How AI Could Support Continued Process Verification (CPV)

A Practical GMP Perspective on AI-Enhanced Process Monitoring, Trend Detection, and APR/PQR Integration

Continued Process Verification, or CPV, is one of the most important but often underdeveloped parts of the pharmaceutical process validation lifecycle. In theory, CPV should provide ongoing assurance that a validated manufacturing process remains in a state of control. In practice, many CPV programs still rely heavily on periodic spreadsheet reviews, manual statistical trending, annual product review summaries, and reactive investigations after deviations or out-of-trend results have already occurred.

Artificial intelligence could help make CPV more proactive. Not by replacing process validation experts, QA, MS&T, or manufacturing leadership, but by improving the ability to detect subtle process shifts, identify drift earlier, connect signals across data systems, and support better review of process performance over time.

The FDA process validation guidance defines process validation as the collection and evaluation of data from process design through commercial production to establish scientific evidence that a process is capable of consistently delivering quality product. FDA's lifecycle model includes Stage 3, Continued Process Verification, where ongoing assurance is gained during routine production that the process remains in a state of control (FDA, 2011).

For pharmaceutical QA professionals, the key question is not whether AI can "automate CPV." The better question is: Can AI help the quality system detect process risk earlier than traditional CPV methods?

The answer is yes - but only if AI is implemented with clear intended use, validated computerized systems, good data governance, human oversight, and strong quality risk management.

What Is Continued Process Verification?

Continued Process Verification is the third stage of the FDA process validation lifecycle. Stage 1 is Process Design, Stage 2 is Process Qualification, and Stage 3 is Continued Process Verification. FDA describes Stage 3 as ongoing assurance during routine production that the process remains in a state of control (FDA, 2011).

This means that process validation does not end after PPQ. A validated process must continue to be monitored throughout its commercial lifecycle. FDA specifically states that after a process is established and confirmed, manufacturers must maintain the process in a state of control over the life of the process, even as materials, equipment, production environment, personnel, and procedures change (FDA, 2011).

A strong CPV program typically evaluates:

CPV Element	Examples
Critical process parameters	Mixing speed, temperature, pressure, hold time, fill speed, compression force
Critical quality attributes	Assay, impurities, sterility, dissolution, moisture, pH, viscosity, particulate matter
In-process controls	Weight variation, bioburden, conductivity, volume, appearance, pressure decay
Process capability	Cp, Cpk, Pp, Ppk, control charts, process variability
Deviations and investigations	Recurring process issues, human error trends, equipment-related deviations
Change controls	Material changes, supplier changes, equipment changes, process parameter changes
Environmental and utility data	Cleanroom monitoring, water systems, compressed air, HVAC, temperature/humidity
APR/PQR outputs	Annual trend summaries, process performance conclusions, improvement opportunities

The purpose is not just to collect data. The purpose is to understand whether the process remains capable, stable, and controlled.

Why Traditional CPV Programs Struggle

Many CPV programs are technically compliant but operationally weak. The problem is not lack of data. Most pharmaceutical companies have more data than they can effectively review. The real challenge is turning that data into timely process understanding.

Common weaknesses include:

Traditional CPV Weakness	Practical GMP Impact
Spreadsheet-heavy review	Data handling errors, inconsistent formulas, limited automation
Annual review frequency	Process drift may be detected months too late
Siloed systems	Batch, lab, deviation, maintenance, and environmental data are reviewed separately
Manual trend interpretation	Subtle patterns may be missed
Overreliance on specifications	Process may drift while still remaining within specification
Weak statistical literacy	Control charts and capability metrics may be misinterpreted
Reactive investigations	CAPAs occur after deviations instead of before failures
Limited cross-product learning	Similar issues across products or lines may not be connected

FDA emphasizes that manufacturers should understand sources of variation, detect the presence and degree of variation, understand the impact of variation on product attributes, and control variation in a manner commensurate with risk (FDA, 2011). Traditional CPV programs often do this only periodically, manually, and incompletely.

That is where AI may provide value.

Traditional Statistical Monitoring in CPV

Before discussing AI, it is important to be clear: AI does not replace traditional statistical monitoring. A strong CPV program still needs scientifically justified statistical tools.

