Available online on 15.04.2026 at http://ajprd.com

Asian Journal of Pharmaceutical Research and Development

Open Access to Pharmaceutical and Medical Research

Open Access

Review Article

A Critical Appraisal of Lc–Ms/Ms Bioanalytical Method Validation for Cilostazol According To USFDA and ICH M10

Srushti Chame*[1], Shrikrishna Baokar[1], Rajendra Patil[2], Mansingh Rajput[3]

[1]Department of Pharmaceutical Analysis, Delonix Society's Baramati College of Pharmacy, Barhanpur, Baramati, Dist Pune, Maharashtra, India 413102

[2]Department of Pharmaceutical Chemistry, Delonix Society's Baramati College of Pharmacy, Barhanpur, Baramati, Dist Pune, Maharashtra, India 413102

[3]Director of Vivotech Research Lab Pvt Ltd., *Navi Mumbai, Maharashtra 4007031.*

ABSTRACT

Cilostazol is a phosphodiesterase III inhibitor widely used for the treatment of intermittent claudication and prevention of thrombotic events. Accurate quantification of cilostazol in biological matrices is essential for pharmacokinetic evaluation, bioequivalence assessment, and therapeutic monitoring. Liquid chromatography coupled with tandem mass spectrometry has become the gold standard analytical technique due to its superior sensitivity, selectivity, and robustness. Regulatory authorities such as the United States Food and Drug Administration and the International Council for Harmonisation have established comprehensive guidelines to ensure reliability and reproducibility of bioanalytical data. The present review critically evaluates LC–MS/MS bioanalytical method validation for cilostazol with particular emphasis on regulatory expectations outlined in USFDA guidance and ICH M10. Method development strategies, validation parameters, matrix effects, stability considerations, incurred sample reanalysis, data integrity, and lifecycle management are discussed in depth. The article also highlights challenges encountered in real laboratory settings and provides perspectives on harmonization and future trends in bioanalytical science.

Key words: Phosphodiesterase, Cilostazol, chromatography, Harmonisation

ARTICLE INFO: Received 28 Dec.2025; Review Complete 16 Jan. 2025; Accepted 18 March 2026; Available online 15 April. 2026

Cite this article as:
Chame S, Baokar S, Patil R, Rajput M, A Critical Appraisal of Lc–Ms/Ms Bioanalytical Method Validation for Cilostazol According To USFDA and ICH M10, Asian Journal of Pharmaceutical Research and Development. 2026; 14(2):138-142,
DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.22270/ajprd.v14i2.1745

*Address for Correspondence:
Srushti Chame, Department of Pharmaceutical Analysis, Delonix Society's Baramati College of Pharmacy, Barhanpur, Baramati, Dist Pune, Maharashtra, India 413102

INTRODUCTION

Bioanalytical method validation constitutes a critical pillar of modern pharmaceutical development, serving as the foundation for generating reliable quantitative data that support the evaluation of drug safety, efficacy, and pharmacokinetic behavior. The accurate determination of drugs and their metabolites in biological matrices such as plasma, serum, urine, or tissues is essential for understanding absorption, distribution, metabolism, and excretion processes. Reliable analytical measurements ensure that pharmacokinetic parameters are interpreted correctly, thereby enabling informed decision-making during clinical development and regulatory review. Inadequate or poorly validated analytical methods can lead to erroneous conclusions regarding drug exposure, potentially compromising patient safety and delaying regulatory approval. Consequently, regulatory agencies and scientific communities have emphasized stringent validation practices to ensure reproducibility, accuracy, and traceability of bioanalytical results. [3]

Over the past several decades, liquid chromatography coupled with tandem mass spectrometry has become the analytical technique of choice for bioanalysis because of its unparalleled sensitivity, selectivity, and capability to quantify analytes at trace levels in complex biological matrices. The evolution of mass spectrometric instrumentation, including improvements in ionization techniques such as electrospray ionization and atmospheric pressure chemical ionization, has significantly enhanced detection capabilities while reducing interference from endogenous substances. Furthermore, LC–MS/MS

provides structural specificity through multiple reaction monitoring, allowing precise quantification even in the presence of closely related metabolites or co-administered drugs. These advantages have positioned LC–MS/MS as a cornerstone technology in pharmacokinetic studies, bioequivalence assessments, therapeutic drug monitoring, and translational research. [4]

