Scientific Research Publishing

Advances in Chemical Engineering and Science, 2026, 16(3), 48-75
https://www.scirp.org/journal/aces
ISSN Online: 2160-0406
ISSN Print: 2160-0392

The Compounding Enforcement Wave: Drivers, Deficiencies, and a Quality System Roadmap for 503A and 503B Facilities

Nansiben Patel, Mem Rani, Mounica Duppala, Alyssa Ragusa, Megha Darji, Kishore Kumar Hotha*

Cormica, Cherry Hill, New Jersey, USA
Email: *drhotha@drhothas.com

How to cite this paper: Patel, N., Rani, M., Duppala, M., Ragusa, A., Darji, M. and Hotha, K.K. (2026) The Compounding Enforcement Wave: Drivers, Deficiencies, and a Quality System Roadmap for 503A and 503B Facilities. *Advances in Chemical Engineering and Science*, **16**, 48-75.
https://doi.org/10.4236/aces.2026.163004

Received: May 11, 2026
Accepted: July 6, 2026
Published: July 9, 2026

Abstract

The U.S. compounding pharmacy sector is entering an unprecedented period of regulatory scrutiny. Since 2023, the FDA has dramatically intensified enforcement against both traditional 503A compounding pharmacies and registered 503B outsourcing facilities, issuing warning letters, Form 483 observations, and import alerts at an accelerating pace. Importantly, FDA's enforcement authority differs fundamentally between the two categories: 503B outsourcing facilities are subject to mandatory current Good Manufacturing Practice (cGMP) under 21 CFR Parts 210 and 211, while 503A pharmacies remain primarily regulated by state boards of pharmacy under a distinct legal framework. A striking indicator of systemic quality failure in the 503B sector: of the 55 registered 503B outsourcing facilities inspected by the FDA through mid-2025, 53 (96%) received at least one Form 483 citing compliance deficiencies—a facility-based figure, counting each inspected facility once, rather than an inspection-event count. The surge in GLP-1 compounding—driven by nationwide shortages of semaglutide (Ozempic, Wegovy) and tirzepatide (Mounjaro, Zepbound)—served as a major accelerant that exposed deep-rooted quality infrastructure gaps across the sector, with documented adverse events, multiple large-scale recalls totaling tens of thousands of units, and over 50 enforcement actions in a single month providing quantitative evidence of its enforcement impact. This article presents a comprehensive analysis of the regulatory landscape governing 503A pharmacies and 503B outsourcing facilities, documents the most frequently cited inspection deficiencies, examines high-profile enforcement case studies from 2024-2025, traces the GLP-1 enforcement saga, and provides a structured roadmap for quality system transformation. The overarching find-

ing is clear: FDA enforcement in this space will continue to intensify, and the era of regulatory tolerance for compounders operating below applicable quality standards is unequivocally over.

Keywords

Section 503A, Section 503B, FDA Compounding Enforcement, Outsourcing Facility, cGMP, GLP-1 Compounding, Semaglutide, Tirzepatide, Form 483, Warning Letters, Sterility Assurance, DQSA

1. Introduction: A Sector under Siege

Pharmacy compounding occupies a vital but inherently complex position in the U.S. drug supply chain. For patients who cannot tolerate commercially available formulations—those with excipient allergies, pediatric patients requiring customized dosing, or individuals needing preparations that have been discontinued for commercial rather than safety reasons—compounded medications represent the only viable therapeutic option [1]. For decades, compounding existed largely in a regulatory gray zone, overseen primarily by state boards of pharmacy with minimal federal intervention. That era is over [1].

The Drug Quality and Security Act (DQSA) of 2013 fundamentally restructured federal oversight of compounding, creating a two-tier framework under Sections 503A and 503B of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (FD&C Act) [1]-[4]. Eleven years after DQSA's enactment, the FDA's enforcement posture has shifted from measured guidance to active, consequential regulatory action. The numbers tell a stark story: of the 55 registered 503B outsourcing facilities inspected by FDA through mid-2025, 53 (96%) received at least one Form 483 documenting compliance deficiencies—a facility-based figure, with each inspected facility counted once regardless of how many times it was inspected [5] [6]. Warning letters, voluntary recalls involving tens of thousands of units, import alerts on active pharmaceutical ingredients (APIs), and cease-and-desist actions from innovator pharmaceutical companies have proliferated at a pace that demands serious industry attention [6]-[14].

Among the most significant accelerants in the current enforcement wave has been the explosive growth of GLP-1 receptor agonist compounding. As nationwide shortages of semaglutide and tirzepatide created enormous patient demand unmet by branded manufacturers, hundreds of 503A pharmacies and 503B outsourcing facilities rushed to fill the gap—often without the quality infrastructure to do so safely [11] [12]. Documented adverse events associated with compounded GLP-1 products, multiple recalls totaling tens of thousands of units, and over 50 warning letters in September 2025 alone targeting GLP-1 marketing violations provide direct evidence of its enforcement impact—though it is important to note that enforcement deficiencies in sterile processing and quality systems predate the

GLP-1 surge and affect the broader compounding sector independently. The FDA's response has been swift and multi-dimensional: warning letters targeting cGMP failures, labeling violations, and unapproved bulk drug substance use [7]-[9]; an import alert with a corresponding "Green List" for GLP-1 APIs (September 2025) [10]; over 50 warning letters issued in September 2025 alone for marketing compounded GLP-1s as "generic" alternatives; [14] and litigation from Novo Nordisk and Eli Lilly against telehealth companies and compounding facilities. [11]-[14].

But GLP-1 enforcement is only the most visible manifestation of a deeper structural problem. An independent analysis of FDA warning letters issued to compounding pharmacies between 2017 and 2022 identified 141 letters covering adulterated drug products (130 cases), misbranded drugs (103 cases), unapproved new drug products (42 cases), and failures in adverse event reporting (22 cases) [14]-[16]. Redica Systems analysis documented a 27% rise in sterile-processing citations between 2022 and 2024 [6]. The pattern is consistent, persistent, and predictable.

This article provides the pharmaceutical industry, compounding pharmacy operators, regulatory consultants, and quality professionals with a comprehensive, evidence-based analysis of the current enforcement landscape [1] [5] [6] [15]. We examine the regulatory framework differentiating 503A and 503B entities, quantify the scale of the problem [5], systematically document the most frequently cited deficiency categories with specific CFR references, present detailed case studies from 2024-2025 [7]-[9], trace the GLP-1 saga from shortage to enforcement resolution [10]-[12], and conclude with a structured, actionable roadmap for quality system transformation. The thesis of this analysis is straightforward: FDA enforcement in the compounding sector follows predictable, documentable failure patterns—and those patterns are entirely preventable with the right quality infrastructure [4] [6] [15].

2. Regulatory Framework: Understanding the 503A/503B Divide

Before analyzing enforcement patterns, it is essential to establish a precise understanding of the regulatory architecture governing compounding in the United States. Misunderstanding the difference between 503A and 503B—and the obligations that flow from each—is itself a root cause of many enforcement actions [1] [7] [15].

2.1. Section 503A: Traditional Pharmacy Compounding

Section 503A of the FD&C Act, originally enacted by the Food and Drug Administration Modernization Act of 1997 and significantly amended by DQSA in 2013, governs compounding by licensed pharmacists in state-licensed pharmacies, federal facilities, and licensed physicians [1]. To qualify for 503A exemptions from the new drug approval requirements (Section 505), current good manufacturing practice (Section 501(a)(2)(B)), and labeling adequacy requirements (Section

502(f)(1)), the compounded drug must meet several key conditions [1].

First, the drug must be compounded for an identified individual patient based on a valid, patient-specific prescription. Second, the bulk drug substances used must be: 1) components of FDA-approved drug products; 2) the subject of an applicable USP or NF monograph; or 3) on the FDA's 503A Bulk Drug Substances List established under 21 CFR 216.23(a) [2]. Third, the compounded product may not be essentially a copy of a commercially available drug product when produced regularly or in inordinate amounts. Fourth, the facility must be licensed by its state board of pharmacy and may not violate applicable state law on compounding. Fifth, the product must not have been identified as presenting demonstrable difficulties for compounding (DDC) [1] [3].

The January 7, 2025 Interim Policy on Compounding Using Bulk Drug Substances under Section 503A introduced a critical change: FDA will no longer categorize newly nominated bulk drug substances into interim categories (Category 1, Category 2, or Category 3) for substances nominated after the guidance's publication date [2]. This effectively means that pharmacies may no longer compound with newly proposed bulk substances until FDA completes its full formal evaluation process and places the substance on the final 503A Bulks List—a process that can take months to years [1] [2].

