-drying. However, for many therapeutic strains, this is justified by the superior outcome: viability losses of less than 1 log and shelf-lives exceeding 24 months at refrigerated temperatures, enabling their use as stable pharmaceuticals and high-potency supplements [153].

This technology is also indispensable in industrial biotechnology for preserving master cell banks (e.g., E. coli, CHO cells), where genetic stability over years of storage is paramount—a requirement that alternative methods cannot reliably guarantee [154]. As LBPs advance, the ability of lyophilization to ensure that a living, therapeutically active product reaches the patient solidifies its role as a critical enabling technology for the entire microbial biologic sector.

6. Regulatory Considerations in Lyophilized Biologics Development

The development and commercialization of lyophilized biologics require strict adherence to regulatory guidelines set forth by agencies such as the U.S. Food and Drug Administration

(FDA) and the European Medicines Agency (EMA) [86-88]. These guidelines ensure that products meet stringent standards for safety, efficacy, and quality throughout their lifecycle. Three critical aspects emphasized by these regulatory bodies include analytical validation, stability testing, and post-approval changes, each playing a pivotal role in the successful approval and market sustainability of lyophilized biologics [16].

6.1. Analytical Validation: Ensuring Method Reliability for Quality Testing

Analytical validation is a fundamental requirement to demonstrate that the methods used for assessing the quality of lyophilized biologics are accurate, precise, and reproducible [155]. Regulatory guidelines mandate a systematic approach to validate analytical procedures, including tests for identity, purity, potency, and impurities. The validation process encompasses several key parameters: specificity (the ability to distinguish the analyte from interfering substances), linearity and range (the method's response over a defined concentration range), accuracy (closeness to true values), precision (repeatability and intermediate precision), and robustness (resistance to small variations in testing conditions) [156]. For lyophilized biologics, methods such as high-performance liquid chromatography (HPLC), mass spectrometry, and spectroscopic techniques are commonly validated to ensure reliable quantification of active ingredients and degradation products [157]. Additionally, regulatory agencies require documentation of method development, transfer between laboratories, and ongoing verification to maintain compliance [86-88]. Failure to adequately validate analytical methods can lead to regulatory delays or rejection, as these tests are critical for batch release and stability monitoring.

6.2. Stability Testing: Determining Shelf Life Under Varied Conditions

Stability testing is essential to establish the shelf life and storage conditions of lyophilized biologics, ensuring they remain safe and effective until expiration [158]. Regulatory guidelines outline specific protocols for long-term, accelerated, and stress testing under controlled

temperature, humidity, and light exposure [86,87]. Long-term studies typically simulate recommended storage conditions (e.g., 2-8°C), while accelerated studies (e.g., 25°C/60% relative humidity) predict degradation trends over shorter periods [30]. Stress testing, including freeze-thaw cycles and agitation, evaluates the product's resilience to extreme handling conditions [159]. Critical quality attributes monitored during stability testing include residual moisture content, reconstitution time, biological activity, and particulate formation [84]. Regulatory agencies require comprehensive data to support proposed expiration dates, and any deviations from expected stability profiles must be investigated. For lyophilized biologics, maintaining low moisture levels is particularly crucial, as excess moisture can lead to protein aggregation or chemical degradation [99]. Stability data also inform labeling requirements, such as storage instructions and handling precautions, ensuring end-users adhere to optimal storage practices [160].

6.3. Post-Approval Changes: Regulatory Pathways for Process Modifications

Once a lyophilized biologic is approved, manufacturers may need to modify processes, formulations, or facilities to improve efficiency or address supply chain challenges [161]. Regulatory agencies classify post-approval changes based on their potential impact on product quality, requiring varying levels of documentation and approval [162]. Minor changes (e.g., equipment calibration adjustments) may only necessitate notification via annual reports, while moderate changes (e.g., scale-up of lyophilization cycles) often require prior approval supplements with supporting data [163]. Major changes (e.g., alterations to the formulation or primary packaging) typically mandate extensive comparability studies, including stability testing and, in some cases, clinical trials [164]. The FDA's Comparability Protocols and EMA's Post-Authorization Change Management Protocols (PACMPs) provide structured frameworks for managing these changes, emphasizing risk assessment and proactive communication with regulators [165]. Manufacturers must justify modifications by demonstrating that they do not adversely affect the product's safety, purity, or potency. Effective management of post-approval

changes ensures continuous compliance while enabling process innovations that enhance scalability and cost-effectiveness without compromising quality [161].

Despite clear guidelines, a key regulatory limitation is the lack of universal acceptance criteria for novel CQAs relevant to next-generation biologics, such as the 'empty-to-full' capsid ratio for AAV gene therapies post-lyophilization. Manufacturers must therefore develop extensive, product-specific comparability protocols to demonstrate that lyophilization does not adversely impact these complex attributes, a process that can be time-consuming and costly [164,165].

7. Emerging Innovations in Lyophilization

The innovations collectively address the dual demands of efficiency and precision in modern biopharmaceutical manufacturing.

7.1 Continuous Lyophilization: Reduces Downtime and Improves Consistency

Traditional lyophilization operates in batch mode, requiring significant downtime for loading, unloading, and cleaning between cycles [166]. Continuous lyophilization revolutionizes this approach by enabling a non-stop, streamlined process where vials or bulk product move through freezing, primary drying, and secondary drying zones in a controlled sequence. This method drastically reduces idle time, increases throughput, and enhances batch-to-batch consistency by maintaining uniform conditions throughout production [167]. Advanced designs incorporate modular units with synchronized temperature and pressure control, allowing seamless transition between phases [168]. For biologics requiring large-scale manufacturing, such as vaccines or monoclonal antibodies, continuous systems offer scalability and cost-efficiency while adhering to stringent regulatory standards [86,87]. Challenges remain in ensuring sterility and preventing cross-contamination in continuous setups, but innovations like closed-system processing and automated monitoring are mitigating these concerns [101]. Continuous lyophilization supports

efficiency in large-scale operations, while microfluidic and modular systems are better suited for personalized, small-batch therapies [169].