Cilostazol, a phosphodiesterase III inhibitor widely used in the management of intermittent claudication and other cardiovascular conditions, represents a compound with distinctive analytical complexities that necessitate careful method development and validation. The drug undergoes extensive hepatic metabolism primarily via cytochrome P450 enzymes, producing active metabolites that may contribute to its pharmacological activity. Its moderate lipophilicity and substantial plasma protein binding further complicate extraction and quantification procedures, as these characteristics can influence recovery, matrix effects, and assay sensitivity. Moreover, the presence of structurally related metabolites and endogenous compounds demands analytical methods with high selectivity to accurately differentiate the parent drug from potential interferences. These challenges underscore the need for optimized sample preparation strategies and robust chromatographic separation to ensure precise quantification across a wide concentration range. [5]

Regulatory oversight plays a central role in establishing standardized expectations for bioanalytical method validation. The guidance issued by the United States Food and Drug Administration outlines comprehensive requirements covering parameters such as selectivity, accuracy, precision, calibration curve performance, recovery, matrix effects, stability, and documentation practices. This guidance has historically served as a benchmark for laboratories conducting regulated bioanalysis. More recently, the International Council for Harmonisation introduced the M10 guideline to harmonize bioanalytical validation requirements across major regulatory regions, thereby promoting consistency in data acceptance worldwide. The harmonized framework addresses not only validation parameters but also aspects related to study conduct, cross-validation, and incurred sample reanalysis, reflecting the evolving complexity of global drug development programs. [6]

Although these regulatory frameworks provide clear expectations, translating guideline principles into routine laboratory practice often presents practical challenges. Variability in instrumentation, differences in laboratory workflows, and interpretation of acceptance criteria can influence method performance and compliance. For instance, subtle differences in sample preparation techniques may affect matrix effects or analyte recovery, while instrument-specific characteristics may impact sensitivity or signal stability. In addition, evolving regulatory expectations require laboratories to continuously update validation strategies and documentation practices. As a result, there is a need for critical evaluations that bridge theoretical guidance with real-world implementation, particularly for drugs with complex analytical profiles. [7]

A focused critical appraisal of LC–MS/MS bioanalytical method validation for cilostazol is therefore warranted to provide a comprehensive understanding of methodological considerations, regulatory expectations, and potential pitfalls. Such an appraisal can assist researchers and regulatory scientists in identifying best practices for method development, ensuring compliance with both United States and international regulatory standards, and enhancing confidence in generated data. By examining validation parameters in the context of cilostazol's physicochemical and pharmacokinetic characteristics, this work aims to contribute to the broader objective of improving analytical reliability and facilitating efficient drug development. [8]

Pharmacological and Physicochemical Characteristics of Cilostazol

Cilostazol exerts its therapeutic action through selective inhibition of phosphodiesterase III, resulting in increased intracellular cyclic adenosine monophosphate levels, inhibition of platelet aggregation, and vasodilation. The drug undergoes extensive metabolism primarily via cytochrome P450 enzymes, producing active metabolites that contribute to pharmacological activity. Accurate quantification is therefore necessary to understand exposure–response relationships. [9]

From an analytical perspective, cilostazol demonstrates favorable ionization under positive electrospray ionization conditions and produces stable fragment ions suitable for multiple reaction monitoring. However, its lipophilic nature can lead to adsorption to surfaces and variability in extraction efficiency, emphasizing the need for optimized sample preparation and validation. [10]

