Fractional Auditing in Pharmaceutical Quality Assurance: An Integrated Approach

Introduction

In the increasingly complex landscape of pharmaceutical research and development, maintaining data integrity while balancing resource constraints has become a critical challenge for quality assurance professionals. Fractional auditing has emerged as a strategic methodology that enables organisations to optimise their quality oversight without compromising compliance. This article explores the implementation of fractional auditing approaches within the pharmaceutical industry's regulatory framework, with particular focus on Information Technology Quality Assurance (ITQA), Computerised System Validation (CSV), and alignment with industry guidance documents.

Understanding Fractional Auditing

Fractional auditing refers to a risk-based sampling approach where a representative subset of data, processes, or systems is audited rather than conducting exhaustive evaluations. This methodology employs statistical principles and risk assessment to ensure that the audited sample provides sufficient confidence in the quality and compliance of the entire population.

Key Principles of Fractional Auditing:

1. **Risk-Based Selection**: Sample selection based on critical quality attributes and potential impact on patient safety, data integrity, and product quality.
2. **Statistical Validity**: Sample sizes determined through established statistical methods to ensure appropriate representation.
3. **Balanced Coverage**: Distribution of audit focus across high, medium, and low-risk areas.
4. **Continuous Improvement**: Iterative refinement of sampling methodologies based on previous findings..

Regulatory Framework and Industry Guidance

GAMP 5 Framework

The Good Automated Manufacturing Practice (GAMP 5) framework, developed by the International Society for Pharmaceutical Engineering (ISPE), provides a foundation for fractional auditing through its emphasis on:

- Risk-based approaches to computerised system validation

- Scalable validation efforts proportionate to system complexity and patient risk
- Leveraging supplier documentation and assessments

GAMP 5 supports fractional auditing by acknowledging that not all aspects of a system require the same level of scrutiny, enabling organisations to focus validation resources where they matter most.

GAMP Good Clinical Practice Guide (GCP GPG V2.0)

The GAMP GCP Guide Version 2.0 extends these principles specifically to clinical research settings, where:

- Risk assessment determines the extent of validation required for clinical systems
- Data criticality dictates the intensity of quality oversight
- Sampling approaches are endorsed for periodic reviews of clinical data systems

The guide explicitly supports the concept that "the depth, extent, and rigor of validation activities should be based on complexity, risk, and regulatory impact of the computerised system."

EMA eSource Guidance

The European Medicines Agency's guidance on electronic source data in clinical trials provides additional context for fractional auditing by:

- Recognising the need for appropriate sampling methodologies when reviewing electronic data capture systems
- Endorsing risk-based approaches to source data verification
- Emphasising critical data points that warrant heightened scrutiny

This guidance supports targeted verification rather than exhaustive review, aligning with fractional auditing principles.

FDA Guidance on Computerised Systems in Clinical Studies

The FDA's stance on computerised systems provides clear support for fractional approaches through:

- Acknowledgment that "a risk-based approach to validation is recommended"
- Guidance that "the extent of validation should be tailored to the nature of the system and its intended use"
- Recognition that sampling methodologies may be appropriate when properly justified

The FDA's focus on critical thinking rather than rigid checklist approaches creates a regulatory environment conducive to fractional auditing.

AI-Related Regulatory Considerations

Recent regulatory developments regarding artificial intelligence add new dimensions to fractional auditing:

EU AI Guidance

The European Union's approach to AI in pharmaceutical contexts emphasises:

- Algorithmic transparency requiring understanding of how AI makes decisions
- Validation sampling that covers the full range of potential inputs
- Testing that ensures AI systems remain within their validated boundaries

Fractional auditing of AI systems must consider representative data across all possible scenarios the algorithm might encounter.

FDA AI Guidance

The FDA's position on AI and machine learning in pharmaceutical applications focuses on:

- The need for ongoing monitoring rather than one-time validation
- Change control processes that accommodate AI's evolutionary nature
- Representative sampling of algorithm performance across diverse populations

The FDA recognises that traditional validation approaches may be insufficient for adaptive AI systems, necessitating new fractional approaches that account for continuous learning capabilities.

