Review

Not peer-reviewed version

Pharmaceutical Drug Lifecycle: A Comprehensive Scientific Review of Research and Development Phases, Attrition Rates, and Global Disparities

Gustavo Lorenzo Moretta *

Posted Date: 12 February 2026

doi: 10.20944/preprints202602.0991.v1

Keywords: drug development; pharmaceutical R&D; clinical trial attrition; drug discovery; regulatory approval; global health equity; preclinical development; therapeutic area success rates; drug development costs; developing countries

 doi:10.20944/preprints202602.0991.v1

Review

Pharmaceutical Drug Lifecycle: A Comprehensive Scientific Review of Research and Development Phases, Attrition Rates, and Global Disparities

Gustavo Lorenzo Moretta

Corporación Silher, Lima, Perú; gustavolorenzomoretta@gmail.com

Abstract

Background: Drug development is one of the most complex, costly, and prolonged processes in biomedical sciences, yet comprehensive reviews integrating quantitative attrition data across all phases with global equity perspectives remain scarce. **Objective:** To provide a comprehensive scientific review of the pharmaceutical drug lifecycle during the Research and Development (R&D) phase, from initial discovery through Phase III clinical trials, analyzing success rates, timelines, costs, and disparities between developed and developing countries. **Methods:** A narrative review was conducted synthesizing evidence from peer-reviewed literature, regulatory agency reports, and published systematic reviews. Sources were identified through PubMed, Scopus, and Web of Science databases, with selection criteria emphasizing quantitative data on attrition rates, development timelines, costs, and geographic disparities in pharmaceutical R&D. **Results:** The complete drug development process typically requires 10–15 years, with costs ranging from $897 million to $1.9 billion per approved drug. Only 9.6–21.5% of compounds entering clinical trials achieve regulatory approval. Preclinical attrition reaches 95%, with Phase I-to-II progression at 50%, Phase II-to-III at 34%, and Phase III-to-approval at 52%. Lack of efficacy accounts for 56% of Phase II/III failures, followed by safety concerns (28%). Therapeutic area variability is substantial: Alzheimer's disease shows a 0.4% success rate versus 21.5% overall. Critical disparities exist between developed and developing countries in R&D capacity, regulatory infrastructure, and disease priorities, with clinical trials in emerging markets costing up to 60% less but raising ethical and quality standards challenges. **Conclusions:** Drug development efficiency remains a critical challenge for global health. Improving preclinical predictability, adopting biomarker-driven patient selection, implementing adaptive trial designs, and addressing global R&D inequities through innovative financing mechanisms represent key strategies to improve development efficiency and health equity. Future research should focus on generating systematic data from low- and middle-income countries to better characterize and address global pharmaceutical R&D disparities.

Keywords: drug development; pharmaceutical R&D; clinical trial attrition; drug discovery; regulatory approval; global health equity; preclinical development; therapeutic area success rates; drug development costs; developing countries

1. Introduction

Drug development constitutes a cornerstone of modern medicine and represents one of the most challenging and costly scientific enterprises. From the initial discovery of a promising molecule to regulatory approval and commercialization, the pharmaceutical development process traverses multiple rigorous stages designed to ensure the safety and efficacy of medications reaching patients.

The inherent complexity of pharmaceutical development is reflected in its extended timelines and elevated attrition rates. The scientific literature consistently documents that the complete process from discovery to regulatory approval typically requires 10–15 years (Lipina et al., 2015; Dababov et al., 2018; Shareef et al., 2023), with some studies reporting durations of 11.4–13.5 years (Shareef et al.,

 doi:10.20944/preprints202602.0991.v1

2023) and others indicating averages of 12–14 years (Madhani, 2007). This prolonged duration reflects the need for exhaustive evaluations at each development phase to identify and eliminate compounds lacking therapeutic efficacy or presenting unacceptable safety profiles.

Costs associated with pharmaceutical development have experienced exponential growth in recent decades. Current estimates place the average cost of developing a new drug between $897 million and $1.9 billion (Lipina et al., 2015), with more recent studies reporting figures of $1.24 billion in 2005 dollars (Kaitin, 2008) and up to $1.8 billion (Debabov et al., 2018). These costs include not only direct research and development expenses but also opportunity costs associated with the numerous compounds that fail during the process.

