Worldwide Clinical Trials

Strategic Bioanalysis: Building a Winning IND-Enabling Path

March 2026

In the complex drug development journey, submitting an Investigational New Drug (IND) application is a pivotal step. It provides proof of concept and preclinical safety data as it moves toward First-In-Human (FIH) studies. At this stage, the focus shifts from proving biological plausibility in animals to confirming translational relevance in humans. Supporting this shift requires a bioanalytical strategy with clear objectives that enables reliable assessment of human exposure, target engagement, pathway modulation, early pharmacodynamic (PD) signals, and potential immunogenicity risk.

In this article, we highlight bioanalytical considerations for IND-enabling and FIH studies. We discuss defining bioanalytical goals, the regulatory landscape, compliance, and considerations influencing assay selection, validation, and execution. We also examine biomarker and PD strategy selection, focusing on translational relevance and fit-for-purpose assay design. Strategic study design elements integrating bioanalytical data into clinical decision-making are also reviewed. Finally, we provide modality-specific examples and summarize best practices and recommendations for robust, interpretable, and regulatory-aligned bioanalytical strategies in early phase clinical development.

Defining IND-Enabling Bioanalytic Goals

At the IND stage, the study goals are to establish a scientifically justified and exposure-based rationale for FIH dosing, demonstrate an acceptable nonclinical safety profile, characterize pharmacokinetics (PK), and generate preliminary biological evidence to enable safe and interpretable early clinical evaluation. So, bioanalytical goals include developing PK, anti-drug antibody (ADA), and biomarker assays to characterize systemic drug exposure, assess immunogenicity responses, study drug-target interactions, and evaluate safety.

IND assays are a mixture of regulated and non-regulated methods, depending on their intended use, so the lab must ensure that the data submitted to regulatory bodies are robust, reliable, and comprehensive to support scientific interpretation and regulatory review. Meeting the stringent requirements for an IND submission poses numerous challenges, including the absence of pre-established bioanalytic methods, translational uncertainty arising from misalignment of exposure and PK responses, limited availability of robust biomarkers, constraints on assay sensitivity and sample volume, the need to balance fit-for-purpose assay development with regulatory credibility, and the tight study timeline.

A successful IND submission requires a strategically designed bioanalytical approach. First, implementation of a fit-for-purpose validation ladder is essential, as regulators prioritize data integrity and interpretability over full validation of the assays. Second, it is critical to establish a robust translational PK/PD framework anchored in an exposure-based rationale; without this, early clinical studies risk achieving human dosing without generating meaningful biological insight. Biomarker selection and development should be driven by clear biological linkage to the mechanism of action (MoA) and feasibility at FIH exposure levels, as many IND programs fail to demonstrate PD effects due to impractical or insensitive readouts. For biologic therapies, careful design and interpretation of immunogenicity assays are equally important, as early ADA signals can be misleading unless assay performance and interpretation frameworks are aligned.

Regulatory Landscape & Compliance Documentation

Bioanalytical activities supporting IND-enabling studies are conducted within a regulatory framework that balances scientific flexibility with expectations for data integrity, traceability, and interpretability. Regulatory oversight is primarily informed by bioanalytical guidance, including ICH M10, immunogenicity testing guidance as well as biomarker guidance that support assays from exploratory purposes to dosing, safety, or clinical decision-making. Importantly, regulatory expectations are driven by assay intent and context of use, rather than by a uniform validation standard.

At the IND stage, bioanalytical assays typically fall into three functional categories:

1. Exposure-defining assays (e.g., PK)
2. Safety- and risk-enabling assays (e.g., immunogenicity, select safety biomarkers)
3. Exploratory or mechanistic assays (e.g., PD or pathway biomarkers)

Each category carries different regulatory expectations. PK assays supporting FIH dose escalation require greater method validation, tighter control of variability, and documentation to ensure confidence in exposure estimates. In contrast, exploratory PD or biomarker assays are generally expected to demonstrate reproducibility, biological responsiveness, and internal consistency rather than full analytical validation.

Compliance documentation must therefore be proportional to assay use while remaining inspection-ready. For regulated assays, required documentation typically includes method development history, validation or qualification reports, SOPs governing assay execution and data handling, instrument qualification records (IQ/OQ/PQ), and reagent preparation and qualification records. This also includes sample handling and stability assessments, as well as predefined acceptance criteria for runs and quality control samples. For exploratory assays, documentation should clearly define assay scope, performance characteristics, and known limitations. This is because regulatory questions frequently arise from ambiguity in assay intent rather than from analytical performance alone.

Biomarker assays introduce additional regulatory complexity due to the lack of standardized reference materials, limited cross-platform harmonization, and biological heterogeneity. Regulators increasingly expect sponsors to articulate the biomarker context of use at the IND stage, including how the biomarker informs MoA, dose selection, or early proof-of-biology. Overinterpretation of exploratory biomarker data or presenting such data as definitive evidence of efficacy can raise regulatory concerns. As such, biomarker documentation should emphasize data trends, biological plausibility, and limitations rather than absolute quantitation or strict cutoff values.