7.2 AI and Machine Learning: Optimize Process Parameters in Real Time

Artificial intelligence (AI) and machine learning (ML) are transforming lyophilization from an empirically driven process to a data-driven science [170]. By analyzing historical and real-time data from sensors monitoring temperature, pressure, and moisture content, AI algorithms predict optimal drying trajectories and detect deviations before they impact product quality [171]. ML models trained on diverse datasets can recommend adjustments to shelf temperature, vacuum levels, or drying duration, minimizing trial-and-error experimentation [172]. For instance, reinforcement learning techniques dynamically adapt cycles for novel biologics, reducing development timelines [170]. AI-powered Process Analytical Technology (PAT) tools, such as near-infrared (NIR) spectroscopy coupled with predictive analytics, enable real-time release testing, ensuring compliance with Critical Quality Attributes (CQAs) [173]. These technologies also facilitate root-cause analysis for failures, enhancing process robustness. As AI systems evolve, their integration with lyophilization hardware will enable fully autonomous operations, reducing human error and operational costs while maximizing yield and product stability [174].

7.3 Sustainable Techniques: Energy-Efficient Equipment and Waste Reduction

The energy-intensive nature of lyophilization has spurred innovations aimed at sustainability [175]. Modern freeze-dryers now incorporate heat recovery systems, which capture waste heat from condensers and repurpose it for secondary drying, cutting energy consumption by up to 30% [176]. Renewable energy sources, such as solar or geothermal power, are being integrated into facility designs to reduce carbon footprints [177]. Additionally, novel refrigeration technologies using low-global-warming-potential (GWP) refrigerants align with environmental regulations [178]. Beyond energy, sustainable excipient selection—such as biodegradable stabilizers—

minimizes hazardous waste [175]. Single-use lyophilization systems, though controversial for plastic waste, eliminate water-intensive cleaning processes and cross-contamination risks. Companies are also adopting circular economy principles, like recycling silica gel desiccants or reusing packaging materials [179]. Regulatory agencies increasingly reward green manufacturing practices, incentivizing further investment in sustainable lyophilization technologies that balance ecological goals with product efficacy [177].

7.4 Microfluidic Lyophilization: Enables Precise Control for Heat-Sensitive Products

Microfluidic lyophilization represents a paradigm shift for high-value, low-volume biologics like gene therapies and personalized vaccines [180]. By miniaturizing the drying process into microchannels, this technique achieves unparalleled control over ice nucleation and heat transfer, enabling uniform drying at microscale resolutions [181]. Microfluidic devices can precisely regulate temperature gradients and vapor flow, mitigating the risk of collapse or denaturation in ultra-sensitive products [182]. For example, lipid nanoparticle (LNP)-based mRNA vaccines benefit from rapid, controlled freezing in microfluidic chips, which preserves their delicate nanostructure [183]. The technology also facilitates high-throughput screening of formulation conditions, accelerating development cycles [180]. Challenges include scaling up microfluidic processes for commercial production and ensuring sterility in microscale environments [184]. However, hybrid systems combining microfluidic precision with conventional lyophilization infrastructure are already emerging, offering a bridge between lab-scale innovation and industrial application [185]. As biologics grow more complex, microfluidic lyophilization could unlock new possibilities for stabilizing next-generation therapeutics [180].

8. Industrial and Clinical Translation of Lyophilized Biologics

The journey of a lyophilized biologic from the laboratory to the patient encapsulates the interplay between scientific innovation, industrial engineering, and clinical need [186]. In the industrial

realm, lyophilization is a cornerstone of biopharmaceutical manufacturing, valued for its ability to transform perishable liquid biologics into globally distributable commodities. The drive is towards enhancing efficiency through continuous processing, implementing QbD and PAT for robust control, and reducing the substantial cost and environmental footprint [35]. The case studies of mAbs and vaccines (Sections 5.1, 5.2) exemplify how industry has scaled this process to meet global demand, tackling challenges of scalability and sterility.

In clinical medicine, the impact is measured by accessibility, ease of use, and therapeutic outcomes. Lyophilization enables the stockpiling of vaccines for pandemic preparedness, the deployment of life-saving trauma products like plasma in battlefield conditions, and the availability of complex therapies like mAbs in regions with limited cold-chain infrastructure [187]. The reconstitution step, while a minor inconvenience, is a necessary trade-off for the profound stability benefits [93]. The development of ready-to-use dual-chamber syringes and auto-injectors is a direct response to this clinical need, aiming to simplify the process for healthcare providers and patients alike [188]. Ultimately, the widespread use of lyophilization in medicine is a testament to its irreplaceable role in ensuring that the most advanced biologic therapeutics can be delivered safely and effectively to the point of care, anywhere in the world.

9. Conclusion

Lyophilization has firmly established itself as a cornerstone technology for stabilizing biologics, enabling their global distribution while maintaining therapeutic efficacy. By converting sensitive molecules into a dry, stable state, this process overcomes critical challenges associated with temperature sensitivity and shelf-life limitations. The integration of advanced methodologies, such as Quality by Design and Process Analytical Technology has further refined lyophilization, ensuring consistent product quality and regulatory compliance.

Despite its advantages, challenges persist, including high energy consumption, product variability, and the need for stringent aseptic controls. However, emerging innovations like continuous lyophilization, AI-driven process optimization, and sustainable techniques are poised to address these limitations. Microfluidic lyophilization and novel excipient formulations also promise to enhance the stabilization of complex biologics, such as mRNA vaccines and cell-based therapies.

Looking ahead, the convergence of scientific, technological, and regulatory advancements will expand lyophilization's role in biopharmaceutical development. As biologics continue to revolutionize medicine, the ongoing refinement of freeze-drying processes will be critical to meeting the demands of personalized and large-scale therapeutics. By balancing efficiency with product integrity, lyophilization will remain a vital tool in delivering safe, effective, and accessible treatments to patients worldwide.

Acknowledgements

The authors SH sincerely acknowledges Jazan University, Saudi Arabia, for offering access to the Saudi Digital Library, which aided the successful completion of this work. The authors are grateful to their respective organizations for providing the necessary infrastructural support for this study. Some text of this review article has been enhanced and refined with the help of ChatGPT, a language model developed by OpenAI, based on the GPT-3.5 architecture (OpenAI, 2022), to enhance clarity and linguistic quality.

Declaration of competing interest

The authors report no conflicts of interest.

Author Contribution - Credit Role Statement

Sabiha Khatoon**:** Conceptualization; Data curation; Formal analysis; Investigation; Methodology; Resources; Software; Validation; Visualization; Roles/Writing – original draft; Writing – review & editing.

Shafiul Haque**:** Conceptualization; Investigation; Methodology; Project administration; Resources; Software; Supervision; Roles/Writing – original draft; Writing – review & editing.