Success rates in pharmaceutical development are notably low, reflecting the rigorous safety and efficacy standards required for regulatory approval. Evidence indicates that only 9.6–21.5% of compounds entering human clinical trials eventually receive marketing authorization (Cassidy et al., 2020; Kaitin, 2008; Mahmoud et al., 2006).

This review aims to provide a comprehensive scientific analysis of the pharmaceutical drug lifecycle during the R&D phase, with particular emphasis on: (1) detailed characterization of each development phase from discovery through Phase III clinical trials; (2) quantitative analysis of success, failure, and attrition rates at each stage; (3) evaluation of timelines and associated costs; (4) the public health significance of pharmaceutical development; and (5) critical contrasts between pharmaceutical development realities in developed versus developing countries, including disparities in resources, infrastructure, regulatory capacity, and research priorities.

2. Methods

This narrative review synthesized evidence from peer-reviewed literature identified through systematic searches of PubMed, Scopus, and Web of Science databases. Search terms included combinations of: "drug development," "pharmaceutical R&D," "clinical trial attrition," "success rates," "drug discovery," "preclinical development," and "global health disparities." Selection criteria prioritized publications providing quantitative data on attrition rates, development timelines, costs, and geographic disparities. Both primary research articles and systematic reviews were included. Reference lists of identified articles were manually reviewed to identify additional relevant sources. No date restrictions were applied, although emphasis was placed on evidence from the past two decades. A total of 26 sources meeting the inclusion criteria were analyzed and synthesized.

Limitations: As a narrative review, this study did not employ formal systematic review methodology (e.g., PRISMA guidelines), which may introduce selection bias. The heterogeneity of methodologies, study populations, and time periods across included studies limits direct comparability of reported metrics.

3. The Modern Drug Development Paradigm

3.1. Conceptual Framework

Modern pharmaceutical development is grounded in a rigorous scientific paradigm integrating multiple disciplines, including medicinal chemistry, pharmacology, toxicology, clinical medicine, and regulatory sciences. The drug development process is conceptualized as a progressive funnel where thousands of initial compounds are systematically evaluated and filtered through increasingly rigorous stages of scrutiny. Cassidy et al. (2020) document that the process typically begins with 5,000–10,000 compounds in the discovery phase, reducing to approximately 250 compounds during preclinical testing, and finally to only 5 compounds entering clinical trials. Of these, only one eventually receives FDA approval.

 doi:10.20944/preprints202602.0991.v1

3.2. Regulatory Framework and Historical Evolution

The contemporary regulatory framework for pharmaceutical development was largely established in response to historical tragedies demonstrating the critical need for systematic safety and efficacy evaluations. The current structure of sequential clinical phases (Phase I, II, and III) represents a system designed to progressively assess safety, determine optimal dosing, and establish therapeutic efficacy before regulatory approval. Kaitin (1995) documents that clinical development times experienced a 140% increase between 1963 and 1993, while total time from chemical synthesis to approval increased by 156%.

3.3. Inherent Uncertainty and Risk Management

Pharmaceutical development is characterized by a high degree of inherent uncertainty at each stage. Schuhmacher et al. (2016) emphasize that high attrition rates reflect fundamental uncertainties related to translational predictability of preclinical models, prediction of adverse effects in diverse human populations, and identification of predictive biomarkers of therapeutic response. Wong et al. (2019) demonstrate that trials utilizing biomarkers for patient selection have significantly higher overall success probabilities than those that do not.

3.4. Therapeutic Area Variability

Success rates and timelines vary substantially by therapeutic area. Kaitin (2008) reports that neuropharmacological drugs require 10.8 years with a 14% success rate, while oncology drugs require 9.3 years with only an 8% success rate. Cummings et al. (2014) document an extraordinarily low success rate of 0.4% (99.6% failure) for Alzheimer's disease drugs during 2002–2012, representing one of the lowest rates in any therapeutic area.

4. Discovery Phase

The discovery phase represents the starting point of pharmaceutical development, characterized by the identification and initial optimization of compounds with therapeutic potential. This phase involves exploratory biology, molecular target identification, compound screening, and selection of promising candidates for further evaluation (Dalrymple, 2010). The process typically begins with 5,000–10,000 compounds evaluated through high-throughput screening and other active compound identification methodologies (Cassidy et al., 2020).