2.2. Section 503B: Outsourcing Facilities

Section 503B established the outsourcing facility framework as DQSA's response to the New England Compounding Center (NECC) tragedy of 2012. Under 503B, outsourcing facilities register with FDA, submit to FDA inspections, comply with current Good Manufacturing Practice (cGMP) requirements at 21 CFR Parts 210 and 211, report adverse events, and submit biannual product reports [15]. In exchange, 503B facilities may compound drug products for office use without patient-specific prescriptions, providing an authorized pathway to bulk compounding for hospitals, clinics, and healthcare practitioners.

The 503B framework is fundamentally a pharmaceutical manufacturing model overlaid on a compounding-style operation. Bulk drug substances must be obtained from establishments registered with FDA and must appear on the 503B Bulks List or be the subject of an FDA-approved drug application. Compounded products must bear specific labeling including "This is a compounded drug," "Not for Resale," batch control numbers, beyond-use dates, and storage conditions. Adverse event reporting under 21 CFR 310.305 is mandatory [15].

2.3. Key Legal Boundaries That Drive Enforcement

Two doctrines appear most consistently in FDA enforcement actions against compounders and warrant particular attention. The "essentially a copy" doctrine prohibits both 503A pharmacies (when compounded regularly or in inordinate amounts) and 503B outsourcing facilities from producing drug products that are identical or nearly identical to commercially available drug products in terms of

active ingredient, route of administration, dosage form, and strength. The activation of this doctrine in the context of semaglutide and tirzepatide—once those drugs were removed from the shortage list—formed the primary legal basis for FDA's 2025 enforcement wave against GLP-1 compounders [11] [12].

The proposed Demonstrable Difficulties for Compounding (DDC) rule, published March 20, 2024, represents the next frontier of compounding restriction. [3] The rule proposes criteria under which drugs or drug categories may be declared demonstrably difficult to compound and therefore prohibited under both 503A and 503B. The criteria include complex formulation, complex drug-delivery mechanism, complex dosage form, complexity of achieving bioavailability, compounding-process complexity, and complexity of physicochemical or analytical testing. While the rule remains under review as of early 2026, its publication signals clearly that FDA intends to further narrow the scope of permissible compounding for complex molecules—a development with significant implications for those compounding biologics, peptides, and complex small molecules [3].

2.4. State-Federal Overlap and Its Compliance Implications

One persistent source of confusion—and enforcement vulnerability—is the interplay between state pharmacy board oversight and FDA jurisdiction. The FDA has historically been restrained in its inspection of 503A facilities, relying instead on state boards of pharmacy as the primary mechanism of oversight. The FDA's insanitary conditions guidance for 503A facilities (distinct from cGMP) defines the threshold for federal enforcement against traditional pharmacies. This bifurcated oversight system creates significant variation in compliance culture: a 503A pharmacy operating in a state with robust board oversight may have substantially different quality practices than one in a state with minimal inspection resources [1] [15]. FDA enforcement discretion letters and warning letters issued to 503A facilities increasingly cite insanitary conditions and bulk substance violations as primary triggers [1] [7].

3. Scale of the Problem: Quantifying the Enforcement Wave

Understanding the magnitude of FDA's current enforcement posture requires examining both the structural characteristics of the compounding sector and the documented compliance performance data now available through FDA enforcement records, independent analyses, and congressional investigations [5] [6] [15].

3.1. The 503B Sector: Size, Structure, and Inspection Coverage

As of July 2025, 93 facilities were registered with FDA as 503B outsourcing facilities [5]. This is a relatively small population by pharmaceutical manufacturing standards, but one that has grown rapidly since DQSA's enactment and now supplies sterile compounded medications to hospitals, clinics, and healthcare practi-

tioners across the country [5] [15]. The compounded products include sterile injectables for hormone replacement therapy, pain management, oncology support, and—until recently—GLP-1 therapies [5] [10].

The most revealing statistic in the current enforcement landscape comes from inspection coverage data: of the 55 registered 503B facilities that have been inspected by FDA, 53—representing 96% of all inspected facilities—received a Form 483 documenting observations of possible violations [5]. This figure is facility-based (each facility counted once regardless of inspection frequency) and covers the inspection period through mid-2025. Only two of the 55 inspected 503Bs completed their most recent inspection without any 483 observations. This extraordinary rate of non-compliance is not an artifact of selective enforcement targeting problem facilities; it reflects the systemic reality that the majority of registered 503B facilities lack the quality infrastructure necessary to consistently meet cGMP expectations [6] [15].

Compounding this concern is the inspection coverage gap: as of mid-2025, 38 registered 503B facilities had never been inspected by FDA [5]. Among those uninspected facilities, multiple were actively producing sterile injectables, implantable sterile hormone pellets, and—in some cases—advertising GLP-1 compounding capabilities. A December 2024 investigation by the Partnership for Safe Medicines identified three uninspected 503Bs that had filed production reports listing sterile implantable and injectables, raising significant patient safety concerns [5]. The FDA's risk-based inspection model, while rational in resource allocation terms, has created a situation where patients may be receiving compounded sterile products from facilities that have never been evaluated against cGMP standards.

3.2. Warning Letter Trends: 2017-2025

A peer-reviewed content analysis published in the Journal of Pharmaceutical Innovation evaluated 141 FDA warning letters issued to compounding pharmacies between 2017 and 2022 [4]. The dominant violation categories were: adulterated drug products (130 of 141 letters, 92%), misbranded drugs (103 letters, 73%), unapproved new drug products (42 letters, 30%), failure to report adverse events (22 letters, 16%), and failure to report drugs to FDA (11 letters, 8%) [4]. The preponderance of adulteration-related citations reflects the fundamental patient-safety dimension of compounding quality failures: a contaminated sterile injectable does not merely constitute a regulatory violation; it poses a direct risk of patient harm or death [4] [15].

Between FY2022 and FY2024, FDA issued a consistent stream of 503B warning letters, although the absolute number of 503B-specific letters in FY2024 declined slightly relative to FY2022 and FY2023 [6] [15]. However, this reduction in letter volume should not be misinterpreted as reduced scrutiny: the depth and severity of individual enforcement actions increased substantially in 2024-2025, with multiple high-profile cases involving voluntary recalls of thousands of units, import alerts, and concurrent regulatory actions from state boards and innovator compa-

nies. The 2025 enforcement calendar demonstrated the FDA's willingness to act with intensity and breadth simultaneously: in September 2025 alone, the agency issued over 50 warning letters to companies marketing compounded GLP-1 products as "generic versions" of or making comparative efficacy claims to FDA-approved branded products [14].

3.3. Recall Activity: A Leading Indicator of System Failure

The FDA's weekly enforcement reports have been, in the agency's own description, "littered with hundreds of recalls" by compounding pharmacies in recent years—primarily citing lack of sterility assurance as the root cause. Notable recent recalls include ProRx's August 2024 voluntary recall of over 13,000 vials of semaglutide and tirzepatide injection due to sterility assurance concerns; QuVa Pharma's March 2025 voluntary recall of fentanyl/bupivacaine compounded products following a warning letter citing inadequate investigation of ISO 5 area microbial contamination [9]; Empower Pharma's September 2024 recall of Pyridoxine HCl Injection Solution lot 609763 after confirmed microbial growth in the ISO 5 aseptic filling area [7]; and Turbare Manufacturing's February 2025 recall of Bevacizumab 1.25 mg/0.05mL syringes following warning letter issuance citing aseptic processing and environmental monitoring failures [8]. Each of these recall events represents the downstream consequence of quality system failures that should have been—and in several cases were—identified during internal quality oversight activities prior to FDA inspection.

4. What FDA Is Actually Looking for: Top Inspection Findings and CFR Citations

The FDA's 2024 Compounding Quality Center of Excellence (CoE) Annual Conference provided industry with direct insight into the most frequently cited Form 483 observations across the 503B sector. Combined with analysis of published warning letters and enforcement data from 2023-2025, a clear and consistent deficiency taxonomy emerges. Understanding these patterns is the first step toward prevention [4] [6] [15].

4.1. Production and Process Controls (21 CFR 211.100(a), 211.113(b))

Production and process controls constitute the single most frequently cited deficiency category, consistently accounting for approximately 29% - 30% of all Form 483 observations across the 503B sector [6]. The two primary regulatory anchors are 21 CFR 211.100(a), requiring written procedures designed to assure the drug has the identity, strength, quality, and purity it purports to possess; and 21 CFR 211.113(b), requiring written procedures to prevent microbiological contamination of sterile drug products, including validation of all aseptic and sterilization processes [15].