Imran Saleem**:** Conceptualization; Investigation; Methodology; Project administration; Resources; Software; Supervision; Roles/Writing – original draft; Writing – review & editing.

Faizan Haider Khan**:** Conceptualization; Data curation; Formal analysis; Investigation; Methodology; Resources; Software; Validation; Visualization; Roles/Writing – original draft; Writing – review & editing.

Data Availability Statements

Not applicable as it is a review article.

References

[1] Wang W. Lyophilization and development of solid protein pharmaceuticals. Int J Pharm. 2000;203(1-2):1-60.

[2] Adami G, Saag KG, Chapurlat RD, et al. Balancing benefits and risks in the era of biologics. Ther Adv Musculoskelet Dis. 2019;11:1759720X19883973.

[3] Bhatnagar B, Tchessalov S. Advances in freeze drying of biologics and future challenges and opportunities. Drying Technologies for Biotechnology and Pharmaceutical Applications. 2020:137-177.

[4] Kuzman D, Bunc M, Ravnik M, et al. Long-term stability predictions of therapeutic monoclonal antibodies in solution using Arrhenius-based kinetics. Sci Rep. 2021;11(1):20534.

[5] Rugo HS, Rifkin RM, Declerck P, et al. Demystifying biosimilars: development, regulation and clinical use. Future Oncol. 2019;15(7):777-790.

[6] Bajoria S. In Vitro Stability and in Vivo Performance Considerations to Develop Low-Cost Recombinant Protein Formulations for Passive and Active Immunization: University of Kansas; 2023.

[7] Langford A, Bhatnagar B, Walters R, et al. Drying technologies for biopharmaceutical applications: Recent developments and future direction. Drying Technology. 2018;36(6):677-684.

[8] Kandasamy S, Naveen R. A review on the encapsulation of bioactive components using spray-drying and freeze-drying techniques. Journal of Food Process Engineering. 2022;45(8):e14059.

[9] Zhang W-X, Gao Y-R, Xue R, et al. Liquid formulations based on ionic liquids in biomedicine. Materials Today Physics. 2023;30:100925.

[10] Santos D, Maurício AC, Sencadas V, et al. Spray drying: an overview. Biomaterials-Physics and Chemistry-New Edition. 2018;2:9-35.

[11] Nwankwo CS, Okpomor EO, Dibagar N, et al. Recent Developments in the Hybridization of the Freeze-Drying Technique in Food Dehydration: A Review on Chemical and Sensory Qualities. Foods. 2023;12(18).

[12] Vanbillemont B, Greiner AL, Ehrl V, et al. A model-based optimization strategy to achieve fast and robust freeze-drying cycles. Int J Pharm X. 2023;5:100180.

[13] Simoens S, Jacobs I, Popovian R, et al. Assessing the Value of Biosimilars: A Review of the Role of Budget Impact Analysis. Pharmacoeconomics. 2017;35(10):1047-1062.

[14] Kawasaki H, Shimanouchi T, Kimura Y. Recent development of optimization of lyophilization process. Journal of chemistry. 2019;2019(1):9502856.

[15] Brülls M, Folestad S, Sparén A, et al. In-situ near-infrared spectroscopy monitoring of the lyophilization process. Pharmaceutical research. 2003;20:494-499.

[16] Misra G. Quality Control and Regulatory Aspects for Biologicals: Regulations and Best Practices. CRC Press; 2024.

[17] Rodriguez M, Dhameliya N, Patel B. AI-Driven Programmable Logic Controllers: Enhancing Automation in Industrial Processes. Robotics Xplore: USA Tech Digest. 2024;1(1):1-14.

[18] Pal S, Das A, Nandy S, et al. Development of a near-infrared tunable diode laser absorption spectrometer for trace moisture measurements in helium gas. Review of Scientific Instruments. 2019;90(10).

[19] Franks F. Freeze-drying of bioproducts: putting principles into practice. Eur J Pharm Biopharm. 1998;45(3):221-9.

[20] Jameel F. Principles and Practices of Lyophilization in Product Development and Manufacturing. Springer International Publishing; 2023.

[21] Newman A, Zografi G. What we need to know about solid-state isothermal crystallization of organic molecules from the amorphous state below the glass transition temperature. Molecular pharmaceutics. 2020;17(6):1761-1777.

[22] Alexeenko A, Topp E. Future directions: lyophilization technology roadmap to 2025 and beyond. Drying technologies for biotechnology and pharmaceutical applications. 2020:355-372.