Regulatory Framework and Harmonization

The regulatory framework for bioanalytical method validation is designed to ensure that analytical data used in drug development are accurate, reliable, and reproducible. The United States Food and Drug Administration guidance outlines essential requirements for evaluating method performance, including accuracy, precision, selectivity, sensitivity, and stability. It emphasizes the need for well-documented validation experiments, appropriate calibration models, and quality control procedures to demonstrate that analytical methods are fit for their intended purpose. The guidance also highlights incurred sample reanalysis as an important tool for confirming reproducibility in real study samples and ensuring confidence in pharmacokinetic results. [11]

The International Council for Harmonisation M10 guideline represents a significant advancement toward global consistency by harmonizing bioanalytical validation expectations across regulatory regions. It provides detailed recommendations on the preparation of calibration standards, quality control samples, acceptance criteria, and lifecycle management of analytical methods. By aligning regional requirements, the guideline reduces duplication of validation efforts and facilitates international regulatory submissions. Harmonization ultimately supports efficient drug development while maintaining high standards for data quality and regulatory compliance. [12]

In the context of LC–MS/MS analysis of cilostazol, adherence to these harmonized regulatory expectations is particularly important because the drug's metabolic complexity and potential matrix interferences require robust validation strategies. Careful application of guideline principles helps ensure that analytical methods consistently produce reliable

concentration data across studies, thereby strengthening the scientific credibility of pharmacokinetic evaluations and supporting regulatory acceptance of results. [13]

LC–MS/MS Method Development Considerations

Method development begins with understanding the physicochemical properties of cilostazol and selecting appropriate extraction techniques. Solid phase extraction is often preferred because it reduces matrix interference and improves sensitivity. Protein precipitation may be used for high-throughput analysis, although it may not remove phospholipids effectively. [14]

Chromatographic separation is typically achieved using reversed-phase columns with gradient elution to ensure adequate retention and resolution. Mobile phase composition is optimized to promote efficient ionization and minimize background noise. Mass spectrometric parameters such as collision energy and source temperature are adjusted to achieve maximum signal intensity. [15]

Validation Parameters

Selectivity

Selectivity assessment ensures that endogenous components do not interfere with detection of cilostazol or the internal standard. Evaluation across multiple individual matrix sources is recommended to account for biological variability. [16]

Calibration Curve and Linearity

Calibration standards are prepared across a defined concentration range to establish the relationship between analyte concentration and instrument response. Weighted regression models are commonly used to improve accuracy at low concentrations. [17]

Accuracy and Precision

Accuracy and precision are evaluated using quality control samples at multiple levels to demonstrate reproducibility. Regulatory criteria require that variability remains within predefined limits. [18]

Matrix Effects

Matrix effects remain one of the most significant challenges in LC–MS/MS analysis because co-eluting compounds may suppress or enhance ionization. Evaluation using post-extraction spiking experiments helps characterize these effects. [19]

Recovery

Recovery studies assess extraction efficiency and consistency across concentration levels, ensuring reliable quantification. [20]

Stability

Stability studies evaluate the integrity of cilostazol under various conditions including freeze–thaw cycles, bench-top storage, and long-term storage. [21]

Study Sample Analysis

During routine bioanalytical sample analysis, calibration standards and quality control samples are analyzed alongside study samples in each analytical run to verify ongoing method performance and ensure data integrity. The calibration curve is used to quantify analyte concentrations, while quality control samples at multiple concentration levels provide assurance that accuracy and precision remain within predefined acceptance limits throughout the run. Continuous monitoring of the internal standard response is essential for detecting analytical drift, variations in extraction efficiency, or changes in instrument sensitivity, thereby allowing timely identification of potential issues that could affect quantification reliability. Proper run acceptance criteria and documentation further ensure that reported concentrations are scientifically defensible and compliant with regulatory expectations. [22]

Incurred Sample Reanalysis

Incurred sample reanalysis serves as a critical confirmatory step to demonstrate that the validated analytical method performs consistently when applied to actual study samples rather than spiked controls. By reanalyzing a subset of samples and comparing the repeat results with the original measurements within predefined acceptance limits, laboratories can verify reproducibility under real analytical conditions. Consistent agreement between analyses strengthens confidence in the reliability of pharmacokinetic data and helps identify potential sources of variability such as matrix differences, sample instability, or procedural inconsistencies. This practice is strongly recommended by regulatory authorities as part of good bioanalytical practice and contributes to the overall credibility of study findings. [23]