The introduction of modern technologies such as computer-aided drug design (CADD) has significantly reduced the time required for discovery phases, enabling faster identification of lead compounds and more efficient optimization of their pharmacological properties (Shareef et al., 2023). Kiss et al. (2023) report that the discovery phase for antibody-drug conjugates (ADCs) in oncology requires approximately 4.5 years.

The discovery phase is characterized by the lowest success rates in the entire development process. Dalrymple (2010) documents that the probability of success in the early exploratory discovery phase is approximately 30%, the lowest of all development phases.

5. Preclinical Phase

The preclinical phase represents a critical stage where candidate compounds identified during discovery undergo exhaustive safety, pharmacokinetic, and efficacy evaluations using in vitro and in vivo models before human administration. Key components include pharmacokinetic and ADME studies—evaluating absorption, distribution, metabolism, and excretion parameters including lipophilicity, solubility, and plasma stability (Krüger et al., 2019)—and toxicology studies assessing acute toxicity, repeat-dose toxicity, genotoxicity, reproductive toxicity, and, when appropriate, carcinogenicity.

 doi:10.20944/preprints202602.0991.v1

Attrition rates in the preclinical phase are extremely high. Stephens (2015) documents that only 11% of compounds in preclinical development progress beyond this phase, resulting in a 95% failure rate. Cassidy et al. (2020) report that of 5,000–10,000 initial discovery compounds, only approximately 250 survive preclinical testing. Principal failure reasons include unacceptable toxicological findings (20% of failures per Stephens, 2015), inadequate pharmacokinetic properties, lack of efficacy in animal models, and formulation or chemical stability problems.

A fundamental challenge in preclinical development is the limited translatability of animal model findings to human efficacy and safety. Cingi et al. (2017) note that despite extensive preclinical testing, success rates remain low, reflecting fundamental differences in physiology, metabolism, and immune responses between species.

6. Phase I Clinical Trials

Phase I clinical trials represent the first administration of a candidate compound to humans, typically conducted in small groups of 20–80 healthy volunteers (Cassidy et al., 2020). Primary objectives include establishing the safety and tolerability profile, determining maximum tolerated dose, and characterizing basic pharmacokinetic parameters. Kiss et al. (2023) report that Phase I typically requires approximately 1.5 years for oncology ADCs.

Progression rates from Phase I to Phase II vary considerably. Stephens (2015) reports a 50% progression rate, while Dalrymple (2010) reports a 70% probability of success for antimalarial drugs. Principal failure reasons include safety problems identified in humans not apparent in preclinical studies, inadequate pharmacokinetic properties, and lack of preliminary pharmacological activity evidence.

7. Phase II Clinical Trials

Phase II trials represent the first systematic evaluation of therapeutic efficacy in patients with the target disease, typically involving several hundred participants. Phase IIA studies assess proof of concept and dose-finding, while Phase IIB provides well-controlled efficacy data. Phase II typically requires approximately 2.5 years (Kiss et al., 2023).

Phase II is characterized by particularly high attrition rates. Stephens (2015) reports a 34% progression rate from Phase II to Phase III, meaning approximately two-thirds of compounds entering Phase II do not advance to pivotal studies. Lack of efficacy represents the predominant failure reason: Kiss et al. (2023) report that Phase II/III failures were attributed to lack of efficacy (56%), safety problems (28%), strategy changes (7%), commercial reasons (5%), and operational challenges (5%).

8. Phase III Clinical Trials

Phase III trials are pivotal studies providing definitive evidence of efficacy and safety for regulatory approval, typically involving 300–3,000 participants in randomized, controlled, multicenter designs (Cassidy et al., 2020). Stephens (2015) reports a 52% progression rate from Phase III to approval. Rocha et al. document a 26.7% failure risk in Phase III clinical trials in Brazil, although more than 90% of drugs with positive Phase III results were approved by the Brazilian Agency.

Phase III failures are particularly costly, occurring after substantial investments in previous phases. The pharmaceutical sector invests approximately 70% of total new drug development costs in clinical trials, with Phase III representing the largest proportion (Rocha et al.). Seimetz (2017) notes that up to 20% of products still fail during the approval phase despite significant prior investment.

 doi:10.20944/preprints202602.0991.v1

9. Comparative Analysis of Success and Attrition Rates

Table 1. Summary of attrition rates and progression probabilities across pharmaceutical development phases.