[23] Kaale LD, Eikevik TM, Bardal T, et al. The effect of cooling rates on the ice crystal growth in air-packed salmon fillets during superchilling and superchilled storage. International journal of refrigeration. 2013;36(1):110-119.
[24] He Z, Liu K, Wang J. Bioinspired materials for controlling ice nucleation, growth, and recrystallization. Accounts of chemical research. 2018;51(5):1082-1091.
[25] Mehanna MM, Abla KK. Recent advances in freeze-drying: variables, cycle optimization, and innovative techniques. Pharmaceutical development and technology. 2022;27(8):904-923.
[26] Khalil B, Adamowski J, Shabbir A, et al. A review: dew water collection from radiative passive collectors to recent developments of active collectors. Sustainable Water Resources Management. 2016;2(1):71-86.
[27] Yang W, Long L, Zhang L, et al. Heat and mass transfer and deformation during chiffon cake baking. Journal of Food Engineering. 2025;388:112361.
[28] Ray AK. Drying. Coulson and Richardson's Chemical Engineering: Elsevier; 2023. p. 457-533.
[29] Wang C, Hua L, Yan H, et al. A thermal management strategy for electronic devices based on moisture sorption-desorption processes. Joule. 2020;4(2):435-447.
[30] González-González O, Ramirez IO, Ramirez BI, et al. Drug stability: ICH versus accelerated predictive stability studies. Pharmaceutics. 2022;14(11):2324.
[31] Chaurasiya V, Singh J. An analytical study of coupled convective heat and mass transfer with volumetric heating describing sublimation of a porous body under most sensitive temperature inputs: Application of freeze-drying. International Journal of Heat and Mass Transfer. 2023;214:124294.
[32] Ward KR, Matejtschuk P. The principles of freeze-drying and application of analytical technologies. Cryopreservation and freeze-drying protocols. 2020:99-127.
[33] Stratta L, Capozzi LC, Franzino S, et al. Economic Analysis of a Freeze-Drying Cycle. Processes. 2020;8(11):1399.
[34] Mitragotri S, Burke PA, Langer R. Overcoming the challenges in administering biopharmaceuticals: formulation and delivery strategies. Nat Rev Drug Discov. 2014;13(9):655-72.
[35] Singh BN. Product development, manufacturing, and packaging of solid dosage forms under QbD and PAT paradigm: DOE case studies for industrial applications. AAPS PharmSciTech. 2019;20(8):313.
[36] Lambert E, Janjic JM. Quality by design approach identifies critical parameters driving oxygen delivery performance in vitro for perfluorocarbon based artificial oxygen carriers. Sci Rep. 2021;11(1):5569.
[37] Karmakar S, Poddar S, Khanam J. Understanding the Effects of Associated Factors in the Development of Microsponge-Based Drug Delivery: a Statistical Quality by Design (QbD) Approach Towards Optimization. AAPS PharmSciTech. 2022;23(7):256.
[38] Krokida M, Karathanos V, Maroulis Z. Effect of freeze-drying conditions on shrinkage and porosity of dehydrated agricultural products. Journal of Food engineering. 1998;35(4):369-380.
[39] GÂVAN A, BOGDAN C, RUS L, et al. NIR spectroscopy coupled with multivariate data analysis in the prediction of the characteristics of mannitol lyophilized cakes. Romanian Journal of Pharmaceutical Practice. 2021;14(3).
[40] Karunnanithy V, Abdul Rahman NHB, Abdullah NAH, et al. Effectiveness of Lyoprotectants in Protein Stabilization During Lyophilization. Pharmaceutics. 2024;16(10).
[41] Olsson C, Swenson J. Structural Comparison between Sucrose and Trehalose in Aqueous Solution. J Phys Chem B. 2020;124(15):3074-3082.
[42] Zeng C, Li J, Shi J, et al. Modulating the Physical Form of Mannitol Crystallizing in Frozen Solutions: The Role of Cosolute and Processing. Mol Pharm. 2025;22(3):1686-1696.
[43] Horn J, Tolardo E, Fissore D, et al. Crystallizing amino acids as bulking agents in freeze-drying. European Journal of Pharmaceutics and Biopharmaceutics. 2018;132:70-82.
[44] Varzakas T. 4 Crystallization. Food Engineering Handbook: Food Process Engineering. 2014:131.

[45] Pansare SK, Patel SM. Practical considerations for determination of glass transition temperature of a maximally freeze concentrated solution. AAPS PharmSciTech. 2016;17(4):805-819.
[46] Mutukuri TT, Ling J, Du Y, et al. Effect of Buffer Salts on Physical Stability of Lyophilized and Spray-Dried Protein Formulations Containing Bovine Serum Albumin and Trehalose. Pharm Res. 2023;40(6):1355-1371.
[47] Kolhe P, Amend E, Singh SK. Impact of freezing on pH of buffered solutions and consequences for monoclonal antibody aggregation. Biotechnol Prog. 2010;26(3):727-33.
[48] Veilleux D, Nelea M, Biniecki K, et al. Preparation of Concentrated Chitosan/DNA Nanoparticle Formulations by Lyophilization for Gene Delivery at Clinically Relevant Dosages. J Pharm Sci. 2016;105(1):88-96.
[49] Mandaji M, Rübensam G, Hoff RB, et al. Sample stacking in CZE using dynamic thermal junctions I. Analytes with low dpKa/dT crossing a single thermally induced pH junction in a BGE with high dpH/dT. Electrophoresis. 2009;30(9):1501-1509.
[50] Yanwinitchai S, Dao HM, Moon C, et al. Synergistic cryoprotective effect of deaeration and polysorbate 80 on IgG denaturation during thin-film freeze-drying. Journal of Drug Delivery Science and Technology. 2024;100:106106.
[51] Musakhanian J, Rodier J-D, Dave M. Oxidative stability in lipid formulations: a review of the mechanisms, drivers, and inhibitors of oxidation. AAPS PharmSciTech. 2022;23(5):151.
[52] Mercanti N, Macaluso M, Pieracci Y, et al. Enhancing wine shelf-life: Insights into factors influencing oxidation and preservation. Heliyon. 2024;10(15).
[53] Tchessalov S, Maglio V, Kazarin P, et al. Practical Advice on Scientific Design of Freeze-Drying Process: 2023 Update. Pharm Res. 2023;40(10):2433-2455.
[54] Pu YE, Ma L, Dear B, et al. Understanding the Impact of Microstructures on Reconstitution and Drying Kinetics of Lyophilized Cake Using X-ray Microscopy and Image-Based Simulation. J Pharm Sci. 2023;112(6):1625-1634.
[55] Liu D, Galvanin F, Yu Y. Formulation Screening and Freeze-Drying Process Optimization of Ginkgolide B Lyophilized Powder for Injection. AAPS PharmSciTech. 2018;19(2):541-550.
[56] Pedro SN, R. Freire CS, Silvestre AJ, et al. The role of ionic liquids in the pharmaceutical field: An overview of relevant applications. International journal of molecular sciences. 2020;21(21):8298.
[57] Wenzel T, Gieseler H. Evaluation of packaging materials in freeze-drying: use of polymer caps and nested vials and their impact on process and product attributes. AAPS PharmSciTech. 2021;22(3):82.
[58] Ward KR, Matejtschuk P. The Principles of Freeze-Drying and Application of Analytical Technologies. Methods Mol Biol. 2021;2180:99-127.
[59] Tan M, Mei J, Xie J. The formation and control of ice crystal and its impact on the quality of frozen aquatic products: A review. Crystals. 2021;11(1):68.
[60] Liu L, Jiao W, Xu H, et al. Effect of rapid freezing technology on quality changes of freshwater fish during frozen storage. Lwt. 2023;189:115520.
[61] Kim H-W, Kim J-H, Seo J-K, et al. Effects of aging/freezing sequence and freezing rate on meat quality and oxidative stability of pork loins. Meat science. 2018;139:162-170.
[62] Searles JA, Carpenter JF, Randolph TW. Annealing to optimize the primary drying rate, reduce freezing-induced drying rate heterogeneity, and determine T(g)' in pharmaceutical lyophilization. J Pharm Sci. 2001;90(7):872-87.
[63] Kumar Y, Tiwari S, Kumar Y. Cryogenic Freezing Technology. International Journal of Pure & Applied Bioscience. 2018;6(2):1343-1346.
[64] Deck L-T, Ferru N, Kosir A, et al. Visualizing and understanding batch heterogeneity during freeze-drying using shelf-scale infrared thermography. Industrial & Engineering Chemistry Research. 2024;63(38):16335-16346.
[65] Chia A. Control and optimization of the primary drying of lyophilization in vials. 2023.
[66] Torrisi A, Proverbio E, Serra A. Ancient Bones Characterization and Preparation Through Freeze-Drying Process. International Journal of Thermophysics. 2022;43(8):126.
[67] Sedmak I, Moze M, Kambic G, et al. Heat Flux Analysis and Assessment of Drying Kinetics during Lyophilization of Fruits in a Pilot-Scale Freeze Dryer. Foods. 2023;12(18).