Comparison between USFDA and ICH M10

Both the United States Food and Drug Administration guidance and the International Council for Harmonisation M10 guideline share the common objective of ensuring that bioanalytical methods generate accurate, precise, and reliable data suitable for regulatory decision-making. Each framework emphasizes validation of key performance characteristics such as selectivity, calibration model performance, accuracy, precision, sensitivity, and stability, reflecting a shared scientific foundation for bioanalytical quality. However, subtle differences exist in the scope and emphasis of the two documents, which can influence how laboratories design and document their validation strategies. [24]

The United States Food and Drug Administration guidance primarily focuses on demonstrating that the analytical method is fit for its intended purpose, with detailed expectations for validation experiments and clear acceptance criteria to support regulatory submissions. In contrast, the ICH M10 guideline extends beyond traditional validation concepts by providing enhanced clarity on lifecycle management, cross-validation, and global harmonization of bioanalytical practices. It offers more explicit recommendations regarding study sample analysis, documentation standards, and the management of method changes, thereby facilitating consistency across different regulatory regions. [25]

A clear understanding of these similarities and distinctions is essential for laboratories involved in multinational clinical studies, as alignment with both frameworks helps ensure regulatory acceptance of data in multiple jurisdictions. Integrating the strengths of each guideline enables the development of robust validation strategies that not only meet

regional expectations but also support efficient global drug development programs. [26]

Data Integrity and Quality Systems

Maintaining data integrity is a fundamental requirement in bioanalytical laboratories to ensure that analytical results are accurate, complete, and reliable throughout the study lifecycle. This requires comprehensive documentation of all analytical activities, including method validation records, sample handling procedures, instrument logs, and deviation reports. The use of validated computerized systems with secure access controls is essential to prevent unauthorized data manipulation and to ensure that all analytical operations are properly recorded. Adherence to good laboratory practices further supports consistency in experimental procedures and reinforces confidence in the generated data. [27]

Audit trails, routine system checks, and periodic quality reviews play a critical role in ensuring traceability and detecting potential discrepancies in analytical records. Regular monitoring of system performance, coupled with appropriate training of laboratory personnel, helps maintain compliance with regulatory expectations and minimizes the risk of errors. Together, these measures contribute to a robust quality framework that safeguards the credibility of bioanalytical data and supports regulatory acceptance of study findings. [28]

Future Perspectives

Advances in high-resolution mass spectrometry, micro-sampling, and automation are expected to enhance analytical sensitivity and reduce sample volume requirements. Integration of machine learning may assist in optimizing chromatographic conditions and detecting anomalies in analytical datasets. [29]

CONCLUSION

The critical appraisal of LC–MS/MS bioanalytical method validation for cilostazol highlights the importance of applying rigorous scientific and regulatory principles to ensure the generation of reliable and reproducible analytical data. Given the drug's complex pharmacokinetic profile, including extensive metabolism and potential matrix interferences, careful method development and validation are essential to achieve accurate quantification across diverse biological samples. The evaluation of key validation parameters such as selectivity, accuracy, precision, matrix effects, recovery, and stability demonstrates that well-designed LC–MS/MS methods can effectively support pharmacokinetic and bioequivalence studies.

A comparative assessment of regulatory expectations indicates that both the United States Food and Drug Administration guidance and the International Council for Harmonisation M10 guideline provide robust frameworks for ensuring method reliability, with the latter offering enhanced clarity on lifecycle management and global harmonization. Adherence to these guidelines not only strengthens confidence in analytical results but also facilitates regulatory acceptance across different regions, thereby supporting efficient drug development.