Traditional CPV tools may include:

Statistical Tool	CPV Use
Control charts	Detect special cause variation
Run charts	Visualize process behavior over time
Process capability analysis	Evaluate whether the process can meet specifications
Regression analysis	Understand relationships between variables
Moving averages	Smooth noisy data and detect shifts
Out-of-trend analysis	Identify unusual but not necessarily out-of-specification results
Multivariate analysis	Evaluate multiple process variables together
APR/PQR trend tables	Summarize annual process and product performance

These tools remain essential because they are transparent, explainable, and familiar to regulators. The limitation is that many traditional tools are applied manually, one variable at a time, and too late in the lifecycle.

For example, a filling process may show no single parameter outside limits, but a combination of slightly increasing fill weight variability, more frequent minor interventions, longer line stoppages, and small environmental monitoring shifts may suggest emerging process instability. A traditional review may not connect those signals quickly.

AI-enhanced CPV is useful when it helps detect those weak signals.

How AI Could Enhance Process Monitoring

AI can support CPV by analyzing large, complex, and time-dependent datasets faster than manual review. In pharmaceutical manufacturing, AI may help identify relationships across process parameters, quality attributes, deviations, equipment events, environmental data, and batch outcomes.

Potential AI-supported CPV functions include:

AI Capability	CPV Application
Anomaly detection	Identify unusual batch behavior before deviation thresholds are reached
Pattern recognition	Detect recurring process signatures associated with future failures
Multivariate monitoring	Evaluate relationships between multiple CPPs and CQAs
Drift detection	Identify slow process movement over time
Predictive modeling	Forecast whether a process is trending toward capability loss
Natural language processing	Analyze deviation, CAPA, and batch record narratives for recurring themes
APR/PQR support	Summarize large datasets and highlight potential trends for human review
Risk ranking	Prioritize products, processes, or parameters needing deeper evaluation

A practical AI-enhanced CPV system might not make decisions. Instead, it might generate statements such as:

- Blend time variability has increased over the last 12 batches.
- Compression force remains within limits, but tablet hardness variability is trending upward.
- Three recent minor deviations share similar operator intervention language.
- Assay remains within specification, but process capability has decreased compared with the previous APR period.
- Batches manufactured after a specific equipment change show increased variability.

These outputs are not final GMP conclusions. They are prompts for qualified human review.

Detecting Subtle Process Trends Earlier

One of the strongest use cases for AI in CPV is subtle trend detection.

Traditional CPV may focus on whether results are within limits. But a process can remain within specification while slowly becoming less capable. This is especially important for mature commercial products where teams may become comfortable with historical performance and may not notice gradual deterioration.

Examples of subtle trends AI could detect include:

Subtle Trend	Possible Meaning
Gradual increase in blend uniformity variability	Raw material variability, mixing efficiency issue, equipment wear
Slowly decreasing Cpk for assay	Process centering issue, material variability, analytical shift
Increasing frequency of minor line interventions	Equipment setup issue, operator technique issue, component variability
Slightly longer sterilization cycle recovery behavior	Utility or equipment performance issue
Small shifts in fill volume distribution	Pump wear, tubing behavior, setup variation
Repeated near-limit pH values	Formulation, raw material, or measurement system issue
More frequent “minor” deviations in same process step	Weakness in procedure, training, equipment, or control strategy

FDA’s guidance makes clear that ongoing programs should collect and analyze product and process data to evaluate the state of control and may identify process or product problems or improvement opportunities (FDA, 2011). AI could strengthen this expectation by improving the speed and depth of data review.

AI for Process Drift Identification

Process drift is one of the most important CPV concerns. Drift may occur because of changes in raw materials, suppliers, equipment condition, operators, analytical methods, environmental conditions, scale, or accumulated small process changes.

AI can support drift detection by comparing current process behavior against:

- PPQ baseline data
- Historical commercial batch data
- Approved control strategy
- Product-specific normal operating ranges
- Site-wide process behavior
- Similar products or similar equipment trains
- Previous APR/PQR periods

For example, in a granulation process, AI may detect that moisture content remains within specification, but drying time has gradually increased over six months. A human reviewer may then investigate whether the cause is seasonal humidity, equipment performance, raw material variability, or operator adjustments.

