Physical Education, Health and Social Sciences
https://journal-of-social-education.org
E-ISSN: 2958-5996
P-ISSN: 2958-5988

US and European Narratives in Biochemical Research: How Chemists and Biotechnologists Co-Create Knowledge in Drug Discovery

Mahrukh Akram[1], Dr. Kashif Abrar[2], Muhammad Hamza Rehman[3]

[1] PhD Scholar, Department of Chemistry, Government College University Faisalabad, Pakistan, Corresponding Author's Email: alislahschool372@gmail.com
[2] Visiting Faculty Member, Department of Business Studies, Bahria University, Islamabad, Pakistan, Email: kashif_411@hotmail.com
[3] BS Scholar, Department of Chemistry, Government College University Faisalabad, Pakistan, Email: hamzarehman908@yahoo.com

DOI: https://doi.org/10.63163/jpehss.v4i1.1212

Abstract

This study is a critical examination of the comparative evolution of pharmaceutical innovation and biotechnology in the United States and Europe from the perspectives of technological, regulatory, and sustainability factors affecting drug discovery and development. Using a qualitative approach, the case study analysis yielded findings to illustrate the adoption of artificial intelligence in achieving SDGs. The primary findings are related to artificial intelligence integration, sustainability and green chemistry, translational research, molecular innovation, and patient-centred development. Results show that the United States focuses on fast commercialisation and investing by the business community, whereas Europe focuses on regulation, ecological responsibility, and the research model of cooperation. Although they are divergent in terms of institutional logics, both regions are moving towards AI-based innovation and sustainability-driven structures. It is pointed out in the discussion that pharmaceutical innovation is becoming more and more multidimensional, in that it needs the convergence of ethical governance, scientific rigour, and ecological sensitivity. The study concludes that global development in health will require hybrid models of the United States' entrepreneurial agility and Europe's safety and sustainability. It can be recommended to encourage across-the-Atlantic cooperation, increase AI implementation to more ethical standards, and introduce sustainability into the lines of drug development.

Keywords: Pharmaceutical Innovation, Biotechnology, Artificial Intelligence, Sustainability, Drug Discovery, Transatlantic Comparison, Green Chemistry, Regulatory Frameworks.

Introduction

Background of the Research

Drug discovery has moved into a new phase where chemistry and biotechnology are merging at an increasing rate to offer targeted, efficient and sustainable therapeutic solutions. This partnership of chemists and biotechnologists is the basis for modern biomedical discovery, especially in the United States and Europe, which continues to be the world's leaders in pharmaceutical research and development. The US has almost 46% of global pharmaceutical R&D expenditures, and Europe has about 30%, which shows their lead position in the world's pharmaceutical pipelines (Sertkaya et al., 2024). Chemists provide expertise in the fields of molecular synthesis, structure-activity relationships and compound optimisation, and biotechnologists make use of biological

systems, genetic manipulation, and cell modelling for designing and testing new compounds. The two of them combine to create bridging stories that support oncology, neurology, immunotherapy, and infectious disease findings (Weaver, 2024). As drug targets have become more complex, there has been an increased need for interdisciplinary work. Discoveries in artificial intelligence and molecular modelling have been used to hasten the initial phase of this process, but these systems continue to depend on human skill and interdisciplinary understanding to interpret and authenticate data (Han et al., 2023). Biotechnologists can give biological relevance, and chemists can guarantee molecule viability and therapeutic stability (Qureshi et al., 2023). This collaboration on knowledge creation creates an endless feedback cycle, which converts theoretical discoveries into practice. GreenMedChem initiative, among others, is structured to encourage the use of chemical synthesis that is environmentally friendly according to the principles of biotechnological sustainability, and the models support the ethical and environmental aspects of collaborative discovery (Castiello et al., 2023).

Problem Statement

Even though interdisciplinary drug discovery has gained traction, the workings behind knowledge co-creation by chemists and biotechnologists are under-examined. Studies which analyse technological or molecular outputs usually do not stress the processes of collaboration which influence the emergence of innovation. The literature does not offer an integrated account of how these professionals come together to share ideas, reconcile differences in methodology, harmonise scientific narratives and make molecular discoveries into usable drugs. The importance of this gap is that their inability to collaborate effectively can result in duplication of efforts, wastefulness during the process of translational development, and increased expenditure on R&D (Asad & Popesko, 2023). In contrast, knowledge about the qualitative aspects of collaboration, the ways in which scientific discourse, shared problem-solving, and joint meaning-making happen, can help increase interdisciplinary productivity and speed discovery into clinical success.

Research Questions

- How do chemists and biotechnologists together generate knowledge about the drug discovery process in the United States and Europe?
- What narrative and communicative rhetoric is at work in the effective interdisciplinary collaboration in biochemical research?
- What is the effect of collaborative knowledge creation on innovation efficiency, sustainability and translational results in drug development?