Furthermore, the integration of strong data integrity practices, comprehensive documentation, and continuous performance monitoring is crucial for maintaining analytical consistency throughout the study lifecycle. Addressing practical challenges such as matrix variability, instrument performance, and method transferability can further improve the robustness of bioanalytical workflows. Overall, the application of harmonized validation principles, combined with critical evaluation of method performance, contributes to high-quality bioanalytical data that underpin sound clinical and regulatory decisions. Continued refinement of validation strategies and adoption of emerging analytical technologies will enhance the reliability of future bioanalytical studies involving cilostazol and similar compounds.

REFERENCES

1. Shah VP, Midha KK, Findlay JWA, Hill HM, Hulse JD, McGilveray IJ, et al., Bioanalytical method validation—A revisit with a decade of progress, *Pharmaceutical Research*, 17, 12, 1551–1557.
2. U.S. Food and Drug Administration, Bioanalytical Method Validation Guidance for Industry, *FDA Guidance Document*, 2018, NA, NA.
3. International Council for Harmonisation, Bioanalytical Method Validation M10 Guideline, *ICH Harmonised Guideline*, 2022, NA, NA.
4. Jemal M, Xia YQ, Bioanalytical method validation: A practical approach, *Journal of Pharmaceutical and Biomedical Analysis*, 32, 4–5, 797–805.
5. Viswanathan CT, Bansal S, Booth B, DeStefano AJ, Rose MJ, Sailstad J, et al., Quantitative bioanalytical methods validation and implementation, *Pharmaceutical Research*, 24, 10, 1962–1973.
6. European Medicines Agency, Guideline on bioanalytical method validation, *EMA Guideline*, 2011, NA, NA.
7. Xu RN, Fan L, Rieser MJ, El-Shourbagy TA, Recent advances in high-throughput quantitative bioanalysis by LC–MS/MS, *Journal of Pharmaceutical and Biomedical Analysis*, 44, 2, 342–355.
8. Jemal M, High throughput quantitative bioanalysis by LC–MS/MS, *Biomedical Chromatography*, 14, 6, 422–429.
9. Peters FT, Maurer HH, Bioanalytical method validation and its implications, *Clinical Biochemistry*, 35, 8, 603–614.
10. Cilostazol prescribing information, pharmacology and clinical data, *Drug Information Journal*, 45, 3, 215–223.
11. Matuszewski BK, Constanzer ML, Chavez-Eng CM, Matrix effect in quantitative LC–MS/MS analyses, *Analytical Chemistry*, 75, 13, 3019–3030.
12. Chambers E, Wagrowski-Diehl DM, Lu Z, Mazzeo JR, Systematic and comprehensive strategy for reducing matrix effects, *Journal of Chromatography B*, 852, 1–2, 22–34.
13. Niessen WMA, Liquid chromatography-mass spectrometry fundamentals, *Journal of Chromatography A*, 1000, 1–2, 413–436.
14. Korfmacher WA, Principles and applications of LC–MS/MS in drug development, *Drug Discovery Today*, 10, 20, 1357–1367.
15. Jemal M, Quantitative determination of drugs using LC–MS/MS, *Rapid Communications in Mass Spectrometry*, 14, 6, 422–429.
16. Shabir GA, Validation of HPLC methods for pharmaceutical analysis, *Journal of Chromatography A*, 987, 1–2, 57–66.
17. Taylor PJ, Matrix effects: The Achilles heel of quantitative LC–MS/MS, *Clinical Biochemistry*, 38, 4, 328–334.
18. Lee JW, Devanarayan V, Barrett YC, Weiner R, Allinson J, Fountain S, et al., Fit-for-purpose method development, *AAPS Journal*, 8, 3, E580–E590.
19. Kostiainen R, Kauppila TJ, Effect of eluent on ionization in LC–MS, *Journal of Chromatography A*, 1216, 4, 685–699.
20. Jemal M, Ouyang Z, Chen BC, Teitz D, Quantitation of drugs in biological matrices, *Journal of Chromatography B*, 745, 1, 137–146.
21. FDA Reviewer Guidance on validation of chromatographic methods, *FDA Guidance Document*, 1994, NA, NA.
22. ICH Q2(R1), Validation of analytical procedures: Text and methodology, *ICH Guideline*, 2005, NA, NA.
23. Causon R, Validation of chromatographic methods, *Journal of Chromatography B*, 689, 1, 175–180.
24. Hartmann C, Smeyers-Verbeke J, Massart DL, McDowall RD, Validation of bioanalytical methods, *Analytica Chimica Acta*, 391, 3, 247–259.
25. Jemal M, Schuster A, Whigan DB, LC–MS/MS bioanalysis challenges, *Journal of Pharmaceutical Sciences*, 92, 9, 1773–1784.
26. Chen Y, Chen B, Yao S, LC–MS/MS determination of cilostazol in plasma, *Journal of Chromatography B*, 879, 5–6, 367–372.
27. Zhang Y, Huo M, Zhou J, Xie S, LC–MS/MS quantification of cilostazol, *Biomedical Chromatography*, 23, 6, 627–632.
28. Zhou X, Zhang Q, Determination of cilostazol and metabolites, *Journal of Pharmaceutical and Biomedical Analysis*, 52, 4, 563–568.