For sterile manufacturing, AI may detect that environmental monitoring results are acceptable individually, but viable particle recovery patterns, intervention frequency, and line stoppages have shifted together. That does not automatically mean contamination risk has increased, but it may justify QA and microbiology review.

The important distinction is this: AI identifies a potential signal. QA, MS&T, validation, manufacturing, and subject matter experts determine whether the signal is meaningful.

Integration With APR/PQR Programs

AI-supported CPV could be especially powerful when connected to Annual Product Review or Product Quality Review programs.

APR/PQR reports often include large amounts of data:

- Batch list
- Deviations
- OOS/OOT results
- Complaints
- CAPAs
- Change controls
- Stability trends
- In-process controls
- Finished product testing
- Yield trends
- Reprocess/rework events
- Environmental monitoring summaries
- Process capability
- Validation status
- Previous APR commitments

The weakness is that APR/PQR is often retrospective. It may identify that a process drifted during the year, but only after many batches were manufactured.

AI could support APR/PQR by:

APR/PQR Area	AI Support
Deviation review	Identify recurring themes across investigations
CAPA effectiveness	Detect whether related deviations decreased after CAPA
Process trends	Highlight parameters with increased variability
Change controls	Correlate post-change batches with process shifts
Complaints	Link complaint trends to batch/process variables

Stability	Flag subtle changes in stability-indicating results
Yield	Detect recurring yield loss patterns
CPV summary	Generate draft trend summaries for SME review

ICH Q10 identifies process performance and product quality monitoring, CAPA, change management, and management review as pharmaceutical quality system elements (ICH, 2008). That makes CPV and APR/PQR natural partners. AI can help connect these quality system elements, but the interpretation must remain under human control.

Practical GMP Examples

Example 1: AI Detects Declining Process Capability Before Specification Failure

A tablet product has assay results consistently within specification. Traditional APR review shows no OOS results. However, an AI-enhanced CPV dashboard detects that Cpk has declined over the last 18 batches and that assay values are slowly shifting toward the lower end of the approved range.

The system flags the trend for MS&T and QA review. The team identifies a raw material supplier lot pattern and opens a change control evaluation.

GMP value: AI helps detect loss of process robustness before product failure occurs.

Example 2: AI Connects Minor Deviations Across Multiple Batches

A filling line has several minor deviations: brief stoppages, short interventions, and small fill-weight adjustments. Each event is closed individually with no product impact.

AI reviews deviation narratives and batch record comments and detects that the same component feeding issue appears repeatedly across multiple batches. Engineering confirms a setup sensitivity with a specific component lot.

GMP value: AI helps identify a recurring issue that manual event-by-event review may miss.

Example 3: AI Flags Seasonal Process Variation

A semi-solid product shows increased viscosity variability every summer. Results remain within specification, but AI identifies a seasonal relationship between room humidity, raw material temperature, and mixing endpoint variability.

The process owner updates CPV monitoring to include seasonal review and evaluates whether additional controls are needed.

GMP value: AI supports process understanding by connecting environmental and process data.

Example 4: AI Supports APR/PQR Drafting

An AI tool reviews validated datasets from the QMS, LIMS, MES, and CPV dashboard. It drafts an APR trend summary highlighting process parameters with increased variability, deviations linked to a recurring equipment issue, and CAPAs requiring effectiveness review.

QA and SMEs review the source data, verify the AI summary, correct incomplete interpretations, and approve the final APR.

GMP value: AI reduces review burden but does not replace QA approval.

Regulatory and Validation Considerations

AI-supported CPV must be treated as part of the GMP quality system if it influences process monitoring, investigation decisions, APR/PQR conclusions, CAPA decisions, or change control decisions.

Key considerations include:

Requirement Area	AI-CPV Consideration
Intended use	Define whether AI is advisory, decision-supporting, or decision-

	executing
Data integrity	Ensure source data are attributable, complete, accurate, and traceable
Validation	Validate the computerized system and AI functions based on risk
Audit trail	Maintain traceability of AI outputs, human review, and decisions
Change control	Control model updates, algorithm changes, data pipeline changes, and dashboard changes
Periodic review	Confirm AI performance remains suitable over time
Human oversight	Define who reviews, approves, rejects, or escalates AI-generated signals
Supplier qualification	Assess AI vendors, hosted platforms, data handling, and support controls
Cybersecurity	Protect process and quality data from unauthorized access or manipulation

FDA's guidance supports modern manufacturing concepts, quality risk management, and quality systems across the process lifecycle (FDA, 2011). However, that does not mean AI tools can be used informally. If an AI tool is used in a GMP process, the company must be able to defend the system's intended use, validation status, data integrity controls, and human decision-making process.