One of the most effective strategies is to leverage pre-IND meetings. These meetings offer a unique opportunity to engage directly with regulatory agencies, gain insights into their expectations, and receive feedback on your bioanalytical methods and overall strategy. By presenting a well-prepared, detailed plan, the study addresses concerns early in the process, thereby streamlining the development timeline and reducing delays. This begins with a formal meeting request letter and is followed up with a briefing document about 60 days before the meeting that details specific questions and any supporting data that provide context for the discussion.

It is expected that the investigators will provide details on:

- Nonclinical selection
- Prior pharmacology/toxicology studies
- Proposed starting human dose calculations.
- A surface-level Phase I protocol with the clinical development plan

It's essential to document all interactions and feedback received during these meetings, as they can serve as valuable references when preparing your final submission.

Data integrity requirements apply uniformly across all bioanalytical activities. Key principles, reliability, traceability, and reproducibility must be maintained regardless of validation status. Even for non-regulated assays, regulators expect appropriate data review processes, audit trails, version control for methods and analysis records, and traceability between raw data and reported results.

Critical Bioanalytic Considerations

Beyond regulatory alignment, technical and operational considerations can substantially impact the interpretability and value of bioanalytical data in IND-enabling studies. Assays developed and optimized in IND studies are intended to investigate toxicology or high-dose pharmacology exposures but lack sufficient sensitivity at projected FIH dose levels. This issue is particularly common when conservative starting doses are selected or when target engagement is expected to be partial.

Matrix selection and sample handling constraints further complicate these bioA assays. Differences between preclinical and clinical matrices, such as species-specific protein composition, endogenous analyte levels, and anticoagulant effects, can substantially alter assay performance, rendering some preclinical assays non-transferable to clinical studies. This challenge is compounded in FIH studies by tight study timelines, where batch data are often required to support timely dose-escalation decisions. Under these conditions, assays must be robust and operationally reliable under realistic clinical sample handling scenarios, and early evaluation of matrix effects and handling robustness is essential to reduce the risk of assay failure or data delays that could directly impact clinical decision-making.

> Reagent strategy and lifecycle management represent another frequently underestimated risk. Many early bioanalytical methods rely on limited-supply, early-stage, or custom reagents that are not immediately scalable.

As programs advance rapidly from IND to dose escalation or expansion cohorts, changes in reagent lots or suppliers can introduce discontinuities that complicate longitudinal data interpretation. Early assessment of reagent availability, lot-to-lot consistency, qualification strategy, and bridging plans is essential to maintain data continuity across cohorts, studies, and development phases.

Finally, data analysis and interpretability frameworks must be defined prospectively rather than retrofitted after data generation. This is particularly important for functional, kinetic, or semi-quantitative assays, where raw data may consist of curves or complex signal patterns rather than single numeric outputs. Predefining data processing methods, normalization approaches, parameter selection, and decision thresholds ensures consistency across samples and timepoints and prevents post hoc interpretation driven by emerging results.

Selecting the Right Biomarkers & PD Strategy

Effective biomarker and PD strategies prioritize translational relevance over analytical complexity. The primary objective is to generate biologically meaningful data that inform mechanism, dose selection, and early proof-of-biology.

Biomarker selection should be focused on a clear mechanistic hypothesis linking the biomarker to the drug's MoA and anticipated clinical pharmacology. This requires matrix considerations because biomarker measurements vary depending on the selected matrices. For example, a drug targeting the central nervous system may not show up as strongly in blood plasma compared to CSF. Biomarkers demonstrating large effects in preclinical models but lacking feasibility or sensitivity at clinically relevant exposure levels frequently fail to deliver value in FIH studies. Preference should be given to biomarkers with demonstrated human relevance, even when expected effect sizes are modest.

A tiered PD strategy is often the most effective approach. Proximal biomarkers, closely linked to target engagement or pathway modulation, provide early mechanistic confirmation, while downstream or integrative biomarkers offer broader biological context. Importantly, not all biomarkers need to be decision-enabling. Exploratory biomarkers can inform hypothesis refinement and subsequent study design when appropriately positioned.

Early phase programs should also distinguish between quantitative versus directional PD readouts. In many studies, consistent exposure-related trends across cohorts are more informative than absolute quantitation. Assay design and data interpretation strategies should reflect this reality, emphasizing robustness and biological coherence rather than strict numerical thresholds.

Strategic Study Design on Bioanalytical Components

Integration of bioanalytical considerations into study design is essential to maximize the value of bioA data. Bioanalysis should be treated as a core element of study design rather than a downstream analytical function.

Sampling strategy is a primary determinant of data interpretability. Inadequate or poorly timed sampling can obscure exposure–response relationships, particularly for transient or rapidly acting PD effects. Early alignment among clinical, pharmacometric, and bioanalytical teams is critical to ensure that sampling captures both PK profiles and relevant biological responses.

Dose-escalation and cohort design should be informed by bioanalytical feasibility. When PD effects are expected to be subtle, adaptive sampling, cohort expansion, or sentinel dosing strategies may enhance interpretability without significantly increasing study complexity.