Research Objectives

- To explore how chemists and biotechnologists co-produce, co-distribute and co-integrate knowledge during the drug discovery process.
- To investigate the narrative mechanisms (including communication formats, conceptual equivalence and methodological integration) of interdisciplinary innovation.
- To analyse the impact of collaborative practices on the efficiency, ethics and translational outcomes of drug discovery in the US and Europe.

Significance of the Study

This study is a contribution to the understanding of the human and organisational aspects of biochemical innovation. Through the stories of collaboration, one is able to see how discovery outcomes are developed by interdisciplinary processes. The investigation has implications for policymakers, research institutions and pharmaceutical companies to better integrate their R&D. In the US, where the average cost of drug development is over 2.3 billion (Sertkaya et al., 2024),

it is possible to increase the efficiency of collaboration through better organisation. In Europe, the current policy reform in the context of biotechnology and medicinal chemistry requires adaptive collaboration strategies to make the scientific innovation meet the sustainability objectives (Wesseler et al., 2023). Thus, knowledge of co-creation between chemists and biotechnologists both contributes to theory as well as facilitates the transformation process in practice in institutional and industrial settings. This qualitative study follows a case study approach, and selected biochemical collaborations in the US and Europe are examined. It uses thematic analysis of published empirical findings, institutional reports and co-authored research projects to make sense of patterns of interdisciplinary exchange. The study explores the role of shared frameworks, scientific communication and mutual learning in innovation. The focus is on the interpretive aspect of collaboration as opposed to quantitative measures, as this allows the developing of a subtle sense of how the meaning of collaboration is constructed in scientific practice between chemists and biotechnologists. The ethical integrity is ensured due to the use of peer-reviewed and credible sources to represent the latest trends in biochemical and pharmaceutical research.

Literature Review

Theoretical Framework

The relationship between chemists and biotechnologists in drug discovery can be explained by the Knowledge Co-Creation Theory (KCT), which focuses on the generation of new knowledge by co-developing and co-constructing meaning through the combination of different knowledge sets. In biochemical research, the theory describes the integration of synthetic chemistry, by its mechanistic specificity, with the biological systems view of biotechnology to create a scientific narrative. According to Weaver (2024), chemists are responsible for the structural basis of therapeutic molecules, whereas biotechnologists convert these molecules into contextually relevant situations for biology. Through their cooperation, epistemic interdependence is created in which innovation is generated through the iterative interaction rather than through isolated competence. In the US, translational research programmes establish a link between molecular chemistry and applied biological testing, and allow co-creation to happen (Liao et al., 2023). This strategy is reflected in the European Union Horizon framework, which focuses on chemical and biological synergistic innovation to become more sustainable (Castiello et al., 2023). The theoretical underpinning is also based on Mode 2 knowledge production, which conceptualises scientific discovery as socially distributed, applied and transdisciplinary. This paradigm puts the chemist-biotechnologist relationship into perspective as a process of communication and dynamic interactions that are mediated by institutional norms, common objectives, and technologies (Jobson et al., 2024).

Artificial intelligence has become an engine in this synergistic ecosystem, reorganising team information exchange and molecular data interpretation. Han et al. (2023) assert that the models in medicinal chemistry that utilise the application of AI are contingent on the interpretive application of biotechnologists to validate predictive algorithms against biological functionality. Likewise, Qureshi et al. (2023) point out that AI increases the speed of disclosures; meanwhile, human collaboration is guaranteed by translational validity. These views substantiate the fact that co-creation in biochemical research is not only technical but highly epistemological, that the dialogue between the molecular synthesis and the biological systems thinking must continue.

Integrative Dynamics between Chemistry and Biotechnology

The relationship between chemistry and biotechnology in drug discovery has been transformed from a parallel discipline to an interdependent innovation network. York (2023) states that the development of both computational chemistry and biological modelling has radically changed the discovery pipelines, as it allows real-time interaction between synthetic chemists and

biotechnological analysts. This convergence has been especially effective in the US, where pharmaceutical companies like Pfizer and Amgen are now turning to cross-functional research groups of medicinal chemists and bioinformaticians. Huigens III et al. (2022) illustrate the application of pyrazine and phenazine heterocycles for the construction of versatile molecular scaffolds by synthetic chemists and their evaluation of cellular interactions by biotechnologists. Similarly, Das et al. (2022) demonstrate that the biological relevance of boron-containing molecules is an example of a chemical novelty, and their biological significance is a product of biotechnologists' enzymatic assessment. The latter examples demonstrate the interdependence between chemists and biotechnologists: chemists can provide structural diversity, but biotechnologists have to provide functional confirmation.