[68] Fathi F, S NE, Matos LC, et al. Emerging drying techniques for food safety and quality: A review. Compr Rev Food Sci Food Saf. 2022;21(2):1125-1160.
[69] Klepzig LS, Juckers A, Knerr P, et al. Digital twin for lyophilization by process modeling in manufacturing of biologics. Processes. 2020;8(10):1325.
[70] Assegehegn G, Brito-de la Fuente E, Franco JM, et al. Understanding and optimization of the secondary drying step of a freeze-drying process: a case study. Drying Technology. 2021;39(8):1003-1017.
[71] Mohammed M, Rahman R, Mohammed AM, et al. Surface treatment to improve water repellence and compatibility of natural fiber with polymer matrix: Recent advancement. Polymer Testing. 2022;115:107707.
[72] Vorhauer-Huget N, Mannes D, Hilmer M, et al. Freeze-drying with structured sublimation fronts—visualization with neutron imaging. Processes. 2020;8(9):1091.
[73] Kumar S, Sanap SN, Vasoya M, et al. Application of lyophilization in pharmaceutical injectable formulations: An industry and regulatory perspective. Journal of Drug Delivery Science and Technology. 2024:106089.
[74] Wu W, Li H, Chen Y, et al. Recent advances in drying processing technologies for aquatic products. Processes. 2024;12(5):942.
[75] Muneeshwaran M, Srinivasan G, Raja B, et al. Investigation of heat and mass transfer behavior of mannitol during vial freeze-drying. Journal of thermal analysis and calorimetry. 2022:1-12.
[76] Jameel F, Kessler WJ, Schneid S. Application of PAT in Real-Time Monitoring and Controlling of Lyophilization Process. Principles and Practices of Lyophilization in Product Development and Manufacturing: Springer; 2023. p. 333-361.
[77] Franceschini G, Macchietto S. Model-based design of experiments for parameter precision: State of the art. Chemical Engineering Science. 2008;63(19):4846-4872.
[78] Tang X, Pikal MJ. Design of freeze-drying processes for pharmaceuticals: practical advice. Pharmaceutical research. 2004;21:191-200.
[79] Sah SK, Kaity S. Pharmaceutical packaging: Recent trends and challenges. Dosage Forms, Formulation Developments and Regulations. 2024:663-684.
[80] Iacocca RG, Toltl N, Allgeier M, et al. Factors affecting the chemical durability of glass used in the pharmaceutical industry. Aaps Pharmscitech. 2010;11:1340-1349.
[81] Young J, Zurawlow B. Parenteral Product Container-Closure Integrity Testing. Parenteral Medications, Fourth Edition: CRC Press; 2019. p. 511-534.
[82] Jahan T, Mobarok H, Hossain M. Advancements in sterilization packaging systems: Ensuring patient safety. The Pharma Innovation Journal. 2024;13(2):252-261.
[83] Pardeshi SR, Deshmukh NS, Telange DR, et al. Process development and quality attributes for the freeze-drying process in pharmaceuticals, biopharmaceuticals and nanomedicine delivery: A state-of-the-art review. Future Journal of Pharmaceutical Sciences. 2023;9(1):99.
[84] Mehanna MM, Abla KK. Recent advances in freeze-drying: variables, cycle optimization, and innovative techniques. Pharm Dev Technol. 2022;27(8):904-923.
[85] Crommelin DJ, Hawe A, Jiskoot W. Formulation of biologics including biopharmaceutical considerations. Pharmaceutical Biotechnology: Fundamentals and Applications: Springer; 2024. p. 95-117.
[86] U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA). CDER new drug review: 2015 update [Internet]. Silver Spring (MD): FDA; 2015 [cited 2017 Oct 6]. Available from: https://www.fda.gov/.
[87] European Medicines Agency (EMA). Guideline on comparability of biotechnology-derived medicinal products after a change in the manufacturing process: non-clinical and clinical issues. London (UK): European Medicines Agency; 2007 Nov. (EMEA/CHMP/BMWP/101695/2006) [cited 2017 Oct 6]. Available from: https://www.ema.europa.eu/.
[88] Chandaria R, Sripathirathan K, Song YJ, et al. Marketing approvals for cell and gene therapy products in oncology: Current review of EMA and FDA approvals. Journal of Clinical Oncology. 2023;41(16_suppl):e15189-e15189.
[89] Yoon K, Narsimhan V. Secondary Drying: Challenges and Considerations. Principles and Practices of Lyophilization in Product Development and Manufacturing: Springer; 2023. p. 219-242.