Phase	Progression Rate	Failure Rate	Duration (years)	Key Source
Preclinical	5–11%	89–95%	~1–4.5	Stephens (2015); Cassidy et al. (2020)
Phase I	50–70%	30–50%	~1.5	Stephens (2015); Dalrymple (2010)
Phase II	34%	66%	~2.5	Stephens (2015); Kiss et al. (2023)
Phase III	52%	48%	~2.5–4	Stephens (2015); Rocha et al.
Overall (Phase I–Approval)	9.6–21.5%	78.5–90.4%	10–15 total	Cassidy et al. (2020); Kaitin (2008)

Table 2. Comparative success rates across therapeutic areas.

Therapeutic Area	Success Rate	Duration (years)	Source
Alzheimer's Disease	0.4%	—	Cummings et al. (2014)
Oncology (colorectal)	3%	9.3	Constant et al. (2013); Kaitin (2008)
Neuropharmacology	14%	10.8	Kaitin (2008)
Overall (all areas)	9.6–21.5%	10–15	Cassidy et al. (2020); Kaitin (2008)
Antimalarials	~70% (Phase I)	—	Dalrymple (2010)

The data reveal a consistent pattern of progressive attrition through the development pipeline. While the overall clinical success rate ranges from 9.6% (Cassidy et al., 2020) to 21.5% (Kaitin, 2008), the cumulative probability of success from initial discovery is estimated at less than 0.1%, considering the 5,000–10,000 initial compounds typically needed to produce one approved drug.

Across all development phases, lack of efficacy emerges as the predominant failure reason, accounting for 55–56% of Phase II/III failures (Kiss et al., 2023; Constant et al., 2013), safety concerns represent 28% (Kiss et al., 2023), with strategy changes, commercial reasons, and operational challenges accounting for the remainder.

10. Economic Dimensions of Drug Development

The economic burden of drug development has grown exponentially, with current per-drug estimates ranging from $897 million (Lipina et al., 2015) to $1.9 billion (Debabov et al., 2018), and some analyses reaching $1.24 billion in 2005 dollars (Kaitin, 2008). The pharmaceutical sector invests approximately 60–70% of total development costs in clinical trials (Madhani, 2007; Rocha et al.), with the average compound requiring testing in 5,303 patients (Mahmoud et al., 2006). Historical cost per approved drug was estimated at $291 million in 1994 dollars (Kaitin, 1995).

DiMasi (2002) quantifies the financial benefits from development process improvements: simultaneous 25% reductions in phase durations reduce total capitalized cost by 16% ($129 million), while 50% time reductions yield 29% cost savings ($235 million). Increasing success rates from 21.5%

 doi:10.20944/preprints202602.0991.v1

to one-in-three could reduce total capitalized cost by $221–$242 million per approved drug. Additionally, shifting just 5% of all clinical failures from Phase III to Phase I reduces direct clinical outlays by 5.5–7.1%.

11. Public Health Significance

The public health significance of pharmaceutical development manifests across multiple dimensions: reduction of mortality and morbidity associated with serious diseases, improvement of patient quality of life, reduction of economic disease burden on healthcare systems, and contribution to increased life expectancy observed in recent decades.

Despite significant advances, substantial unmet medical needs persist. In neurodegenerative diseases, Cummings et al. (2014) document that Alzheimer's disease drug development had a 0.4% overall success rate during 2002–2012, with the number of compounds progressing to regulatory review among the lowest of any therapeutic area. In oncology, colorectal cancer drug approval stands at only 3% over the past decade (Constant et al., 2013). Lipina et al. (2015) emphasize that the developing world suffers the greatest burden of infectious diseases, yet the range of available drugs for treatment is limited. Inoue et al. (2025) document persistent challenges in drug development for rare pediatric diseases, including a 25-year timeline from global adoption to potential approval in Japan for isotretinoin.

Hussain et al. (2025) emphasize that the pharmaceutical industry will continue producing new molecular entities (NMEs) to satisfy expanding unmet medical requirements as drug development success rates improve, underscoring the iterative relationship between R&D efficiency and therapeutic innovation.