Current Industry Perspectives

Large Pharmaceutical Organisations

Major pharmaceutical companies have increasingly embraced fractional auditing approaches, driven by:

- The volume of data generated through global clinical trials
- Resource constraints in quality departments
- Implementation of centralised monitoring strategies
- Digital transformation initiatives requiring efficient oversight

Companies like Pfizer, Novartis, and Merck have publicly discussed their implementation of risk-based monitoring and sampling approaches that align with fractional auditing philosophies. These organisations typically employ sophisticated statistical methods to determine appropriate sample sizes and leverage advanced analytics to identify patterns suggesting potential compliance issues.

Consulting Firms

Leading consulting organisations specialising in pharmaceutical quality systems have been vocal advocates for fractional approaches, with firms such as Deloitte, PwC, and specialised GxP consultancies promoting:

- Risk-based audit strategies
- Leveraging automation for preliminary data screening
- Statistical methodologies for determining minimum necessary sample sizes
- Integration of continuous monitoring tools to supplement periodic audits

These consultancies frequently cite efficiency gains of 30-40% when implementing properly designed fractional auditing approaches compared to traditional methods.

Small and Medium Biotechnology Companies

Emerging biotechnology organisations face unique challenges that make fractional auditing particularly valuable:

- Limited quality assurance resources
- Accelerated development timelines
- Reliance on outsourced partners and systems
- Need to demonstrate robust quality oversight to potential acquirers or partners

These organisations typically adopt more pragmatic approaches to fractional auditing, focusing intensely on critical data paths while leveraging vendor assessments and certification to reduce validation burden on commodity systems.

Implementing Fractional Auditing in ITQA and CSV

Sample Size Determination

When implementing fractional auditing for computerised systems validation, determining appropriate sample sizes becomes crucial. Industry practice has converged on several approaches:

1. **Square Root of N Plus One**: For homogeneous populations, sampling $\sqrt{n+1}$ items is often considered adequate (where n is the total population size).
2. **Statistical Quality Control Methods**: Leveraging established methodologies like ANSI/ASQ Z1.4 for attribute sampling.
3. **Critical Parameter Focus**: Ensuring 100% coverage of critical parameters while sampling non-critical elements.
4. **Progressive Sampling**: Beginning with smaller samples and expanding if issues are detected.

Risk Stratification Framework

Effective fractional auditing requires clear categorization of systems and data based on risk:

Risk Category	System Examples	Data Examples	Recommended Sampling Approach
High	EDC Systems, SDTM Dataset Generation, Primary Endpoint Collection	Primary Efficacy Endpoints, Safety Data, Inclusion/Exclusion Data	100% for critical fields, 20-30% for supporting fields
Medium	IWRS, CTMS, eTMF Systems	Secondary Endpoints, Drug Accountability, Protocol Deviations	10-20% stratified sampling
Low	Training Systems, Non-clinical Data Management, Document Management	Demographic Information, Non-critical Covariates	5-10% random sampling

Documentation Requirements

Documentation supporting fractional auditing approaches must be robust and should include:

1. **Sampling Plan**: Detailing methodology, rationale, and statistical basis
2. **Risk Assessment**: Justifying the categorisation of systems and data elements
3. **Predetermined Acceptance Criteria**: Defining thresholds for escalating to expanded sampling
4. **Audit Trail Review Methodology**: Specifying approach to audit trail sampling
5. **Deviation Management Process**: Outlining actions when issues are identified in samples

Case Studies in Fractional Auditing

Case Study 1: EDC System Development Documentation Audit

A global pharmaceutical sponsor engaged Digital Quality Associates (DQA) to conduct a fractional audit of their Electronic Data Capture (EDC) system's development documentation, focusing on the vendor's core product development process in accordance with ICH GCP E6 R3 section 5.10 requirements for electronic systems.