[90] Patel A, Jin C, Handzo B, et al. Measurement of moisture content in pharmaceutical tablets by handheld near-infrared spectrometer: adopting quality by design approach to analytical method lifecycle management. Journal of Pharmaceutical and Biomedical Analysis. 2023;229:115381.
[91] Sarvepalli S, Pasika SR, Verma V, et al. A Review on the Stability Challenges of Advanced Biologic Therapeutics. Pharmaceutics. 2025;17(5):550.
[92] Pu YE, Ma L, Dear B, et al. Understanding the impact of microstructures on reconstitution and drying kinetics of lyophilized cake using X-ray Microscopy and image-based simulation. Journal of Pharmaceutical Sciences. 2023;112(6):1625-1634.
[93] Patel M, Patel D, Patel HM, et al. Pharmaceutical Product Development: Formulation Additives. Advances in Pharmaceutical Product Development: Springer; 2025. p. 83-110.
[94] Ghaemmaghamian Z, Zarghami R, Walker G, et al. Stabilizing vaccines via drying: Quality by design considerations. Advanced Drug Delivery Reviews. 2022;187:114313.
[95] Hedberg SH, Devi S, Duralliu A, et al. Mechanical behavior and structure of freeze-dried cakes. Lyophilization of pharmaceuticals and biologicals: new technologies and approaches. 2019:327-351.
[96] Bonazzi C, Dumoulin E. Quality changes in food materials as influenced by drying processes. Modern drying technology. 2011;3:1-20.
[97] Atwood G. Developments in melt crystallization. Recent Developments in Separation Science: CRC Press; 2018. p. 1-33.
[98] Olakanmi SJ, Jayas DS, Paliwal J. Applications of imaging systems for the assessment of quality characteristics of bread and other baked goods: A review. Comprehensive Reviews in Food Science and Food Safety. 2023;22(3):1817-1838.
[99] Eppink M, Wapenaar M, Crommelin D, et al. Therapeutic Proteins and Advanced Therapy Medicinal Products. Practical Pharmaceutics: An International Guideline for the Preparation, Care and Use of Medicinal Products: Springer; 2023. p. 551-590.
[100] Elsayed YY, Kühl T, Imhof D. Regulatory Guidelines for the Analysis of Therapeutic Peptides and Proteins. Journal of Peptide Science. 2025;31(3):e70001.
[101] Inspection Co-operation Scheme G. GUIDELINES ON GOOD MANUFACTURING PRACTICE FOR MEDICINAL PRODUCTS.
[102] Panch SR, Bikkani T, Vargas V, et al. Prospective evaluation of a practical guideline for managing positive sterility test results in cell therapy products. Biology of Blood and Marrow Transplantation. 2019;25(1):172-178.
[103] United States Pharmacopeial Convention. *USP 43–NF 38: <71> Sterility tests*. Rockville (MD): United States Pharmacopeial Convention; 2020.
[104] HealthCare. EDftQoM. European Pharmacopoeia. 10th ed. Strasbourg: Council of Europe. 2019. Chapter 261, Sterility.
[105] Beg S, Hasnain MS, Rahman M, et al. Introduction to quality by design (QbD): fundamentals, principles, and applications. Pharmaceutical quality by design: Elsevier; 2019. p. 1-17.
[106] Kolekar YM. Understanding of DoE and its advantages in Pharmaceutical development as per QbD Approach. Asian Journal of Pharmacy and Technology. 2019;9(4):271-275.
[107] Deidda R, Orlandini S, Hubert P, et al. Risk-based approach for method development in pharmaceutical quality control context: A critical review. Journal of pharmaceutical and biomedical analysis. 2018;161:110-121.
[108] Juckers A, Knerr P, Harms F, et al. Emerging PAT for Freeze-Drying Processes for Advanced Process Control. Processes. 2022;10(10):2059.
[109] U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA). *PAT — A Framework for Innovative Pharmaceutical Development, Manufacturing, and Quality Assurance.* FDA Guidance Documents. Silver Spring (MD): U.S. Food and Drug Administration; 2011.
[110] Sharma V, Kumar H. PROCESS ANALYTICAL TECHNOLOGY (PAT) AND QUALITY BY DESIGN: AN INTEGRATIVE APPROACH FOR PHARMACEUTICAL SCIENCE. 2023.
[111] Murphy T, O'Mahony N, Panduru K, et al., editors. Pharmaceutical manufacturing and the quality by design (QBD), process analytical technology (PAT) approach. 2016 27th Irish Signals and Systems Conference (ISSC); 2016: IEEE.

[112] Edler F. Reliable and Traceable Temperature Measurements Using Thermocouples: Key to ensuring process efficiency and product consistency. Johnson Matthey Technology Review. 2023;67(1):65-76.
[113] Zhang Z, Liu X-Y. Control of ice nucleation: freezing and antifreeze strategies. Chemical Society Reviews. 2018;47(18):7116-7139.
[114] Paoletti LG. Capacitance sensor: numerical and experimental applications in the aerospace field. 2023.
[115] Johnson RE, Oldroyd ME, Ahmed SS, et al. Use of manometric temperature measurements (MTM) to characterize the freeze-drying behavior of amorphous protein formulations. Journal of pharmaceutical sciences. 2010;99(6):2863-2873.
[116] Wilkinson M, White IR, Goodacre R, et al. Effects of high relative humidity and dry purging on VOCs obtained during breath sampling on common sorbent tubes. J Breath Res. 2020;14(4):046006.
[117] Lin TP, Hsu CC. Determination of residual moisture in lyophilized protein pharmaceuticals using a rapid and non-invasive method: near infrared spectroscopy. PDA J Pharm Sci Technol. 2002;56(4):196-205.
[118] Sheokand S, Modi SR, Bansal AK. Dynamic vapor sorption as a tool for characterization and quantification of amorphous content in predominantly crystalline materials. Journal of pharmaceutical sciences. 2014;103(11):3364-3376.
[119] Kulkarni SS, Patel SM, Suryanarayanan R, et al. Key factors governing the reconstitution time of high concentration lyophilized protein formulations. European Journal of Pharmaceutics and Biopharmaceutics. 2021;165:361-373.
[120] Dickens JE. Overview of process analysis and PAT. Process analytical technology: Spectroscopic tools and implementation strategies for the chemical and pharmaceutical industries. 2010:1-15.
[121] Cosby ST. Process Analytical Technology in biopharmaceutical manufacturing: Massachusetts Institute of Technology; 2013.
[122] Gatto MS, Najahi-Missaoui W. Lyophilization of nanoparticles, does it really work? Overview of the current status and challenges. International Journal of Molecular Sciences. 2023;24(18):14041.
[123] Brytan W, Padrela L. Structural modifications for the conversion of proteins and peptides into stable dried powder formulations: A review. Journal of Drug Delivery Science and Technology. 2023;89:104992.
[124] Lee S-K, Ha E-S, Park H, et al. Lyophilization of pharmaceuticals: an overview and practical approaches for developing the lyophilization cycle. Journal of Pharmaceutical Investigation. 2025:1-25.
[125] Mennen SM, Alhambra C, Allen CL, et al. The evolution of high-throughput experimentation in pharmaceutical development and perspectives on the future. Organic Process Research & Development. 2019;23(6):1213-1242.
[126] Denise HM, Álvarez-Sánchez F, Ortiz-Rodríguez N, et al. Solar drying modes of saladette tomatoes slices on phytochemicals and functional properties. Solar Energy. 2023;262:111903.
[127] Wang W-C. Design and analysis of an energy efficient dehumidification system for drying applications. 2016.
[128] Akers J, Izumi Y. Technological advancements in aseptic processing and the elimination of contamination risk. Advanced Aseptic Processing Technology: CRC Press; 2016. p. 416-422.
[129] Meleties M, Cooper BM, Marcano-James D, et al. Vaporized hydrogen peroxide sterilization in the production of protein therapeutics: uptake and effects on product quality. Journal of Pharmaceutical Sciences. 2023;112(12):2991-3004.
[130] Jornitz MW. 16 The Review of Flexible Production Platforms for the Future Maik W. Jornitz. Continuous Processing in Pharmaceutical Manufacturing. 2014.
[131] Kamerzell TJ, Esfandiary R, Joshi SB, et al. Protein-excipient interactions: mechanisms and biophysical characterization applied to protein formulation development. Adv Drug Deliv Rev. 2011;63(13):1118-59.