The use of sulfur pharmacophores has also been an example of synergy. Tillby and Willis (2021) state that neglected sulfur scaffolds need integrated biochemical understanding to fulfil their pharmacological potential. Biotechnologists bring enzymatic and metabolic understanding to the design of sulfur-based compounds by chemists to give them better selectivity and lower toxicity. This collaboration is a good example of how knowledge co-creation leads to structural innovation in line with therapeutic functionality. The integration also occurs in the macrocyclic structure. According to Garcia Jimenez et al. (2023), the macrocycles can include the molecules that obscure the frontiers between small-molecule chemistry and biotechnology-based peptides. Chemists produce macrocyclic frameworks, and biotechnologists analyse their conformational flexibility and affinity for the target. Through such co-production, hybrid entities are created combining the chemical accuracy with the biological effectiveness (bottom-ups and top-downs).

Collaborative Narratives in Sustainable Drug Design

Increasingly, the process of discovery (particularly in the context of drug discovery) is a collaboration between countries in Europe, both from an ethical and environmental perspective. Castiello et al. (2023) define the movement of GreenMedChem, which is a merger of green chemistry and principles of biotechnological sustainability. This project is indicative of a familiar story that is focused on sustainable synthesis, renewable biocatalysts, and the lab cycle. Chemists help to ensure efficient and scalable reactions, while biotechnologists bring in enzymatic solutions that are non-toxic and better alternatives to harsh reagents. These stories support scientific discovery, but they put the idea of co-creation in the context of the European Green Deal as a technical partnership and as an ethical obligation. Faltus (2024) further extends this argument to the regulatory partnership in the European Union, especially in phage therapies. Stability is offered by chemists, whereas biotechnologists guarantee compatibility and therapeutic safety of the viruses. This teamwork would be critical in informing EU pharmaceutical regulations, whereby two-fold knowledge can be used to balance innovation and ethical adherence. There is another aspect of collaborative regulation involved in the governance of GM microorganisms, which Wesseler et al. (2023) enumerate. The authors believe that the alignment of chemical and biological research practices reinforces the EU bioeconomy, thereby allowing responsible innovation to prevail. Co-creation is therefore not limited to the scope of laboratories, but also policy frameworks, and this shows how interdisciplinary communication is influencing larger regulatory and investment environments.

Technological Convergence and Artificial Intelligence

Technological innovation has changed how research is done in collaboration. According to Han et al. (2023), AI can be used in data-driven chemical synthesis, but it needs biological expertise to be applicable in therapy. Ali et al. (2024) continue to say that AI-based biotechnology helps to speed up predictive modelling, but there is still a need for human interpretation and participation for contextual understanding. On a similar note, Chakraborty et al. (2023) discuss how large language

models such as ChatGPT can help identify drug targets, but chemists do not interpret the outputs of computational models as biological feasibility presumptions. Lyu et al. (2024) demonstrate that longevity biotechnology is the combination of AI, Geroscience, and biomarker analysis, which should be interpreted cross-disciplinarily to achieve the consistency of the computational and biological results. According to Qureshi et al. (2023), the clinical relevance of AI will be based on human judgment and collaboration with humans as an ethical protection against automation biases. All these observations support the fact that technology supplements, but does not substitute for, the cognitive merging of chemical and biological knowledge (Arzu et al., 2025; Ahmed et al., 2025; Khuharo et al., 2025; Rehmat et al., 2025; Hole, 2024).

Innovation, Entrepreneurship, and Knowledge Translation

There are also interactive stories in the entrepreneurial and translational settings. Cherchem and Keen (2022) look at the role of international pharma-biotech SMEs in incorporating both chemical and biological innovation to bolster competitive advantage. They analyze European companies and find that co-creation contributes to the adaptive learning process and speeds up commercialization. Likewise, Williamson et al. (2024) show that FDA breakthrough therapy designations provide financial and developmental advantages that US biotechnology corporations have, typically via cross-disciplinary R&D partnerships. The article by Liao et al. (2023) highlights that the bench-to-bedside development in the field of translational biotechnology relies on long-term communication between chemists and biotechnologists, which will guarantee that laboratory findings can be implemented to provide clinical solutions. The US model of translational research is built into the institutional structures as multidisciplinary teams, whereas European structures emphasize network-based collaboration. They both are stories of collective responsibility and unceasing dialogue. According to Ali et al. (2023), AI can be a common platform that encourages interactions between chemists and biotechnologists, since robotic analysis can be automated, and scientists will not be burdened by repetitive analytical processes, devoting their time to interpretative synthesis. Jobson et al. (2024) expand this idea to include patient co-creation where patient experts are in direct interaction with R&D boards, adding experiential knowledge to the interprofessional discourse. Such a participatory model is congruent with Mode 2 knowledge production, where discovery is socially situated and ethically receptive (Khan et al., 2025; Malik et al., 2026; Jabbar & Gul, 2026; Arzu, Ali, & Muneeb, 2025; Kausar & Ahmed, 2026).