In practice, the most recurrent deficiencies include: inadequate or absent asep-

tic process validation programs; media fill protocols that fail to simulate worst-case conditions; smoke studies conducted as static demonstrations rather than dynamic assessments reflecting actual manipulations; and failure to treat requalification activities with the same rigor as initial qualification [6] [15].

The Nebraska facility warning letter issued May 2025 (discussed in Section 5) illustrates the cascade effect: media fills were "in draft" four months after the Form 483, smoke studies were performed as staged poses rather than realistic operational simulations, and gowning qualification limits were set permissively rather than harmonized with USP Chapter <1116> microbiological control benchmarks. Each of these individual failures, while potentially addressable in isolation, collectively created a quality system that investigators found impossible to accept as assuring a validated state of control [15].

4.2. Environmental and Personnel Monitoring (21 CFR 211.42(c)(10)(iv), (v), (vi))

Environmental monitoring (EM) deficiencies represent approximately 11% of all 503B Form 483 observations and are among the most consequential, as they directly address the ability to detect and respond to cleanroom contamination events before product release. The relevant regulatory requirements are found at 21 CFR 211.42(c)(10), which requires adequate systems for monitoring environmental conditions in aseptic processing areas, cleaning and disinfecting rooms and equipment to produce aseptic conditions, and maintaining equipment used to control aseptic conditions [15].

Specific EM deficiencies consistently cited by FDA investigators include: failure to trend viable and non-viable particulate data and investigate alert/action limit excursions with scientific rigor; inadequate documentation of EM sampling locations, frequencies, and rationale; failure to investigate ISO 5 area recoveries as potential indicators of aseptic process breach; inadequate personnel monitoring programs; and inadequate disinfection agent rotation, contact time documentation, and efficacy qualification [6] [15].

Empower Pharma's April 2025 warning letter presents a particularly instructive example: the facility released a batch of Pyridoxine HCl Injection Solution despite positive microbial growth being recovered in the ISO 5 aseptic filling area during environmental monitoring, without conducting an adequate product impact assessment prior to release [7]. The lot was not recalled until September 5, 2024—nearly five months after compounding—demonstrating a failure to act on EM data before or at the point of product release. This case illustrates the direct patient safety consequence of an EM program that generates data but does not integrate it into batch release decisions [7] [15].

4.3. Sterility Testing and Beyond-Use Dating (21 CFR 211.167(a), 211.166(a))

Section 21 CFR 211.167(a) requires that each batch of drug product purporting to

be sterile or pyrogen-free must have appropriate laboratory determination of satisfactory conformance to final specifications, including sterility and pyrogen requirements, where applicable. Section 211.166(a) requires an adequate written program for assessing the stability characteristics of drug products and using those results to determine appropriate storage conditions and expiration/beyond-use dates [15].

Beyond-use dating (BUD) deficiencies are a chronic issue in the 503B sector, reflecting the industry's historical tendency to assign BUDs based on compounding convenience or commercial competitiveness rather than validated stability and sterility data [6] [15]. Facilities routinely assign extended BUDs—sometimes 90 days or longer for sterile injectables—without conducting the container-closure integrity testing, real-time stability studies, and sterility assurance level calculations (under USP <71>, <85>, and <51>) required to support those dating periods [15]. The finalization of USP <797> standards in November 2023, which introduced stricter BUD requirements for Category 1 and Category 2 sterile preparations, has added pressure on 503B facilities to update their BUD justification frameworks substantially. Many facilities were still working through this transition during FDA inspections in 2024 and 2025 [6] [15].

Note: A detailed technical treatment of the analytical and microbiological testing domains underlying the deficiencies summarized in Sections 4.2 and 4.3—including FDA query sequences, common failure modes, and expert guidance for potency/identity testing, sterility testing under USP <71>, bacterial endotoxin testing under USP <85>, method validation under ICH Q2(R2), stability and beyond-use date justification, and environmental monitoring data—is presented in a companion paper by the same authors. The present article addresses these domains only at the level of regulatory citation and enforcement consequence.

4.4. Cleaning Validation (21 CFR 211.67)

Equipment cleaning deficiencies under 21 CFR 211.67 represent a frequently cited but often underestimated compliance risk. The requirement is straightforward: equipment and utensils used in the manufacture, processing, packing, or holding of drug products must be cleaned and maintained, and written procedures established for their cleaning and maintenance. The compliance reality is more complex: cleaning validation (CV) requires documented evidence—not just procedures—demonstrating that cleaning methods reliably remove residues of drug substances, cleaning agents, and microbial contamination from all product-contact surfaces to levels that are safe and do not compromise drug product quality [15].

The Empower Pharma warning letter highlights an egregious example: cleaning validation for multiple product-contact equipment items used in compounding implantable testosterone and estradiol pellets had not been completed, yet production was continuing on these products [7]. The FDA's response was unequivocal: the facility had not provided a risk assessment for this gap, had not commit-

ted to halting production pending CV completion, and had not demonstrated that similar CV gaps did not exist for other products [7]. A particularly problematic dimension of this case was that implantable products—with extended patient contact and no mechanism for removal if contaminated—represent some of the highest-risk compounded preparations, precisely where cleaning validation rigor should be greatest [7] [15].

A related deficiency pattern involves the introduction of new cleaning agents or equipment without validating whether the changes maintain or improve cleaning efficacy. The Nebraska facility warning letter of May 2025 cited this exact pattern: new cleaning materials were introduced before validating their ability to remove drug residues from product-contact surfaces—a classic change control failure [15].

4.5. Investigations and CAPA (21 CFR 211.192)

Section 21 CFR 211.192 requires a thorough investigation of any unexplained discrepancy or failure of a batch or any of its components to meet specifications, whether or not the batch has already been distributed. FDA investigators repeatedly cite failures in the quality and completeness of investigations triggered by out-of-specification results, environmental monitoring excursions, and sterility test failures [6] [15].

Common investigation failures include: inadequate scope extension—failing to evaluate other potentially affected batches, operators, or equipment associated with a contamination event; premature root cause assignment without adequate data to support the conclusion; corrective action commitments that are procedural rather than systemic; and CAPA closure without verification of effectiveness [6] [15]. The QuVa Pharma June 2025 warning letter specifically cited failure to expand investigation scope to other potentially affected batches when an ISO 5 area microbial contamination was detected—a textbook example of inadequate investigational breadth [9].

4.6. Labeling Deficiencies (503B Conditions; 21 CFR 211.122)

Labeling deficiencies occupy a distinct category in 503B enforcement because they represent violations of both the cGMP labeling regulations (21 CFR 211.122 et seq.) and the specific 503B conditions established under Section 503B of the FD&C Act. The 503B framework requires that compounded drug products bear labels stating: "This is a compounded drug"; "Not for Resale"; the facility name and address; batch control number; BUD; storage conditions; and—for office-administered products—the statement "Office Use Only". Failure to include any of these elements renders the product misbranded, which constitutes a prohibited act under Section 301(a) of the FD&C Act [15].

The FDA's February 2025 Form 483 to BPI Labs illustrated the real-world consequences of labeling non-compliance: the "Office Use Only" statement was omitted from labels on multiple sterile injectable batches including semaglutide and

tirzepatide vials. Similarly, the April 2025 warning letter to the Phoenix, Arizona 503B facility cited semaglutide and tirzepatide injections as not including necessary label statements. These are not inadvertent omissions; they reflect inadequate label control systems that fail to incorporate all required elements into batch-specific label review and approval processes [7] [15].

4.7. Bulk Drug Substance Sourcing and API Quality (503B Conditions; 21 CFR 211.84)

Using APIs from non-FDA-registered establishments is a direct violation of 503B conditions and one of the most serious deficiency types FDA has cited. The January 2025 warning letter to the Exton, Pennsylvania facility specifically cited that compounded drug products used bulk drug substances from a source that is not an FDA-registered establishment. For 503B facilities, the requirement is clear: bulk drug substances must be obtained from establishments registered with FDA under 21 CFR Part 207 [15]. This requirement exists because FDA registration provides a mechanism for verifying that API manufacturers operate under current Good Manufacturing Practice—and because uninspected or unregistered API manufacturers, particularly those based overseas, represent a significant source of contamination, potency, and impurity risk [10] [15].