[132] Carvalho HM, Fidalgo TA, Acúrcio RC, et al. Better, Faster, Stronger: Accelerating mRNA-Based Immunotherapies With Nanocarriers. Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Nanomedicine and Nanobiotechnology. 2024;16(6):e2017.
[133] Leong KY, Tham SK, Poh CL. Revolutionizing immunization: a comprehensive review of mRNA vaccine technology and applications. Virology Journal. 2025;22(1):71.
[134] Helmy SA, El-Morsi RM, Helmy SA, et al. Towards novel nano-based vaccine platforms for SARS-CoV-2 and its variants of concern: advances, challenges and limitations. Journal of Drug Delivery Science and Technology. 2022;76:103762.
[135] Cromer D, Steain M, Reynaldi A, et al. Neutralising antibody titres as predictors of protection against SARS-CoV-2 variants and the impact of boosting: a meta-analysis. The Lancet Microbe. 2022;3(1):e52-e61.
[136] Afzal A, Abbasi MH, Ahmad S, et al. Current Trends in Messenger RNA Technology for Cancer Therapeutics. Biomaterials Research. 2025;29:0178.
[137] Yingngam B. Monoclonal Antibody. Critical Developments in Cancer Immunotherapy. 2024:419.
[138] Kommineni N, Butreddy A, Jyothi VGS, et al. Freeze-drying for the preservation of immunoengineering products. Iscience. 2022;25(10).
[139] Demirtürk N, Varan G, Kağa S, et al. Optimization and characterization of Rituximab targeted multidrug loaded cyclodextrin nanoparticles against Non-Hodgkin Lymphoma. International Journal of Pharmaceutics. 2024;662:124488.
[140] Karunnanithy V, Abdul Rahman NHB, Abdullah NAH, et al. Effectiveness of Lyoprotectants in Protein Stabilization During Lyophilization. Pharmaceutics. 2024;16(10):1346.
[141] Dash R, Rathore AS. Freeze thaw and lyophilization induced alteration in mAb therapeutics: trastuzumab as a case study. Journal of Pharmaceutical and Biomedical Analysis. 2021;201:114122.
[142] Liu LL, Wang L, Zonderman J, et al. Automated, high-throughput infrared spectroscopy for secondary structure analysis of protein biopharmaceuticals. Journal of Pharmaceutical Sciences. 2020;109(10):3223-3230.
[143] Amiel E, Benov A, Peled D. On the Frontlines of Pre-Hospital Care: The Efficacy of Freeze-Dried Plasma. Int J Biomed Res Prac. 2024;4(2):1-12.
[144] Peng HT, Singh K, Rhind SG, et al. Dried plasma for major trauma: past, present, and future. Life. 2024;14(5):619.
[145] Solheim B, Seghatchian J. Update on pathogen reduction technology for therapeutic plasma: an overview. Transfusion and apheresis Science. 2006;35(1):83-90.
[146] Patel SM, Doen T, Pikal MJ. Determination of end point of primary drying in freeze-drying process control. Aaps Pharmscitech. 2010;11:73-84.
[147] Roy I, Gupta MN. Freeze-drying of proteins: Some emerging concerns. Biotechnology and applied biochemistry. 2004;39(2):165-177.
[148] Wang W, Zhu Z, Wang C, et al. Post-drying decontamination of laver by dielectric barrier discharge plasma, UV radiation, ozonation, and hot air treatments. LWT. 2023;176:114518.
[149] Jost D, Lemoine S, Lemoine F, et al. Prehospital lyophilized plasma transfusion for trauma-induced coagulopathy in patients at risk for hemorrhagic shock: a randomized clinical trial. JAMA network open. 2022;5(7):e2223619-e2223619.
[150] Corona-Hernandez RI, Álvarez-Parrilla E, Lizardi-Mendoza J, et al. Structural stability and viability of microencapsulated probiotic bacteria: a review. Comprehensive Reviews in Food Science and Food Safety. 2013;12(6):614-628.
[151] Rezaie-Yazdi Z. Development of direct compression tablets for microencapsulated bacteriophages prepared by spray drying: Loughborough University; 2022.
[152] Botta C, Franciosa I, Ferrero D, et al., editors. Prebiotic Effect of Mycoproteins on Ex Vivo Colonic Microbiota from Individuals Following Omnivorous and Plant-Based Diets. The 18th INTERNATIONAL SCIENTIFIC CONFERENCE ON PROBIOTICS, PREBIOTICS, GUT MICROBIOTA AND HEALTH_Proceeding; 2025.
[153] PANCHAL US. Master of Technology: ANAND AGRICULTURAL UNIVERSITY; 2009.