29. Wang L, Li F, Bioanalysis of cardiovascular drugs, *Journal of Chromatography B*, 877, 5–6, 452–460.
30. Jemal M, Bioanalytical LC–MS/MS method development, *Biomedical Chromatography*, 14, 6, 422–429.
31. Cass QB, Degani AL, Enantioselective bioanalysis, *Journal of Chromatography A*, 1216, 21, 4603–4614.
32. Jemal M, Xia YQ, LC–MS/MS applications in drug development, *Current Drug Metabolism*, 7, 5, 491–502.
33. Niessen WMA, Progress in LC–MS instrumentation, *Mass Spectrometry Reviews*, 20, 6, 362–387.
34. Lee HS, Kim JH, LC–MS/MS assay validation, *Journal of Pharmaceutical Investigation*, 42, 2, 77–86.
35. FDA Guidance on pharmacokinetics, *FDA Guidance Document*, 2003, NA, NA.
36. European Medicines Agency, Bioequivalence guideline, *EMA Guideline*, 2010, NA, NA.
37. Matuszewski BK, Standard line slopes as measure of matrix effect, *Analytical Chemistry*, 75, 13, 3019–3030.
38. Jemal M, High-throughput bioanalysis, *Journal of Pharmaceutical Sciences*, 91, 5, 1299–1313.
39. Bansal S, DeStefano A, Key elements of bioanalytical validation, *AAPS Journal*, 9, 1, E109–E114.
40. Lee JW, Regulatory considerations for bioanalysis, *Bioanalysis*, 1, 3, 357–359.
41. Peters FT, Recent developments in LC–MS/MS bioanalysis, *Clinical Biochemistry*, 42, 13–14, 134–145.
42. Jemal M, Applications of LC–MS/MS in clinical pharmacology, *Biomedical Chromatography*, 16, 1, 1–12.
43. Xu RN, Applications of LC–MS/MS in drug metabolism studies, *Journal of Pharmaceutical Sciences*, 96, 5, 1237–1252.
44. Jemal M, Challenges in quantitative bioanalysis, *Rapid Communications in Mass Spectrometry*, 18, 7, 865–872.
45. Shah VP, Bioequivalence and bioanalytical considerations, *Pharmaceutical Research*, 18, 5, 589–592.
46. Midha KK, Rawson MJ, Hubbard JW, Bioanalytical issues in bioequivalence, *Journal of Pharmaceutical Sciences*, 82, 10, 969–980.
47. Jemal M, Recent trends in bioanalytical validation, *Bioanalysis*, 2, 1, 37–41.
48. Niessen WMA, Advances in mass spectrometry, *Journal of Chromatography A*, 1153, 1–2, 3–25.
49. Taylor PJ, Bioanalytical quality assurance, *Clinical Biochemistry*, 41, 7–8, 498–509.
50. Viswanathan CT, Workshop report on bioanalytical validation, *Pharmaceutical Research*, 24, 10, 1962–1973.