The GLP-1 enforcement actions brought this issue into particularly sharp relief. [10] Many compounders sourced semaglutide and tirzepatide APIs from overseas manufacturers—primarily in China and India—whose facilities had never been inspected by FDA and whose API quality had never been verified against U.S. standards [10] [11]. FDA received multiple reports of adverse events tied to compounded GLP-1 products, including at least one case involving a compounded tirzepatide product bearing the name of a pharmacy that did not exist, suggesting fraudulent or counterfeit supply chain involvement. The FDA's September 2025 "Green List" import alert (Import Alert 66-80) was established specifically to address this supply chain integrity failure by allowing automatic detention of GLP-1 APIs from non-listed, unverified manufacturers [10].

4.8. Adverse Event Reporting (503B Conditions; 21 CFR 310.305)

503B outsourcing facilities are required to report adverse events associated with compounded drugs to FDA. Failures in this area—cited in 22 of the 141 warning letters analyzed in the 2017-2022 study period—reflect inadequate pharmacovigilance programs rather than absence of adverse events [4]. The Exton, Pennsylvania facility warning letter (January 2025) specifically cited inadequate adverse event reporting procedures as a major deficiency [15]. For facilities producing high-volume sterile injectables distributed to multiple healthcare institutions, the absence of a functioning adverse event surveillance and reporting infrastructure represents both a patient safety failure and a regulatory compliance failure of the first order [4] [15].

4.9. Summary: FDA 503B Deficiency Categories—Frequency and Regulatory Reference

FDA inspections of 503B outsourcing facilities commonly identify recurring gaps across sterility assurance, aseptic operations, environmental controls, investigations, labeling, and supplier qualification. Table 1 provides a practical summary of these deficiency categories, linking each area to the primary regulatory reference, observed frequency, and potential enforcement risk. This helps prioritize the areas that typically require the most attention during inspection readiness, quality system remediation, and routine compliance oversight (Table 1).

Table 1. FDA 503B deficiency categories with primary CFR citation, observed frequency, and enforcement risk.

Deficiency Category	Primary CFR Citation	Approx. Frequency*	Enforcement Risk
Production & Process Controls/Aseptic Processing	21 CFR 211.113(b), 211.100(a)	~30% of 483s	Warning Letter + Recall
Environmental & Personnel Monitoring	21 CFR 211.42(c)(10)	~11% of 483s	Warning Letter + Recall
Sterility Testing & BUD Justification	21 CFR 211.167(a), 211.166(a)	High frequency	Recall/Import Alert
Cleaning Validation	21 CFR 211.67	Moderate frequency	Warning Letter
Investigations & CAPA	21 CFR 211.192	Moderate frequency	Warning Letter
Labeling Deficiencies (503B conditions)	21 CFR 211.122; FD&C 503B	Moderate frequency	Warning Letter + Seizure risk
Bulk API Sourcing (Non-registered)	21 CFR 207; FD&C 503B	Significant recent increase	Warning Letter + Import Alert
Adverse Event Reporting	21 CFR 310.305; FD&C 503B	~16% of WLs (2017-2022)	Warning Letter

*Frequency estimates based on FDA 2024 CoE Conference data, Redica Systems analysis [6], and peer-reviewed literature [4]. *WL = Warning Letter.*

4.10. FDA Enforcement Findings in 503A Compounding Pharmacies

While Sections 4.1 - 4.9 focus primarily on 503B outsourcing facilities—which are subject to mandatory cGMP and, consequently, the most systematically documented inspection findings—503A compounding pharmacies are not immune from FDA enforcement action. Understanding the specific legal basis and most common findings for 503A facilities is essential for practitioners in that sector.

Unlike 503B facilities, 503A pharmacies are not subject to cGMP under 21 CFR Parts 210 and 211. FDA's primary authority for initiating enforcement against

503A pharmacies derives from the "insanitary conditions" provision of Section 501(a)(2)(A) of the FD&C Act and from bulk substance violations where compounded products do not qualify for 503A exemptions. State boards of pharmacy serve as the primary regulatory oversight mechanism for 503A facilities [1] [2].

The peer-reviewed content analysis by Abou-Issa *et al.* (2022), which reviewed 141 FDA warning letters to compounding pharmacies between 2017 and 2022, identified the following as the most prevalent violation categories across both 503A and 503B entities [4]: adulterated drug products (130 letters, 92%), misbranded drugs (103 letters, 73%), unapproved new drug products (42 letters, 30%), failure to report adverse events (22 letters, 16%), and failure to report drugs to FDA (11 letters, 8%). Because the majority of compounding pharmacies by count are 503A entities, these findings disproportionately reflect 503A compliance patterns [4] [16].

For 503A pharmacies specifically, the most commonly cited FDA findings in recent enforcement actions span five primary areas [1] [2] [4] [16]-[18]:

Bulk Substance Violations

Using APIs or bulk drug substances not on the FDA's 503A Bulk Drug Substances List, not the subject of a USP/NF monograph, and not a component of an FDA-approved drug product is a direct violation of Section 503A's exemption conditions. The January 7, 2025 Interim Policy change—ending automatic Category 1/2/3 classification for newly nominated substances—has significantly narrowed the permissible bulk substance universe for 503A pharmacies, and facilities that continue compounding with newly nominated substances not yet formally listed face direct enforcement exposure [1] [2].

Essentially-a-Copy Violations

Compounding products that are essentially identical to commercially available drug products, particularly when produced regularly or in inordinate amounts, removes the 503A exemption and renders the product an unapproved new drug. This doctrine was activated as the primary legal basis for FDA enforcement against 503A GLP-1 compounders following the shortage resolutions for semaglutide and tirzepatide in early 2025 [11] [12].

Insanitary Conditions

FDA applies its insanitary conditions authority where sterile or non-sterile preparations are compounded under conditions that could contaminate or render the product harmful. Typical findings include inadequate cleaning and disinfection programs, uncontrolled environmental conditions for sterile preparation, pest control failures, and the absence of fundamental contamination controls. This authority has been used by FDA in cases involving both sterile and non-sterile 503A compounding operations [1] [7] [16].

Beyond-Use Dating Without Data Support

Following the November 2023 revision of USP <797>, Category 2 CSPs—sterile preparations made in a cleanroom environment—require BUD assignments supported by sterility testing, container-closure integrity data, and stability studies.

Many 503A pharmacies have not yet commissioned the studies required to support extended BUDs under the revised standard, assigning BUDs based on historical practice or compendial defaults rather than product-specific data [1] [3] [17].

Prescription Requirement Failures

Compounding medications without a valid patient-specific prescription—or marketing compounded products to the general public without meeting the permitted anticipatory compounding conditions—removes 503A protection. Bulk compounding of controlled substances without prescriptions and direct-to-consumer marketing of compounded products have both triggered enforcement actions against 503A entities [1] [14].

The 503A enforcement trajectory suggests that while FDA has historically exercised restraint in directly inspecting 503A pharmacies, the agency's willingness to act—particularly in cases of insanitary conditions, bulk substance violations, and GLP-1-related compounding—is increasing. Facilities in this sector should treat the 503A compliance requirements not as a minimal checklist but as a baseline that requires active monitoring and genuine operational commitment [1] [2] [4] [16] [18].

5. Case Studies: High-Profile Enforcement Actions 2024-2025

The following case studies are drawn from publicly available FDA enforcement records, including warning letters, Form 483 observations, and voluntary recall notices. Each case illustrates how individual deficiency categories manifest in operational reality and how inadequate responses to FDA concerns escalate from 483 observations to formal warning letters and recalls [7]-[9].

5.1. Empower Pharma (Houston, Texas)—Warning Letter April 2, 2025

Empower Pharma—one of the largest and most widely distributed 503B outsourcing facilities in the United States—received an FDA warning letter on April 2, 2025, following a 503B inspection conducted between August 1 and August 28, 2024, at its Houston, Texas facility [7]. The facility had previously been the subject of an Endpoints News and Houston Chronicle investigation in May 2024 alleging serious operational and safety concerns.

The warning letter cited multiple serious deficiencies. Most critically, a batch of Pyridoxine HCl Injection Solution (100 mg/mL, Lot 609763, compounded April 18, 2024) was released for distribution despite positive microbial growth being detected in the ISO 5 aseptic filling area during environmental monitoring. The facility did not conduct an adequate product impact assessment prior to release, and the lot was not recalled until September 5, 2024—nearly five months after compounding and only after FDA investigators identified the issue during an inspection [7].

Cleaning validation for product-contact equipment used in compounding im-

plantable testosterone and estradiol pellets had not been completed despite ongoing production. The facility's responses failed to provide a risk assessment for this gap, failed to commit to halting production pending validation completion, and did not demonstrate that similar gaps did not exist for other products [7].