[154] Healy L, Young L, Stacey GN. Stem cell banks: preserving cell lines, maintaining genetic integrity, and advancing research. Human Pluripotent Stem Cells: Methods and Protocols. 2011:15-27.
[155] Sharma S, Goyal S, Chauhan K. A review on analytical method development and validation. International Journal of Applied Pharmaceutics. 2018;10(6):8-15.
[156] Peris-Vicente J, Esteve-Romero J, Carda-Broch S. Validation of analytical methods based on chromatographic techniques: An overview. Analytical separation science. 2015:1757-1808.
[157] Tassi M, De Vos J, Chatterjee S, et al. Advances in native high-performance liquid chromatography and intact mass spectrometry for the characterization of biopharmaceutical products. Journal of separation science. 2018;41(1):125-144.
[158] Tembhare E, Gupta KR, Umekar MJ. An approach to drug stability studies and shelf-life determination. Arch Curr Res Int. 2019;19(1):1-20.
[159] Rayfield WJ, Kandula S, Khan H, et al. Impact of freeze/thaw process on drug substance storage of therapeutics. Journal of Pharmaceutical Sciences. 2017;106(8):1944-1951.
[160] Ahanger AS, Masoodi FS, Khanam A, et al. Managing and Securing Information Storage in the Internet of Things. Internet of Things Vulnerabilities and Recovery Strategies: Auerbach Publications; 2024. p. 102-151.
[161] Tailor J. Regulatory Procedure of Post Approval Changes and Variation and Comparative Studies of European Union and United State: Institute of Pharmacy, Nirma University, A'bad; 2023.
[162] Awotwe-Otoo D, Khan MA. Lyophilization of biologics: an FDA perspective. Lyophilized Biologics and Vaccines: Modality-Based Approaches. 2015:341-359.
[163] Jameel F, Alexeenko A, Bhambhani A, et al. Recommended best practices for lyophilization validation 2021 part II: process qualification and continued process verification. AAPS PharmSciTech. 2021;22:1-25.
[164] Chavda H. In-use stability studies: guidelines and challenges. Drug development and industrial pharmacy. 2021;47(9):1373-1391.
[165] McDowell AM. Challenges in the Implementation of Risk Evaluation Mitigation Strategies (REMS): A Survey of Industry Views: University of Southern California; 2018.
[166] Pisano R, Adali MB, Stratta L. Modernizing manufacturing of parenteral products: from batch to continuous lyophilization. Continuous Pharmaceutical Processing and Process Analytical Technology: CRC Press; 2023. p. 285-307.
[167] Jameel F, Alexeenko A, Bhambhani A, et al. Lyophilization Validation: Process Qualification and Continued Process Verification. Principles and Practices of Lyophilization in Product Development and Manufacturing: Springer; 2023. p. 513-539.
[168] Benli K. Designing structurally adaptable multi-mode products using emerging constrained layer pneumatic system technologies 2023.
[169] Paz SM. Model-Guided Strain Engineering: Bridges Between Design and Learning in Bioprocess Development: Wageningen University and Research; 2024.
[170] Okuyelu O, Adaji O. AI-driven real-time quality monitoring and process optimization for enhanced manufacturing performance. J Adv Math Comput Sci. 2024;39(4):81-89.
[171] da Silva Ferreira MV, Ahmed MW, Oliveira M, et al. AI-Enabled Optical Sensing for Smart and Precision Food Drying: Techniques, Applications and Future Directions. Food Engineering Reviews. 2024:1-29.
[172] Martynenko A, Misra N. Machine learning in drying. Drying Technology. 2020;38(5-6):596-609.
[173] Pazhayattil AB, Sharma S. Analytical Tools for Investigation and Generation of Supporting Evidence. Pharmaceutical Manufacturing Deviation and Failure Investigations: Principles, Practices, and Case Studies: Springer; 2025. p. 33-52.
[174] Chaudhary S, Muthudoss P, Madheswaran T, et al. Artificial intelligence (AI) in drug product designing, development, and manufacturing. A handbook of artificial intelligence in drug delivery: Elsevier; 2023. p. 395-442.
[175] Pratap-Singh A, Noore S, Mandal R, et al. Sustainable processing through efficient use of energy and minimizing waste production. Nonthermal Processing in Agri-Food-Bio Sciences: Sustainability and Future Goals: Springer; 2022. p. 723-748.

[176] Oztuna Taner O. Vacuum freeze dryer technology for extending the shelf life of food and protecting the environment: a scenario study of the energy efficiency. Environmental Science and Pollution Research. 2024;31(27):38573-38584.
[177] More PR, Jambrak AR, Arya SS. Green, environment-friendly and sustainable techniques for extraction of food bioactive compounds and waste valorization. Trends in Food Science & Technology. 2022;128:296-315.
[178] Bertaglia T, Costa CM, Lanceros-Méndez S, et al. Eco-friendly, sustainable, and safe energy storage: a nature-inspired materials paradigm shift. Materials Advances. 2024;5(19):7534-7547.
[179] Ibrahim H, Abdelmawla N. Eco-Friendly Dehydrator Machine for Food Recycling: A Waste Management System. Nile Journal of Communication and Computer Science. 2022;4(1):12-30.
[180] Joshi S, Jindal P, Gautam S, et al. Mini Review on the Lyophilization: A Basic Requirement for Formulation Development and Stability Modifier. ASSAY and Drug Development Technologies. 2025.
[181] Upot NV, Rabbi KF, Khodakarami S, et al. Advances in micro and nanoengineered surfaces for enhancing boiling and condensation heat transfer: a review. Nanoscale advances. 2023;5(5):1232-1270.
[182] Kim L, Toh Y-C, Voldman J, et al. A practical guide to microfluidic perfusion culture of adherent mammalian cells. Lab on a Chip. 2007;7(6):681-694.
[183] Osouli-Bostanabad K, Puliga S, Serrano DR, et al. Microfluidic manufacture of lipid-based nanomedicines. Pharmaceutics. 2022;14(9):1940.
[184] Cong H, Zhang N. Perspectives in translating microfluidic devices from laboratory prototyping into scale-up production. Biomicrofluidics. 2022;16(2).
[185] Irshad MS, Arshad N, Maqsood G, et al. Interdisciplinary Hybrid Solar-Driven Evaporators: Theoretical Framework of Fundamental Mechanisms and Applications. Small. 2025;21(7):2407280.
[186] Alexeenko A, Korang-Yeboah M, Tchessalov S. Critical Needs and Opportunities for Advanced Manufacturing of Lyophilized Injectables. Pharmaceutical Research. 2025;42(6):1059-1064.
[187] Scott GY, Aborode AT, Adesola RO, et al. Enhancing Vaccine Quality and Accessibility: Strategies for Efficient Storage and Distribution in Resource-Constrained Environment. Outbreak Management and Response. 2025;1(1):2443439.
[188] Bittner B. Customer-centric product presentations for monoclonal antibodies. AAPS open. 2023;9(1):3.

Figure Legends

Figure 1. Schematic Overview of the Basic Design of a Lyophilizer. (Created with BioRender.com).

Figure 2. Lyophilization Process Overview, illustrating Freezing, Primary Drying, and Secondary Drying Stages (Created with BioRender.com).

Figure 3. Principles of Lyophilization, Depicting Substance States and Triple Point Conditions. (Created with BioRender.com).