The audit methodology specifically targeted development documentation using a risk-based sampling

approach:

Requirements Documentation:

- 100% of user requirements specifications (URS) for critical functionality (patient randomisation, primary endpoint collection)
- 30% of URS for non-critical functionality, selected based on potential impact to data integrity
- Cross-verification that 25% of vendor functional specifications properly addressed corresponding URS

Release Notes and Version Control:

- 100% of release notes for major version releases in the past 24 months
- 50% of release notes for minor updates, focusing on those affecting data capture components
- Verification that 20% of documented changes were properly reflected in the validation documentation

Bug Fix and Patch Documentation:

- 100% of documented critical bugs (data integrity, security, patient safety)
- 40% of high-severity bugs from the past 12 months
- 15% of medium-severity bugs, randomly sampled
- Traceability verification that 30% of bug fixes had proper regression testing documentation

Change Control Process:

- 35% of change requests, focusing on those affecting core data collection functionality
- 40% of change implementation documentation to verify proper impact assessment
- 25% of testing documentation for implemented changes

DQA's targeted approach revealed critical gaps in the change control process where 30% of sampled bug fixes lacked appropriate regression testing documentation, potentially violating ICH GCP E6 R3 section 5.3.3 requirements for maintaining validated status. The audit also identified that release notes for two minor updates failed to disclose changes to the audit trail timestamp functionality—a critical element for data integrity and regulatory compliance.

Case Study 2: eTMF Vendor Documentation Assessment

DQA implemented a fractional auditing approach for a mid-sized biotechnology company's electronic Trial Master File (eTMF) system, specifically examining the vendor's development documentation and release management processes against ICH GCP E6 R3 requirements.

The documentation review methodology comprised:

System Development Life Cycle Documentation:

- 100% of design specifications for document version control features
- 40% of technical specifications relating to document metadata and classification
- 25% of development documentation for search and retrieval functionality

Release Management Documentation:

- 100% of major release documentation for the past 18 months

- 30% of patch release notes, selected across system components
- Verification that 35% of advertised features in release notes were properly documented in system specifications

Bug Tracking and Resolution:

- 45% of critical bugs reported in the past 24 months
- 25% of bugs affecting document control features
- Traceability assessment for 30% of bug resolution documentation to ensure proper verification and validation

Validation Documentation:

- 50% of test cases for core document management functionality
- 25% of test evidence for recent system updates
- 20% of validation summary reports across version releases

Through this focused sampling approach, DQA discovered that the eTMF vendor had implemented undocumented changes to the document classification algorithm across three consecutive minor releases—potentially affecting the system's compliance with ICH GCP E6 R3 section 5.10.12 regarding document organisation. Additionally, the audit revealed inconsistencies in how software patches were documented and tested, with several patches lacking formal risk assessments required by GAMP 5.

Case Study 3: AI-Based Patient Recruitment System Development Documentation Review

A large pharmaceutical company utilising an AI-driven patient recruitment system engaged DQA to audit the development documentation and release management processes for this novel technology. The audit was specifically designed to examine compliance with ICH GCP E6 R3 quality management principles and emerging AI regulatory expectations.

The fractional audit methodology focused on:

Algorithm Development Documentation:

- 100% of algorithm design specifications
- 50% of training dataset documentation to verify proper representation
- 35% of algorithm validation protocols and results
- 25% of technical documentation for data preprocessing components

Version Control and Release Documentation:

- 100% of major algorithm version change documentation
- 40% of parameter update documentation
- Verification that 30% of algorithm updates had appropriate validation documentation

Bug and Anomaly Tracking:

- 100% of critical anomalies affecting patient selection
- 50% of algorithm drift incidents

- 35% of data processing errors
- Traceability verification for 45% of remediation actions

Patch and Update Documentation:

- 100% of emergency patches to the selection algorithm
- 40% of routine updates to system components
- 25% of documentation updates related to system use

By focusing on the development process documentation, DQA identified that the AI system development team had inconsistently documented the rationale for algorithm parameter changes across three consecutive releases. This finding violated core principles of algorithm transparency required by emerging AI regulations and ICH GCP E6 R3 section 5.3.3 regarding control of computerised systems. Moreover, the audit revealed that 35% of examined algorithm updates lacked sufficient validation documentation to demonstrate that system changes did not affect the integrity of previously processed patient data.