The Empower Pharma case represents the full spectrum of compounding enforcement—from initial quality failures and inadequate internal investigations to unremediated cleaning validation gaps and insufficient CAPA documentation—and stands as a cautionary archetype for the sector [7] [15].

5.2. Phoenix, Arizona 503B Facility—Warning Letter April 8, 2025

An FDA-registered outsourcing facility in Phoenix, Arizona, received a warning letter on April 8, 2025, following an inspection conducted September 24 through October 10, 2024 [7]. The facility produced prefilled sterile injectables, including formulations of semaglutide and tirzepatide. Primary deficiencies included labeling violations, cGMP violations resulting in adulterated drug products, and sterile products being prepared, packed, or held under insanitary conditions [7] [15].

The facility had previously initiated a voluntary recall of bevacizumab in November 2024 due to sterility concerns—indicating a pattern of sterility assurance failures predating the 2024 inspection [7]. The Phoenix facility case demonstrates that labeling deficiencies are rarely isolated compliance gaps but typically coexist with deeper quality system failures [7] [15].

5.3. Exton, Pennsylvania 503B Facility—Warning Letter January 15, 2025

The Exton, Pennsylvania warning letter of January 15, 2025, following an inspection July 15 through August 2, 2024, presented a trifecta of 503B condition failures: compounded drug products used bulk drug substances from a source that is not an FDA-registered establishment; product labels did not include required information; and procedures for reporting adverse events were inadequate. Sterile products were also cited as having been prepared, packed, or held under insanitary conditions [15].

The API sourcing violation is particularly significant: using non-FDA-registered bulk substance sources compromises the entire quality chain from raw material to finished product. This facility's non-compliance illustrates the inadequacy of relying on certificates of analysis from unverified sources as a proxy for actual API quality—a practice that remains prevalent across the compounding sector [10] [15].

5.4. BPI Labs—Form 483 Observation, February 21, 2025

BPI Labs received an FDA Form 483 on February 21, 2025, following an inspection at its registered 503B outsourcing facility. The primary observation cited that compounded drug labels lacked mandatory information required under Section 503B, specifically including the statement "Office Use Only"—an omission affect-

ing multiple sterile injectable batches including semaglutide and tirzepatide vials. The "Office Use Only" statement defines the legal distribution framework for 503B products and its absence creates legal exposure under multiple provisions of the FD&C Act [15].

5.5. QuVa Pharma (Sugar Land, Texas)—Warning Letter June 18, 2025

QuVa Pharma, a well-established 503B outsourcing facility registered since 2015, received an FDA warning letter dated June 18, 2025, following an inspection conducted September 24 through October 28, 2024. [9] The warning letter cited that the facility did not perform adequate product evaluation and take appropriate corrective action after microbial contamination was recovered within its ISO 5 aseptic processing area—failing to expand its investigation scope to potentially affected batches compounded under similar conditions [9] [15]. The consequent recall of fentanyl/bupivacaine compounded products, initiated March 6, 2025, involved multiple lot numbers due to the lack of sterility assurance [9].

The QuVa case underscores that regulatory history and tenure do not insulate facilities from enforcement action when investigation quality fails [9] [15].

5.6. Turbare Manufacturing (Conway, Arkansas)—Warning Letter September 16, 2025

Turbare Manufacturing, registered as a 503B outsourcing facility since June 2023, received a warning letter on September 16, 2025, following a January 2025 inspection [8]. The letter cited failure to establish validated processes for sterile drug production (21 CFR 211.113(b)); failure to establish an adequate environmental monitoring system (21 CFR 211.42(c) (10) (iv)); and insanitary conditions [8] [15]. The facility had initiated a voluntary recall of Bevacizumab 1.25 mg/0.05mL syringes on February 18, 2025, due to lack of sterility assurance [8]. Turbare's media fill requalification protocol—consisting of only one full-scale batch rather than three consecutive successful runs—was cited as inadequate. This case demonstrates that newly registered facilities without robust foundational quality systems are at high risk for major deficiencies on first inspection [8] [15].

6. The GLP-1 Catalyst: How Semaglutide and Tirzepatide Changed the Enforcement Landscape

Among the most significant accelerants in reshaping the FDA's approach to compounding oversight has been the explosive growth of GLP-1 receptor agonist compounding. Documented adverse events associated with compounded GLP-1 products, multiple large-scale recalls, and over 50 warning letters in a single month provide concrete evidence of its enforcement footprint—while acknowledging that broader quality system weaknesses in sterile compounding predate and extend beyond the GLP-1 episode. To understand the full arc, it is necessary to trace the timeline of the GLP-1 compounding saga—from the initial shortage declara-

tions that opened the door to lawful compounding, through the quality failures that proliferated under shortage-driven enforcement discretion, to the enforcement wave that followed resolution of the shortage [6]-[10] [12].

6.1. The Shortage-Driven Compounding Surge

Semaglutide (the active ingredient in Ozempic and Wegovy) and tirzepatide (the active ingredient in Mounjaro and Zepbound) emerged as transformational therapies for type 2 diabetes and obesity in the early 2020s [19]. Their clinical success created demand that vastly outpaced manufacturing capacity, leading FDA to add both drugs to the drug shortage list. Under both 503A and 503B frameworks, inclusion on the shortage list provided a legal pathway to compounding these products—allowing both patient-specific prescriptions (503A) and office-use bulk compounding (503B) of semaglutide and tirzepatide APIs [11] [12].

The commercial opportunity was enormous. With branded products unavailable, inaccessible due to cost, or insufficient in supply, hundreds of compounding pharmacies and outsourcing facilities entered the GLP-1 compounding market [11] [14]. Many did so without the quality infrastructure, supply chain integrity, or analytical capabilities necessary to produce safe, accurate-dose sterile injectables [4] [6]. APIs were sourced from overseas manufacturers—many unregistered with FDA—at significant cost savings. Some facilities began producing peptides such as semaglutide analogs, tirzepatide, retatrutide (an investigational drug not approved for compounding under any circumstances), and various peptide combinations that fell outside any legitimate compounding authorization framework [3] [10].

6.2. FDA's Escalating Response: From Reminder Letters to Import Alerts

FDA's response evolved through multiple phases. Initially, the agency issued reminder letters to national pharmacy associations highlighting the regulatory requirements applicable to GLP-1 compounding [11] [14]. In February 2024, FDA issued warning letters specifically targeting manufacturers of counterfeit semaglutide. As adverse event reports accumulated—including hospitalizations associated with misdosed compounded GLP-1 products and at least one case involving a product bearing the name of a pharmacy that did not exist—FDA escalated to direct facility enforcement [4] [7]-[10].

In March 2024, the FDA proposed the Demonstrable Difficulties for Compounding rule, which was widely understood as a signal of the agency's intention to further restrict complex molecule compounding [3]. By mid-2024, multiple 503B facilities producing GLP-1 products had undergone inspection and received Form 483 observations [6]. Warning letters to the Exton, Pennsylvania facility (January 2025), the Phoenix, Arizona facility (April 2025), and Empower Pharma (April 2025) specifically cited GLP-1 products as components of their non-compliance portfolios [5] [7] [8].

6.3. The Shortage Resolution Saga: A Regulatory Rollercoaster

The regulatory pathway from shortage to enforcement was anything but linear. FDA declared the tirzepatide shortage resolved in October 2024, triggering immediate litigation from the Outsourcing Facilities Association. FDA reaffirmed its shortage resolution determination in a declaratory order on December 19, 2024, granting 503A pharmacies a 60-day grace period for continued tirzepatide compounding (expiring February 18, 2025) and 503B facilities a 90-day period (expiring March 19, 2025). For semaglutide, FDA declared the shortage resolved on February 21, 2025, granting 503A pharmacies until April 22, 2025, and 503B facilities until May 22, 2025 [12].

The Outsourcing Facilities Association filed a second lawsuit challenging the semaglutide shortage resolution determination in February 2025, but courts declined to issue preliminary injunctions. After the grace periods expired, 503B facilities had no legal authority to compound semaglutide or tirzepatide under the shortage exception. Because neither API is on the 503B Bulks List, and because the essential-copy doctrine prohibits compounding products that are identical or nearly identical to commercially available drugs without relying on the shortage exception, 503Bs were effectively barred from GLP-1 compounding as of May 22, 2025 [11].

6.4. The Green List and Post-Shortage Enforcement Architecture

In September 2025, FDA established Import Alert 66-80—the "Green List"—to stop GLP-1 APIs with potential quality concerns from entering the U.S. supply chain [10]. Under the import alert, GLP-1 APIs entering the U.S. from facilities not on the Green List are subject to automatic detention without physical examination. The list includes only facilities that have been inspected and found compliant with FDA manufacturing standards.