Decision frameworks for data integration should be predefined. Clear criteria for how bioanalytical data inform dose escalation, cohort progression, or study modification help ensure that early clinical decisions are evidence-based and transparent, particularly when working with exploratory biomarkers.

Modality-Specific BioA

Biomarker selection and assay acceptance differ across clinical programs; bioanalysis is also drug-modality-dependent. Drug modality strongly influences the analytical platform, workflow, data format, and analysis strategy.

Small Molecules

Small molecules typically present fewer bioanalytical challenges from an assay technology standpoint, but sensitivity and metabolite coverage may become limiting factors at FIH. Conservative starting doses, particularly those derived from MABEL or pharmacology-based approaches, can push plasma concentrations close to assay detection limits. In such cases, early decisions around assay sensitivity, metabolite inclusion, and matrix selection are critical to ensure that exposure–response relationships can be meaningfully assessed. Overly complex metabolite strategies may add analytical burden without improving decision quality in early escalation cohorts.

Monoclonal Antibodies

Monoclonal antibodies introduce added complexity related to immunogenicity and target-mediated drug disposition. In FIH studies, free and total drug measurements often diverge rapidly as target engagement increases, underscoring the importance of aligning assay selection with the specific clinical question being addressed. Immunogenicity assessment also requires careful interpretation, as early ADA signals may reflect transient IgM responses or drug clearance effects rather than clinically meaningful, persistent immunogenicity. Experience has shown that overinterpretation of early ADA findings, without clear consideration of assay limitations and biological context, can introduce unnecessary program risk.

Bispecific Antibodies

Bispecific antibodies present additional bioanalytical challenges due to their dual-target architecture and complex binding behavior. Key early decisions focus on analyte definition, as bispecifics can exist in multiple functional states depending on whether one or both arms are engaged, and early clinical programs often benefit from prioritizing intact molecule exposure to support dose escalation rather than attempting full arm-specific characterization. Assay design must ensure selectivity for the intended bispecific format while managing potential interference from mispaired species, fragments, or target binding, and highly specific dual-arm assays may trade sensitivity at low FIH exposure levels. Target-mediated drug disposition is frequently amplified in bispecific programs, particularly when one arm binds a highly expressed or rapidly internalized target, leading to nonlinear PK and divergence between free and total drug measurements. Immunogenicity assessment and PD strategy should therefore be interpreted in the context of these dynamics, with emphasis on downstream biological effects consistent with the intended mechanism rather than exhaustive characterization of dual-arm engagement at early clinical doses.

Antibody–Drug Conjugates

Antibody-drug conjugates complicate bioanalysis due to the presence of multiple circulating analytes, including intact conjugate, total antibody, and free or conjugated payload. While comprehensive analyte coverage is appealing in the clinical stage, IND programs often benefit from a more focused strategy that prioritizes analytes most relevant to safety and dose escalation decisions. Attempting to fully characterize all components too early can increase assay complexity, delay timelines, and dilute interpretability without proportional decision value.

Oligonucleotide Therapeutics

Oligonucleotide therapeutics present distinct bioanalytical challenges due to their unique PK behavior, tissue-targeted distribution, and reliance on intracellular mechanisms of action. Plasma exposure alone often provides limited insight into biological activity, as many oligonucleotides rapidly distribute to tissues such as the liver, kidney, or CNS, where PD effects occur. Assay strategies must therefore balance sensitive measurement of the circulating parent compound with feasible, translatable PD readouts, often favoring downstream biomarkers over direct target engagement at early clinical doses. Matrix effects, nuclease degradation, and hybridization-based assay interference can complicate quantitation, and methods optimized in nonclinical matrices may not transfer directly to human samples.

Although oligonucleotides themselves generally exhibit low intrinsic immunogenicity, delivery platforms such as lipid nanoparticles, PEGylation, or other carriers can introduce immunogenicity and complement activation risks that require careful bioanalytical and safety monitoring.

Gene & Cell Therapies

Gene and cell therapies present unique bioanalytical challenges due to their complex biodistribution, long-lasting or irreversible biological effects, and indirect relationship between administered dose and clinical response. Traditional plasma PK measurements are often insufficient or non-informative, as therapeutic activity is driven by vector transduction efficiency, transgene expression, or cellular persistence and functionality within target tissues. Bioanalytical strategies, therefore, rely heavily on a combination of vector or cell tracking, transgene expression, and downstream functional or pathway biomarkers, each with inherent variability and sampling limitations. Matrix constraints, limited tissue accessibility, and assay sensitivity at low copy numbers further complicate interpretation, while immune responses against vectors, transgenes, or engineered cells represent a critical safety and efficacy determinant. As a result, early clinical bioanalysis for gene and cell therapies should prioritize qualitative or directional evidence of biological activity, durability, and exposure–response coherence, while acknowledging assay limitations and interpreting early data cautiously in the context of long-term clinical outcomes.

Worldwide would like to acknowledge the contributions of Tom Zhang and Zach Rosinger, PhD, in preparing this article.