The fractional methodology demonstrated that systematic examination of targeted development documentation, release notes, and bug fix records revealed process deficiencies that would have been difficult to identify through standard functional testing alone, particularly in the context of complex systems like AI-based patient recruitment tools.

Challenges and Mitigation Strategies

Regulatory Acceptance

Challenge: Ensuring regulatory inspectors understand and accept fractional approaches.
Mitigation: Develop robust scientific justifications for sampling methodologies and maintain comprehensive documentation linking risk assessments to sampling decisions. Cite specific regulatory guidance supporting risk-based approaches.

Statistical Confidence

Challenge: Ensuring sample sizes provide adequate statistical confidence.
Mitigation: Employ qualified statisticians in designing sampling plans and utilise established statistical methods like power analysis to determine minimum necessary sample sizes.

Detecting Systematic Issues

Challenge: Ensuring the capability to detect systemic problems rather than isolated incidents.
Mitigation: Implement stratified sampling approaches that cover different process areas, time periods, and user populations to maximise the likelihood of detecting patterns indicative of systemic issues.

Future Trends in Fractional Auditing

AI-Enhanced Sampling

Machine learning algorithms are increasingly being employed to optimise sampling strategies by:

- Identifying patterns indicative of higher risk areas
- Dynamically adjusting sampling based on findings
- Predictive analytics to anticipate potential compliance issues
- Natural language processing to analyse narrative content

Continuous Monitoring

The industry is moving toward continuous monitoring approaches that complement traditional periodic auditing:

- Real-time data quality checks
- Automated anomaly detection
- Integration of process and system performance metrics
- Adaptive sampling based on continuous risk assessment

Blockchain for Data Integrity

Emerging blockchain technologies are being explored to enhance data integrity verification:

- Immutable audit trails
- Cryptographic verification of data samples
- Smart contracts for automated compliance checks
- Reduced need for extensive sampling due to inherent integrity guarantees

Conclusion

Fractional auditing represents a sophisticated evolution in pharmaceutical quality assurance that aligns scientific rigor with practical resource constraints. By integrating risk-based approaches within the framework of established regulatory guidance, organisations can achieve comprehensive oversight while optimising resource allocation.

The key to successful implementation lies in transparent methodology, robust documentation, and clear communication with stakeholders. When properly executed, fractional auditing not only reduces resource burden but can actually enhance quality outcomes by focusing expert attention on the most critical aspects of pharmaceutical research and development.

For Data Quality Assurance professionals, mastering the principles and implementation of fractional auditing represents a valuable skill set that will become increasingly important as the industry continues to generate ever-larger volumes of data requiring oversight and validation.

References

1. International Society for Pharmaceutical Engineering. (2022). GAMP 5: A Risk-Based Approach to Compliant GxP Computerized Systems.
2. International Society for Pharmaceutical Engineering. (2023). GAMP Good Practice Guide: GxP Compliant Laboratory Computerized Systems (2nd ed.).
3. European Medicines Agency. (2020). Qualification Opinion on eSource Direct Data Capture (DDC).
4. U.S. Food and Drug Administration. (2022). Use of Electronic Records and Electronic Signatures in Clinical Investigations Under 21 CFR Part 11 – Questions and Answers.
5. European Commission. (2023). Regulatory Framework for Artificial Intelligence in Healthcare and Pharmaceutical Applications.
6. U.S. Food and Drug Administration. (2023). Artificial Intelligence and Machine Learning in Software as a Medical Device.

This article was prepared for Data Quality Assurance professionals working in pharmaceutical research and development environments and provides a general analysis of the recent regulatory amendments. Organisations should consult with their compliance teams and legal advisors for specific implementation guidance.