Also in September 2025, FDA issued over 50 warning letters to companies marketing compounded GLP-1 products as "generic versions" of or making comparative efficacy claims to FDA-approved branded products—a practice that violates both the essentially-a-copy doctrine and false or misleading labeling prohibitions [14]. Eli Lilly filed suit against multiple telehealth companies for continuing to sell what it characterized as illegal tirzepatide alternatives. Novo Nordisk pursued both regulatory and litigation channels against compounders of unauthorized semaglutide products. The National Advertising Division recommended that Willow Health Services modify or discontinue health claims for compounded semaglutide tablets in December 2025, following a challenge by Novo Nordisk [14].

The Pharmacy Compounding Advisory Committee (PCAC) rejected multiple peptides from the 503A Bulks List at its December 2024 meeting, including ipamorelin and BPC-157—closing off what had been a significant peptide compounding market. Retatrutide, an investigational GLP-1/GIP/glucagon triple agonist, was never an approved compounding ingredient and compounders using it face the most serious legal exposure [3] [11].

The GLP-1 episode offers a definitive lesson for the compounding sector: mar-

ket opportunity without quality infrastructure is a regulatory liability, not a business advantage. Facilities that rushed to capitalize on shortage-driven demand without building the quality systems, supply chain controls, and analytical capabilities necessary to produce safe sterile injectables predictably became enforcement targets. The correlation between GLP-1 compounding activity and 2024-2025 warning letter issuance is not coincidental [13].

7. Regulatory Timeline: Key FDA Actions 2023-2025

The chronological summary in Table 2 captures the most significant FDA regulatory actions, guidance publications, and enforcement milestones in the compounding space over the past 24 months, providing a reference framework for understanding the pace and trajectory of regulatory escalation.

Table 2. Chronological summary of FDA regulatory actions, guidance publications, and enforcement milestones in the compounding sector, October 2023 through December 2025.

Date	Action Type	Key Development
Oct 2023	Warning/ Guidance	FDA issues warning about compounded ketamine products; signals attention to non-GLP-1 complex compounds
Nov 2023	USP Standards	USP finalizes revised <795>, <797>, and <800> compounding standards effective November 1, 2023, establishing stricter BUD requirements
Dec 2023	Draft Guidance	FDA publishes draft 503A Interim Policy Guidance on bulk drug substances for public comment
Feb 2024	Enforcement	FDA issues warning letters against two counterfeit semaglutide manufacturers; sends reminder letters to NABP and FSMB on GLP-1 compounding requirements
Mar 2024	Proposed Rule	FDA publishes proposed DDC rule: Drug Products That Present Demonstrable Difficulties for Compounding under 503A/503B; public comment period through June 18, 2024
Jul-Oct 2024	Inspections	Major 503B facility inspections: Exton PA (Jul-Aug), Sugar Land TX/QuVa (Sep-Oct), Phoenix AZ (Sep-Oct), Empower Pharma Houston TX (Aug); Form 483s issued
Aug 2024	Recall	ProRx voluntary recall of 13,000+ vials of semaglutide/tirzepatide injection due to sterility assurance concerns
Sep 2024	Recall + Update	Empower Pharma recalls Pyridoxine HCl Injection lot 609763; FDA updates 503A Bulk Drug Substances List

Continued

Oct 2024	Shortage Status	FDA declares tirzepatide shortage resolved; litigation filed by Outsourcing Facilities Association
Dec 2024	PCAC + Shortage	PCAC rejects multiple peptides (ipamorelin, BPC-157) from 503A Bulks List; FDA reaffirms tirzepatide shortage resolved; establishes 60-day (503A) and 90-day (503B) grace periods
Jan 7, 2025	Final Guidance	FDA finalizes 503A Interim Policy Guidance: ends Category 1/2/3 system for bulk substances nominated after Jan 7, 2025
Jan 15, 2025	Warning Letter	Warning letter to Exton, PA 503B: non-registered API source, labeling violations, adverse event reporting failures, insanitary conditions
Jan 2025	Inspection	Turbare Manufacturing (Conway, AR) inspection; Form 483 issued Jan 24, 2025; recall of bevacizumab syringes initiated Feb 18, 2025
Feb 2025	Form 483s	BPI Labs 483 (Feb 21): missing "Office Use Only" on semaglutide/tirzepatide labels; Eagle Pharma 483 (Feb 27): repeat aseptic processing failures
Feb 21, 2025	Shortage Status	FDA declares semaglutide shortage resolved; grace period: 503A until Apr 22, 2025; 503B until May 22, 2025
Apr 2025	Warning Letters	Warning letters to Empower Pharma Houston TX (Apr 2) and Phoenix AZ facility (Apr 8); both cite sterile processing failures, cGMP violations, GLP-1 labeling issues
Apr 2025	Litigation	Eli Lilly sues Mochi Health, Willow Health, Fella Health, Henry Meds for unauthorized tirzepatide compounding/marketing
May 2025	Warning Letter	Warning letter to Nebraska 503B facility: media fill deficiencies, inadequate smoke studies, cleaning validation failures
May 22, 2025	Enforcement	503B GLP-1 enforcement discretion ends for semaglutide; no legal authority for 503Bs to compound semaglutide or tirzepatide
Jun 2025	Warning Letter	Warning letter to QuVa Pharma (Sugar Land, TX): inadequate ISO 5 contamination investigation; recall of fentanyl/bupivacaine products

Continued

Sep 2025	Import Alert	FDA establishes Green List Import Alert 66-80: GLP-1 APIs from non-listed manufacturers subject to automatic detention at U.S. border
Sep 2025	Warning Letters	FDA issues 50+ warning letters for marketing compounded GLP-1s as generic alternatives or making comparative claims
Sep 2025	Warning Letter	Warning letter to Turbare Manufacturing (Conway, AR): sterility failures, EM deficiencies
Dec 2025	NAD	National Advertising Division recommends Willow Health modify/discontinue compounded semaglutide health claims following Novo Nordisk challenge

8. The Way Forward: A Quality System Transformation Roadmap

The enforcement data analyzed in this article points to a fundamental conclusion: the dominant risk factor for FDA enforcement action in the compounding sector is not regulatory complexity or unfair agency targeting—it is the absence of a pharmaceutical-grade quality culture and infrastructure [4] [6] [7]. The good news is that the failure patterns are predictable, documented, and preventable. The following recommendations are organized by entity type and reflect the gap between current industry practice and FDA expectations [1] [15].

8.1. For 503A Compounding Pharmacies

The first priority for 503A pharmacies is developing a real-time regulatory intelligence capability. The January 2025 change to the Interim Policy—ending automatic Category 1 status for newly nominated bulk substances—means that the acceptable substance universe can change without warning [2]. Facilities must monitor FDA's 503A Bulk Drug Substances List, PCAC meeting outcomes, and Federal Register notices continuously, not episodically [2] [3]. Reliance on industry association newsletters as the primary regulatory intelligence channel is insufficient given the pace of recent change [4] [13].

The second priority is achieving genuine USP <795> and <797> compliance—not minimum procedural compliance, but substantive operational compliance with the intent of the standards. The revised <797> BUD provisions require data-supported beyond-use dating for Category 2 preparations; facilities that are assigning BUDs based on historical practice rather than validated stability data are exposed to enforcement action whenever FDA exercises its insanitary conditions inspection authority [1] [4]. Additionally, 503A pharmacies must rigorously apply the essentially-a-copy analysis before initiating compounding programs [1] [2].

On API sourcing, 503A pharmacies should apply the same rigor to their bulk substance vendor qualification programs that would be expected of a licensed

pharmaceutical manufacturer: supplier qualification audits or assessments, CoA review against established acceptance criteria, incoming testing where analytical capability exists, and supply chain transparency documentation [1] [2] [15]. The use of "Research Use Only" labeled APIs for human compounding—a practice explicitly prohibited and increasingly the subject of FDA warning letters in 2025—must be eliminated [7]-[10].

8.2. For 503B Outsourcing Facilities

The central mindset shift required for 503B facilities is recognition that they are pharmaceutical manufacturers, not pharmacies operating at scale. Every operational decision—from facility design and personnel qualification to batch release and CAPA management—must be made through the lens of cGMP compliance and FDA inspection readiness [7]-[9] [15].