Validation Framework for AI-Supported CPV

1. Define Intended Use

The first question is not "What can the AI do?" The first question is "What GMP decision could this AI influence?"

Examples:

Intended Use	Risk Level
Visual dashboard for process trends	Low to moderate
Advisory alert for SME review	Moderate
AI-generated APR/PQR draft summary	Moderate
AI recommendation to open deviation or CAPA	Moderate to high
AI recommendation to change process parameters	High
AI automatic adjustment of process controls	Very high

Most companies should begin with advisory use cases.

2. Assess Source Data

AI is only as reliable as the data it receives. CPV data should be assessed for completeness, accuracy, timeliness, data mapping, master data consistency, batch genealogy, equipment ID consistency, method changes, missing values, manual overrides, and data exclusions.

3. Validate Data Pipelines

The system should verify that data from LIMS, MES, SCADA, QMS, CMMS, and ERP are transferred accurately and completely.

4. Test AI Outputs Against Historical Cases

The company can test whether the AI would have detected known historical process drifts, deviations, recurring issues, or capability declines.

5. Define Human Review Requirements

Every AI-generated signal should have a documented review pathway: who receives the alert, what source data must be checked, when QA is notified, when a deviation is required, when change control is required, and when the alert is documented as no action required.

6. Perform Periodic Review

The AI model should be reviewed periodically for missed trends, false alerts, user overrides, model drift, source system changes, and changes in product lifecycle stage.

Risk Analysis for AI in CPV

AI Use Case	Potential Risk	GMP Impact	Required Control
AI detects process drift	False positive alert	Unnecessary investigation burden	SME triage and alert classification
AI misses real drift	Delayed detection of process issue	Possible product quality impact	Traditional CPV controls remain active
AI summarizes APR data	Inaccurate summary	Misleading APR/PQR conclusion	QA/SME review against source data
AI correlates deviation trends	False correlation	Wrong CAPA focus	Human investigation and statistical confirmation
AI predicts batch risk	Overreliance on model	Incorrect quality decision	AI advisory only; QA retains decision authority
AI integrates multiple systems	Data mapping error	Wrong trend conclusion	Validated data pipeline and reconciliation
AI model is updated	Output behavior changes	Loss of validated state	Change control and revalidation assessment

The biggest risk is not that AI makes an obvious error. The bigger risk is that AI produces a plausible trend interpretation that looks credible but is not scientifically justified.

Human Oversight Model

AI-supported CPV should have clearly defined ownership.

Function	Responsibility
QA	Owns GMP decision-making, APR/PQR approval, deviation/CAPA escalation
MS&T / Process Validation	Evaluates process trends, process capability, and control strategy impact
Manufacturing	Provides operational context and batch execution insight
QC / Analytical	Reviews analytical variability, method changes, and laboratory trends
Engineering	Evaluates equipment-related process signals
IT / CSV	Owns system validation, access control, backup, cybersecurity, audit trails
Data Science	Supports model development, performance monitoring, and technical interpretation
System Owner	Maintains intended use, SOPs, periodic review, and change control

The safest model is human-in-the-loop. AI can identify signals, rank risks, draft summaries, or suggest areas for review. Humans must determine GMP meaning, product impact, regulatory significance, and required action.

AI Should Not Replace CPV Fundamentals

A weak CPV program will not become strong just because AI is added. AI should not be used to cover up poor process understanding, weak sampling plans, incomplete data, inconsistent batch records, or inadequate statistical procedures.

Before implementing AI, companies should confirm they already have:

- Defined CPPs and CQAs
- Approved CPV plan

- Justified statistical methods
- Validated data sources
- Data governance
- Clear alert/action criteria
- APR/PQR linkage
- Deviation/CAPA escalation process
- Change control process
- Periodic review process
- Qualified reviewers

AI should strengthen these fundamentals, not bypass them.