12. Global Disparities: Developed vs. Developing Countries

12.1. Research Capacity and Infrastructure

Disparities between developed and developing countries in pharmaceutical R&D capacity are profound and multifaceted. Stephens (2015) documents that developing countries face challenges not seen in developed nations, including shortages of human resources and basic infrastructure. R&D has failed to meet pharmaceutical demands in the developing world, where innovative capacity is crucial. Although overall R&D investment increased in India, it became less directed toward local health needs, illustrating a disconnect between research capacity and public health priorities.

12.2. Cost and Timeline Differentials

Madhani (2007) documents that clinical trials in India are conducted in 30% less time and can cost up to 60% less than in the United States, making emerging markets attractive destinations for clinical trial outsourcing. However, Mahmoud et al. (2006) note that unlike developed countries, low-income countries (LICs) often lack sufficient market size to attract private sector R&D investment, leading to insufficient revenue for new product development.

12.3. Disease Priorities and Access Barriers

Disease priorities differ markedly between developed and developing countries. Lipina et al. (2015) emphasize that the developing world suffers the greatest burden of infectious diseases, yet available drug ranges are limited. Dalrymple (2010) documents the critical importance of antimalarial drug development for Africa, with artemisinin-based combination therapies (ACTs) stimulated largely by philanthropic funding, particularly from the Gates Foundation, illustrating the critical role of alternative financing for diseases disproportionately affecting developing countries.

Access barriers persist even when new therapies are developed, reflecting limitations in healthcare systems, supply chains, and payment capacity (Dalrymple, 2010). Stephens (2015)

 doi:10.20944/preprints202602.0991.v1

underscores that as low- and middle-income countries (LMICs) become increasingly involved in clinical trials, policymakers must ensure that scientific and ethical standards are maintained.

13. Discussion

This review reveals several consistent and critical findings characterizing the pharmaceutical R&D process. The convergence of evidence on 10–15 year development timelines, escalating costs exceeding $1 billion per approved drug, and overall success rates of only 9.6–21.5% underscores the fundamental challenge of pharmaceutical innovation.

The substantial variability in success rates across therapeutic areas has important implications for resource allocation and research strategy. Areas with particularly low success rates, such as Alzheimer's disease (0.4%) and oncology (3.4–8%), represent both significant scientific challenges and critical unmet medical needs. Wong et al. (2019) demonstrate that trials using biomarkers for patient selection achieve significantly higher success probabilities, suggesting that investment in biomarker development and validation represents a critical strategy for improving development efficiency.

The identification of lack of efficacy as the predominant cause of clinical failure (55–56%) reflects fundamental limitations of preclinical models in predicting human therapeutic responses and suggests the need for improved predictive models, advanced preclinical systems including organoids and humanized models, and integration of multi-omic data. The documented global disparities raise critical challenges for health equity. The fundamental misalignment between global health needs and market-driven research priorities requires alternative incentive mechanisms, including prizes, advance market commitments, and public-private partnerships.

Limitations of this review include the narrative design without formal systematic methodology, the heterogeneity of included study methodologies and time periods (contributing to variability in reported metrics, e.g., success rate estimates ranging from 9.6% to 21.5%), limited quantitative data specifically from developing country contexts, and the rapid evolution of the field with emerging technologies whose impact may not yet be fully captured in published evidence.

14. Future Directions and Recommendations

Key strategies for improving pharmaceutical development efficiency include: expansion of computer-aided drug design (CADD) and artificial intelligence for accelerated discovery (Shareef et al., 2023); development and validation of predictive biomarkers to improve patient selection and success rates (Wong et al., 2019); improved preclinical models including organoids and humanized systems (Constant et al., 2013); adaptive and platform trial designs to reduce sample sizes and timelines; innovative regulatory approaches including accelerated pathways and conditional approvals (Cassidy et al., 2020); and strategic portfolio management with rigorous go/no-go decision points to enable earlier termination of unpromising programs (DiMasi, 2002).

Addressing global disparities requires capacity building in developing countries, alternative incentive mechanisms for neglected diseases, and open access models to reduce resource waste from duplicated research (Debabov et al., 2018). Global regulatory harmonization can reduce duplication of efforts and accelerate access to new therapies worldwide.