Sterility assurance must be treated as a system, not a series of discrete tests. A mature sterility assurance program integrates facility design (ISO classification, HVAC qualification, pressure differentials), personnel aseptic technique qualification, process validation (three consecutive successful media fills under worst-case conditions), environmental monitoring (viable and non-viable trending, alert/action limits with statistical justification, microbial identification for excursions), and sterility testing (USP <71> compliance, appropriate sampling size relative to batch size, growth promotion testing for each test batch). The 2024-2025 warning letters consistently reveal facilities that have implemented elements of this system without the integrative rigor necessary to constitute a validated state of control [6]-[9].

Cleaning validation deserves specific emphasis because it is routinely treated as a checkbox compliance exercise rather than a science-based risk management activity [7]-[9] [15]. CV studies must be designed based on a worst-case assessment that considers the solubility of residues, the surface area of product-contact equipment, the toxicological limit of active ingredient residues, and the analytical sensitivity of the cleaning verification method [1] [15]. Production must not commence on unvalidated CV; pre-production CV should be on the critical path for new product introductions, and change control for cleaning agents or equipment requires formal CV revalidation [7] [8] [15].

The CAPA system is the quality system's immune response—when it functions well, it prevents the recurrence of deficiencies and the escalation of isolated failures into systemic problems [1] [15]. FDA warning letters consistently reveal CAPA systems that assign corrective actions to SOPs rather than to underlying operational behaviors; that close actions based on procedure revision rather than behavioral verification; and that fail to extend the scope of investigation to identify all affected product lots and patients [7]-[9]. Building a CAPA program that investigators find credible requires evidence of root cause determination through systematic analysis, not assumption [4] [15].

Beyond-use dating extensions must be supported by validated data that in-

cludes container-closure integrity testing, real-time stability studies with appropriate analytical methods, and sterility testing at the proposed extended BUD [1] [15]. Labeling quality systems for 503B facilities require the same rigor applied to pharmaceutical manufacturer labeling controls. The frequency of labeling deficiencies in recent FDA enforcement actions reflects labeling control systems that are insufficiently robust for the scale and volume of modern 503B operations [7]-[9].

8.3. Quality System Maturity Model for Compounders

A useful framework for self-assessment is a quality system maturity continuum that maps current state against the aspirational state implied by FDA enforcement expectations and established quality system frameworks [6] [15] [20] [21].

An important caveat applies to this model: for 503B outsourcing facilities, achieving Level 2 (cGMP-aligned) is a mandatory legal baseline under 21 CFR Parts 210 and 211—not an aspirational target. For 503A compounding pharmacies, the pathway through the maturity levels is driven by USP standards, state board expectations, and FDA's insanitary conditions authority rather than mandatory cGMP; the aspirational target is substantive compliance with USP <795> and <797> intent rather than full pharmaceutical-manufacturer-grade infrastructure.

At Level 1, the basic compliance state, quality activities are primarily reactive, procedurally defined, and minimally documented [1] [15]. This represents the quality culture in much of the 503A sector and in newly registered 503B facilities [5] [6]. Facilities at this level are characterized by written SOPs without verified adherence, environmental monitoring programs without statistical trending, BUDs assigned by practice rather than data, and investigations that assign root causes without systematic analysis [4] [7]-[9]. A 503A facility at Level 1 may avoid enforcement action if it does not trigger FDA's insanitary conditions jurisdiction; a 503B facility at Level 1 will almost certainly receive a Form 483 on its first inspection that, absent adequate corrective action, is likely to escalate to a warning letter [6]-[8] [15].

At Level 2, the cGMP-aligned state, facilities have implemented the documented quality systems required under 21 CFR Parts 210 and 211 and can demonstrate evidence of their function [1] [15]. Environmental monitoring data is trended and excursion investigations are documented. Media fills have been performed and qualification reports exist. Cleaning validation studies are complete for marketed products [7] [8] [15]. CAPA systems have documented corrective actions with verification records. This is where FDA expects all registered 503B facilities to operate [1] [15]. The facility-based 96% Form 483 rate among 503Bs inspected through mid-2025 suggests that Level 2 represents the aspirational state for many, not the operational reality [5] [6]. (53 of 55 inspected facilities received a Form 483; see Section 3.1 for the full statistical context.)

At Level 3, the pharmaceutical manufacturer-grade state, quality systems are proactive, data-driven, and integrated with operational decision-making. Annual

product reviews drive continuous improvement. Risk management frameworks (ICH Q9) and pharmaceutical quality system principles (ICH Q10) inform inspection readiness priorities [1] [15] [20] [21]. Process analytical technology (PAT) or enhanced in-process controls provide real-time quality assurance. CAPA effectiveness is tracked through key performance indicators [7] [15]. This is the standard exemplified by pharmaceutical manufacturers subject to pre-approval inspections and import alerts, and it represents the aspirational benchmark for high-volume 503B facilities operating in the current enforcement environment [6] [10] [15].

8.4. Industry and Regulatory Stakeholder Responsibilities

The current enforcement landscape also reflects structural challenges that require systemic responses beyond individual facility improvement. FDA must prioritize completing the inspection of the approximately 38 registered 503B facilities that had never been inspected as of mid-2025 [5]. Facilities producing sterile injectables, implantable products, or high-volume preparations for hospital systems without ever having been evaluated against cGMP standards represent an unacceptable patient safety risk [7] [8] [15]. The risk-based inspection model, while rational in theory, must be calibrated to ensure that no registered 503B producing sterile products operates uninspected for more than 12 months.

State boards of pharmacy require enhanced harmonization with FDA standards for 503A oversight. The current bifurcated system—in which FDA applies insanitary conditions guidance to 503A facilities while state boards apply USP standards—creates inconsistent compliance expectations and enforcement outcomes across state lines [1] [2] [5]. National harmonization of 503A inspection frameworks would substantially improve baseline quality across the sector [1] [5] [15].

The pending DDC rule represents an important frontier for industry engagement [3]. Compounders, patient advocates, and pharmaceutical manufacturers should participate actively in the rulemaking process to ensure that the criteria for DDC designation are scientifically grounded, that transition periods are adequate, and that the process for removing drugs from the DDC lists if compounding technologies improve is clearly defined [1] [3] [15].

Industry associations including the Alliance for Pharmacy Compounding (A4PC), the International Academy of Compounding Pharmacists (IACP), and the Outsourcing Facilities Association should consider developing shared quality standards, benchmarking programs, and voluntary quality system accreditation frameworks that go beyond minimum regulatory compliance [5] [6] [15]. In an environment where 96% of inspected 503B facilities have compliance deficiencies, the sector cannot rely on regulatory enforcement alone to drive quality improvement [1] [6] [15].

8.5. Limitations of the Enforcement Evidence Base

The findings and regulatory trends analyzed in this article are derived primarily

from publicly available FDA enforcement records—warning letters, Form 483 observations, voluntary recall notices, and enforcement databases—supplemented by independent analyses from the Partnership for Safe Medicines and Redica Systems. These sources have inherent limitations that readers should consider when interpreting the sector-wide conclusions drawn in this article.

First, warning letters, Form 483 observations, and recalls reflect visible, detected compliance deficiencies in facilities that have been inspected or have otherwise come to FDA's attention. They do not represent the full distribution of compliance quality across the compounding sector. Because FDA inspection coverage of 503B facilities remains incomplete—38 of 93 registered 503Bs had never been inspected as of mid-2025 [5]—and because the vast majority of 503A compounding pharmacies are overseen primarily by state boards of pharmacy with variable inspection resources, the enforcement record is necessarily a partial and non-representative sample of the broader compliance landscape.

Second, the enforcement data may overrepresent more severe or later-stage compliance failures. Facilities with marginal compliance gaps that have not yet been inspected—or that resolved deficiencies prior to inspection—are not reflected in the warning letter or 483 count. The apparent prevalence of serious quality failures may therefore be higher in the enforcement literature than in the actual operating population of compounding facilities. This limitation counsels caution in generalizing from the enforcement record to sector-wide prevalence.

Third, the individual case studies presented in Section 5 represent specific factual situations in specific facilities at specific points in time. They are selected from the publicly available enforcement record and are not a random or representative sample of all compliance actions. Their generalizability to the broader sector should be interpreted accordingly.

These limitations do not diminish the significance of the enforcement patterns documented in this article, which are consistent across multiple independent data sources and a multi-year observation period. They do, however, counsel against treating the enforcement record as a complete characterization of sector-wide compliance quality, and support the need for expanded FDA inspection coverage as discussed in Section 8.4.