Implementation Roadmap for AI-Enhanced CPV

1. **Identify the CPV pain points:** Focus on products or processes where manual review is burdensome, drift has occurred, or data are difficult to interpret.
2. **Start with advisory analytics:** Use AI to flag possible trends for review, not to make GMP decisions.
3. **Clean and standardize data:** Harmonize batch IDs, equipment IDs, material codes, process parameters, test methods, and deviation categories.
4. **Define intended use and risk level:** Document whether the AI is used for visualization, alerting, prediction, investigation support, or reporting.
5. **Validate the system:** Validate data flows, calculations, dashboards, audit trails, access controls, and AI model performance according to intended use.
6. **Pilot on one product or process:** Compare AI outputs with existing CPV review and SME judgment.
7. **Create SOPs and governance:** Define alert review, escalation, documentation, QA approval, and change control requirements.
8. **Integrate with APR/PQR:** Use AI outputs to support annual review, but require source data verification and SME approval.
9. **Monitor performance:** Track false positives, missed trends, user feedback, process improvements, and CAPA effectiveness.
10. **Scale gradually:** Expand only after the pilot demonstrates value and control.

Why CPV Is One of the Best AI Topics for AIforQA.org

For long-term authority in pharmaceutical QA, CPV is an excellent topic because it is technical, practical, and directly tied to GMP expectations. It also connects naturally to other high-value topics:

- AI for Change Control Impact Assessments
- AI-Assisted Root Cause Analysis
- AI for Batch Record Review by Exception
- AI and Pharmaceutical Technology Transfer
- AI for APR/PQR Automation
- AI for Process Validation Lifecycle Management

These are stronger than generic “AI in pharma” topics because they focus on actual quality system pain points. QA professionals do not need vague promises about digital transformation. They need help understanding how AI could support real workflows without creating regulatory risk.

Conclusion

AI could significantly improve Continued Process Verification by helping pharmaceutical companies detect process drift earlier, identify subtle trends, connect process data across systems, and support APR/PQR review. The strongest use cases are not fully automated decisions, but better decision support for QA, MS&T, validation, manufacturing, QC, and engineering teams.

FDA's process validation lifecycle already expects manufacturers to maintain processes in a state of control and use ongoing programs to collect and analyze product and process data (FDA, 2011). AI can support that expectation by improving the depth, speed, and consistency of CPV review.

But AI does not remove GMP responsibility. It must be implemented with validated systems, controlled data pipelines, strong data integrity, human oversight, change control, and periodic review. The goal is not to let AI decide whether a process is in control. The goal is to help qualified humans see process risk earlier and make better GMP decisions.

For AIforQA.org, this topic is a strong cornerstone article because it sits exactly where AI can provide realistic value: not hype, not replacement of QA judgment, but improved process understanding across the product lifecycle.

References

FDA. Process Validation: General Principles and Practices. U.S. Food and Drug Administration, January 2011. This guidance defines process validation as a lifecycle activity and describes Stage 3 Continued Process Verification as ongoing assurance during routine production that the process remains in a state of control. https://www.fda.gov/files/drugs/published/Process-Validation--General-Principles-and-Practices.pdf

ICH. Q10 Pharmaceutical Quality System. International Council for Harmonisation, 2008. This guideline describes the pharmaceutical quality system, including process performance and product quality monitoring, CAPA, change management, and management review. https://database.ich.org/sites/default/files/Q10%20Guideline.pdf

European Commission. EudraLex Volume 4, EU GMP Annex 15: Qualification and Validation. Provides EU GMP expectations for qualification and validation activities, including ongoing verification principles. https://health.ec.europa.eu/system/files/2016-11/2015-10_annex15.pdf

European Medicines Agency. Process Validation for Finished Products: Information and Data to be Provided in Regulatory Submissions. Provides EU regulatory expectations for process validation data in marketing authorization applications and lifecycle process validation considerations. https://www.ema.europa.eu/en/documents/scientific-guideline/process-validation-finished-products-information-data-be-provided-regulatory-submissions_en.pdf

FDA. 21 CFR Part 211 - Current Good Manufacturing Practice for Finished Pharmaceuticals. Includes requirements for production and process controls, in-process materials, laboratory controls, and batch production records relevant to CPV. https://www.ecfr.gov/current/title-21/chapter-I/subchapter-C/part-211