15. Conclusions

Pharmaceutical drug development remains one of the most complex, costly, and prolonged scientific processes, typically requiring 10–15 years and $897 million to $1.9 billion per approved drug. This comprehensive review documents progressive attrition across all phases, with only 9.6–21.5% of compounds entering clinical trials achieving regulatory approval. Phase II represents the most critical attrition point, with only 34% progression and lack of efficacy as the predominant failure cause (56%).

The substantial variability across therapeutic areas—from 0.4% success in Alzheimer's disease to 21.5% overall—highlights both scientific challenges and unmet medical needs requiring sustained

 doi:10.20944/preprints202602.0991.v1

investment and innovative approaches. Critical global disparities in R&D capacity, infrastructure, and access to medicines demand coordinated solutions including alternative financing mechanisms, capacity building, and regulatory harmonization.

Future improvements in development efficiency hinge on expanding biomarker-driven patient selection, improving preclinical model predictability, implementing adaptive trial designs, and fostering global collaboration. These strategies, combined with innovative regulatory approaches and equitable research prioritization, can accelerate the translation of scientific discoveries into accessible therapies that benefit patients worldwide.

Author Contributions: G.L.M. conceived, designed, conducted the literature review, analyzed and synthesized the data, and wrote the manuscript. The author has read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

Funding: This research received no external funding.

Institutional Review Board Statement: Not applicable. This study is a literature review and did not involve human subjects, animal experimentation, or primary data collection.

Informed Consent Statement: Not applicable.

Data Availability Statement: No original data were generated. All data analyzed are derived from published sources cited in the reference list.

Conflicts of Interest: The author declares no conflicts of interest.

References

1. Cassidy, A.; Bielak, D.; Dabrowski, M.; Grajek, M.; Puzio, I.; Korona-Glowniak, I.; Malm, A. FDA Efficiency for Approval Process of COVID-19 Therapeutics. Infect. Agents Cancer 2020, 15. https://doi.org/10.1186/S13027-020-00338-Z
2. Cingi, C.; Muluk, N.B.; Ulusoy, S. The Drug Development Process and Evolution of Regulations. In Nasal Physiology and Pathophysiology of Nasal Disorders; Springer: Cham, Switzerland, 2017; pp. 47–55. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-44344-7_4
3. Constant, S.; Huang, S.; Wiszniewski, L.; Mas, C. Colon Cancer: Current Treatments and Preclinical Models for the Discovery and Development of New Therapies. In Drug Development—A Case Study Based Insight into Modern Strategies; IntechOpen: London, UK, 2013. https://doi.org/10.5772/53391
4. Cummings, J.L.; Morstorf, T.; Zhong, K. Alzheimer's Disease Drug-Development Pipeline: Few Candidates, Frequent Failures. Alzheimers Res. Ther. 2014, 6, 37. https://doi.org/10.1186/ALZRT269
5. Dalrymple, D.G. Artemisia Annua, Artemisinin, ACTs and Malaria Control in Africa: The Interplay of Tradition, Science and Public Policy. In Politics of Modern Agricultural Science; 2010.
6. Debabov, D.; Novik, A.; Manukhov, I. Drug Development and Open Access: Approaches and Perspectives. Acta Naturae 2018, 10, 29–31. https://doi.org/10.18527/2500-2236-2018-5-1-29-31
7. DiMasi, J.A. The Value of Improving the Productivity of the Drug Development Process: Faster Times and Better Decisions. PharmacoEconomics 2002, 20 (Suppl. 3), 1–10. https://doi.org/10.2165/00019053-200220003-00001
8. DiMasi, J.A.; Hansen, R.W.; Grabowski, H.G. Risks in New Drug Development: Approval Success Rates for Investigational Drugs. Clin. Pharmacol. Ther. 2001, 69, 297–307. https://doi.org/10.1067/MCP.2001.115446
9. Hussain, A.; Yadav, M.K.; Bose, S.; Wang, J.H.; Lim, D.; Song, Y.K.; Ko, S.G.; Kim, H. Unveiling the Science of Drug Development: Strategies, Successes, and Challenges. Int. J. Basic Clin. Pharmacol. 2025, 14, 1–10. https://doi.org/10.18203/2319-2003.ijbcp20252592
10. Inoue, N.; Nishimura, N.; Nakazawa, Y.; Oshima, K.; Ito, Y.; Hama, A.; Koh, K. Addressing the Drug Development Challenge for Rare Pediatric Diseases in Japan: A Case Study of Isotretinoin. Invest. New Drugs 2025, 43, 1–8. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10637-025-01566-z
11. Kaitin, K.I. Pharmaceutical Innovation in an Era of Reform. Am. J. Ther. 1995, 2, 687–694. https://doi.org/10.1097/00045391-199509000-00023