9. Conclusions

The compounding pharmacy sector faces a regulatory environment that has been fundamentally and irreversibly transformed. FDA's enforcement posture—once characterized by measured guidance and selective intervention—has shifted decisively toward systematic, evidence-based enforcement of cGMP standards against 503B outsourcing facilities and insanitary conditions standards against 503A pharmacies. It is essential to note that these two enforcement tracks differ in their legal foundation: 503B facilities are held to mandatory pharmaceutical manufacturing standards under 21 CFR Parts 210 and 211 as a condition of registration, while 503A pharmacies face a distinct and evolving enforcement posture under

insanitary conditions authority and bulk substance provisions—not the same manufacturing-grade cGMP obligation. The data supporting this characterization is unambiguous: 53 of 55 registered 503B outsourcing facilities inspected through mid-2025 (96%) received at least one Form 483—a facility-based figure that reflects systemic quality infrastructure deficiencies rather than isolated enforcement outliers. Hundreds of compounding pharmacy recalls, over 50 warning letters in a single month targeting GLP-1 marketing violations, and an import alert architecture specifically designed to close the foreign API quality gap complete this picture of accelerating regulatory pressure.

The GLP-1 episode has been the sector's most consequential stress test. What it revealed is not simply that individual facilities made specific quality errors, but that a significant portion of the compounding sector—particularly among 503B outsourcing facilities—lacks the foundational quality infrastructure to safely produce the complex, high-risk sterile preparations that the market has demanded of them. Facilities that rushed to capitalize on shortage-driven GLP-1 demand without building compliant aseptic processing, validated sterility assurance, qualified API supply chains, and functional quality systems have found themselves the subjects of warning letters, recalls, litigation, and reputational damage.

But the GLP-1 episode is also a story with a constructive lesson: those facilities that built the right quality infrastructure, sourced APIs from compliant and FDA-registered manufacturers, implemented validated sterility assurance programs, and maintained functional CAPA systems continued to serve patients compliantly throughout the shortage period and are well-positioned for the post-shortage regulatory environment. Quality investment is not merely a compliance obligation—it is a competitive differentiator and a business continuity strategy in an enforcement environment that shows every indication of continuing to intensify.

For 503B compounders, the path forward requires not compliance theater but genuine quality culture transformation—from reactive to proactive quality management, from procedural compliance to outcomes-based verification, from minimum-viable quality systems to pharmaceutical-manufacturer-grade infrastructure, as mandated by law. For 503A compounding pharmacies, the path forward is defined by substantive compliance with USP <795> and <797>, real-time regulatory intelligence on bulk substance list changes, and genuine adherence to the prescription and clinical difference requirements that define their legal operating space—a distinct pathway from the cGMP mandate applicable to their 503B counterparts, but one that demands the same quality commitment. For the industry as a whole, the path forward requires recognizing that the era of regulatory tolerance for compounders operating below applicable quality standards is not returning—and that patient safety, not enforcement pressure, is the real reason why that era should not return.

The compounding sector serves genuine and irreplaceable patient needs. Patients with allergies, children requiring pediatric formulations, patients receiving individualized hormone replacement or pain management therapies, and the

healthcare institutions that serve them depend on compounding pharmacies and outsourcing facilities to provide safe, effective, and consistently manufactured preparations. Fulfilling that mission with integrity—and with the quality systems to back it up—is both the regulatory imperative and the ethical obligation of every entity operating in this space.

Conflicts of Interest

The authors declare no conflicts of interest regarding the publication of this paper.

References

[1] U.S. Food and Drug Administration (2024) Pharmacy Compounding of Human Drug Products under Section 503A of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act—Guidance for Industry. FDA. https://www.fda.gov/regulatory-information/search-fda-guidance-documents/pharmacy-compounding-human-drug-products-under-section-503a-federal-food-drug-and-cosmetic-act

[2] U.S. Food and Drug Administration (2025) Interim Policy on Compounding Using Bulk Drug Substances Under Section 503A of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act—Final Guidance for Industry. Federal Register, January 7, (Docket FDA-2015-D-3517). https://www.fda.gov/regulatory-information/search-fda-guidance-documents/interim-policy-compounding-using-bulk-drug-substances-under-section-503b-federal-food-drug-and

[3] U.S. Food and Drug Administration (2024) Drug Products or Categories of Drug Products That Present Demonstrable Difficulties for Compounding under Sections 503A or 503B of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act. https://www.federalregister.gov/documents/2024/03/20/2024-05801/drug-products-or-categories-of-drug-products-that-present-demonstrable-difficulties-for-compounding

[4] Dmour, I. (2022) Content Analysis of US FDA Warning Letters Issued to Compounding Pharmacies Regarding Violations of Current Good Manufacturing Practices between 2017 and 2022. *Journal of Pharmaceutical Innovation*, **18**, 965-979. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12247-022-09692-4

[5] Partnership for Safe Medicines (2025) What Is a 503B Outsourcing Facility, and Why Are So Many of Them Uninspected by FDA? July 2025. https://www.safemedicines.org/2025/07/503b-fda-inspections.html?utm

[6] Redica Systems (2025) 503B Outsourcing Facility FDA Inspection Readiness Guide 2025. Redica Systems Analysis: 27% Rise in Sterile-Processing Citations 2022-2024. August 2025. https://www.redica.com/inspection-readiness-guide-for-503b-outsourcing-facilities

[7] FDA (2025) Warning Letter: Empower Clinic Services LLC dba Empower Pharma. https://www.fda.gov/inspections-compliance-enforcement-and-criminal-investigations/warning-letters/empower-clinic-services-llc-dba-empower-pharma-700962-04022025?utm

[8] FDA (2025) Warning Letter: Turbare Manufacturing. https://www.fda.gov/inspections-compliance-enforcement-and-criminal-investigations/warning-letters/turbare-manufacturing-713516-09162025?utm

[9] FDA (2025) Via Electronic Mail Read/Delivery Receipt Requested. https://www.fda.gov/about-fda/fda-commissioner/quva-pharma-inc-sugar-land-tx-untitled-letter-issued-06182025

[10] U.S. Food and Drug Administration (2025) FDA Launches Green List to Protect Americans from Illegal Imported GLP-1 Drug Ingredients. FDA Press Release. https://www.fda.gov/news-events/press-announcements/fda-launches-green-list-protect-americans-illegal-imported-glp-1-drug-ingredients?utm

[11] Frier Levitt Law (2025) The Return of 503B Compounding of GLP-1 Medications. https://www.frierlevitt.com/articles/the-return-of-503b-compounding-of-glp-1-medications/?utm

[12] McDermott Will & Emery (2025) Semaglutide Shortage Resolved. https://www.mcdermottlaw.com/insights/semaglutide-shortage-resolved/?utm

[13] James, B. (2026) Navigating 503B Outsourcing Trends and 2026 Outlook. https://www.barringtonjames.com/resources/category/contract-outsourcing/?utm

[14] Polsinelli (2025) National Advertising Division Puts Compounded GLP-1 Advertising on a Diet. https://www.polsinelli.com/publications/nad-compounded-glp-1-advertising-diet?utm

[15] U.S. Food and Drug Administration (2025) Compliance Program 7356.040: Outsourcing Facility Inspections. https://www.fda.gov/media/185146/download?utm

[16] Gudeman, J., Jozwiakowski, M., Chollet, J. and Randell, M. (2013) Potential Risks of Pharmacy Compounding. *Drugs in R&D*, **13**, 1-8. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40268-013-0005-9

[17] Kastango, E.S. and Bradshaw, B.D. (2004) USP Chapter 797: Establishing a Practice Standard for Compounding Sterile Preparations in Pharmacy. *American Journal of Health-System Pharmacy*, **61**, 1928-1938. https://doi.org/10.1093/ajhp/61.18.1928

[18] American Society of Health-System Pharmacists (2014) ASHP Guidelines on Compounding Sterile Preparations. *American Journal of Health-System Pharmacy*, **71**, 145-166. https://academic.oup.com/ajhp/article/71/2/145/5111112?utm_source=chatgpt.com&login=false

[19] Nauck, M.A., Quast, D.R., Wefers, J. and Meier, J.J. (2021) GLP-1 Receptor Agonists in the Treatment of Type 2 Diabetes—State-of-the-Art. *Molecular Metabolism*, **46**, Article ID: 101102. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.molmet.2020.101102

[20] International Council for Harmonisation (2008) ICH Q10—Pharmaceutical Quality System. ICH. https://www.ich.org/page/quality-guidelines?utm

[21] U.S. Food and Drug Administration (2006) Guidance for Industry: Quality Systems Approach to Pharmaceutical CGMP Regulations. FDA. https://www.fda.gov/regulatory-information/search-fda-guidance-documents/quality-systems-approach-pharmaceutical-current-good-manufacturing-practice-regulations