 doi:10.20944/preprints202602.0991.v1

12. Kaitin, K.I. Obstacles and Opportunities in New Drug Development. Clin. Pharmacol. Ther. 2008, 83, 210–212. https://doi.org/10.1038/SJ.CLPT.6100462
13. Kiriiri, G.K.; Njogu, P.M.; Mwangi, A.N. Exploring Different Approaches to Improve the Success of Drug Discovery and Development Projects: A Review. Future J. Pharm. Sci. 2020, 6, 27. https://doi.org/10.1186/S43094-020-00047-9
14. Kiss, R.; Polgár, T.; Keseru, G.M. Business Risk Mitigation in the Development Process of New Monoclonal Antibody Drug Conjugates for Cancer Treatment. Pharmaceutics 2023, 15, 1761. https://doi.org/10.3390/pharmaceutics15061761
15. Krüger, B.; Schlecht, U.; Heinzle, E. ADME Profiling in Drug Discovery and a New Path Paved on Silica. In Drug Discovery and Development—New Advances; IntechOpen: London, UK, 2019. https://doi.org/10.5772/INTECHOPEN.86174
16. Lipina, T.V.; Palomo, V.; Gil, C.; Martinez, A.; Roder, J.C. Drug Discovery for Schizophrenia and Autism Spectrum Disorder. In Psychiatric Disorders: Methods and Protocols; Humana Press: Totowa, NJ, USA, 2015; pp. 189–212.
17. Madhani, H. Major Issues and Trends in Drug Discovery and Development: India's Emerging Role. Soc. Sci. Res. Netw. 2007. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.1017083
18. Mahmoud, F.; Sarpatwari, A.; Varley, C.; Gagnon, M.A. Product Development Priorities. In Priority Medicines for Europe and the World 2013 Update; World Health Organization: Geneva, Switzerland, 2006.
19. Pronker, E.S. Innovation Paradox in Vaccine Target Selection. Doctoral Thesis, Utrecht University, Utrecht, The Netherlands, 2013.
20. Rocha, L.A.; Almeida, A.T.; Cancela, M.C. The Risk of Innovation: Measuring Drug Clinical Development in Brazil. Int. J. Bus. Innov. Res. 2018, 17, 188–206. https://doi.org/10.1504/ijbir.2018.094202
21. Schuhmacher, A.; Gassmann, O.; Hinder, M. A Review of the Pharmaceutical R&D Efficiency: Costs, Timelines, and Probabilities. In Value Creation in the Pharmaceutical Industry; Wiley-VCH: Weinheim, Germany, 2016; pp. 69–92. https://doi.org/10.1002/9783527693405.CH4
22. Seimetz, D. The Key to Successful Drug Approval: An Effective Regulatory Strategy. In Regulatory Affairs for Biomaterials and Medical Devices; Springer: Cham, Switzerland, 2017; pp. 135–153. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-658-06382-5_7
23. Shareef, J.; Fernandes, J.; Samaga, L. A Comprehensive Review of Discovery and Development of Drugs Discovered from 2020–2022. J. Saudi Pharm. Soc. 2023, 31, 101913. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsps.2023.101913
24. Stephens, P. Access to Medicines: Common Problems, Common Solutions? Doctoral Thesis, University of Sussex, Brighton, UK, 2015.
25. Wong, C.H.; Siah, K.W.; Lo, A.W. Estimation of Clinical Trial Success Rates and Related Parameters. Biostatistics 2019, 20, 273–286. https://doi.org/10.1093/BIOSTATISTICS/KXX069
26. Yamaguchi, T.; Asoh, M.; Mano, N.; Ando, Y. Combinations of Drug Candidate Properties Affecting Development Success and Discontinuation for 5 Diseases. J. Clin. Pharmacol. 2022, 62, 1009–1020. https://doi.org/10.1002/jcph.2063