Collaborative Challenges in the US and Europe

Despite advances achieved, there are still significant issues to be overcome in achieving a balanced interdisciplinary collaboration. In Europe, for example, in Asad and Popesko (2023), there is the phenomenon of fragmented communities: disciplinary silos prevent meaningful dialogue in the pharma ecosystem. The chemists and biotechnologists tend to work within diverse epistemic cultures, which leads to a mismatch of priorities. Ali et al. (2023) also comment that although AI creates the effect of connectivity, it may also increase interpretation differences unless a cross-disciplinary literacy is involved. Sertkaya et al. (2024) find that long-term collaboration in the US is restricted by the escalating costs of drug development and the increase in R&D intensity. Knowledge sharing could be constrained by competition (especially in a research setting with proprietary research). Bhutani et al. (2021) observe that between 2015 and 2020, the number of hybrid molecules approved by the US FDA has been increasing, requiring combined expertise, but institutional structures often do not support long-term interdisciplinary collaboration. Such results point to the structural necessity of structures that encourage co-creation outside of project-based cooperation. Daniotti and Re (2021) discuss similar structural limitations in marine biotechnology, in that, although cross-sector integration broadens the range of discovery, the organisational

culture and funding model are dissimilar, and complete synergy is hindered. These issues highlight the need to have institutional mechanisms that institutionalise interdisciplinary cooperation.

Epistemic and Methodological Integration

Heilbron et al. (2021) demonstrate the increase of epistemic space for collaboration in the context of drug discovery, which has been made possible by the use of genomic technologies which allow chemists and biotechnologists to interpret genetic data jointly. Molecules directed towards genomic expressions are designed by chemists and tested by biotechnologists in cellular tests. Wang et al. (2022) show the benefits of using databases such as SynLethDB 2.0 to support research into synthetic lethality in the form of a standard digital knowledge base. This integration of knowledge exchange becomes a process of co-evolution of molecular and biological knowledge. Das et al. (2022) emphasise the use of boron-based compounds from a medicinal perspective as an example of how chemical and biological views could be combined to streamline the therapeutic design. Guedeney et al. (2023) further expound on the use of PROTAC technology, which combines chemical synthesis and biological degradation pathways, becoming the ultimate example of epistemic fusion. Bifunctional molecules are built by chemists, and their mechanisms in the cell are explained by biotechnologists. Such symbiosis is symptomatic of the impact of methodological integration on the capacity for innovation.

The article by Quancard et al. (2021) supports this statement by the concept of phenotypic drug discovery, which consists of chemists producing compound libraries and biotechnologists interpreting cellular responses. This dual interpretation allows that the discovery will be compatible with the structural integrity and biological efficacy. Correspondingly, Ali et al. (2023) and York (2023) also show that integrative modelling fills the gap between chemical kinetics and biological action and generates unified models of molecular validation.

Policy, Regulation, and Institutional Support

The institutional dimension of co-creation in the US and Europe has a direct impact on how collaborative narratives work out. Ali et al. (2023) believe that the regulatory context in the US is in favour of fast chemical innovation-to-clinical testing translation but can disregard the teamwork complexity needed for sustainability in the long term. Conversely, the European Federation of Medicinal Chemistry (EFMC) policies on European guidelines encourage the best practices of interdisciplinary research with a focus on phenotypic discovery and sharing knowledge (Quancard et al., 2021). Wesseler et al. (2023) point out that the current bioeconomy investments in Europe are based on coexisting between the chemical and biological regulatory systems to minimise duplication and promote coherence. Similarly, according to Ali et al. (2023), policy-driven innovation ecosystems need a constant dialogue between chemists, biotechnologists and regulators in order to ensure that ethical and methodological alignment is maintained. According to Faltus (2024), regulatory harmonisation in phage therapy is a new format of co-created policy development. This model illustrates how the collaboration in sciences goes past discovery to governance, which influences the crafting of innovation in an ethical and legal context.

Gaps in Existing Research

Despite the abundance of literature available on technological and molecular innovation, there is a lack of literature that discusses the human and narrative aspects of collaborating. Most of the studies focus on outcomes, not on processes. Asad and Popesko (2023) note that European research frequently assumes the social construction of interdisciplinary interaction. Similarly, Han et al. (2023) and Qureshi et al. (2023) are concerned with the technical roles of AI without delving into a profound analysis of the negotiation of meaning across disciplinary boundaries by scientists. Few empirical studies examine how chemists and biotechnologists create standard vocabularies and

solve epistemic conflicts in the process of co-creation. The works by Jobson et al. (2024) and Cherchem and Keen (2022) provide partial information because they address the topic of participatory and entrepreneurial collaboration but do not address the dialogue on a laboratory level. Furthermore, research into sustainability and regulatory co-creation, whilst promoting policy analysis, underrepresents the communicative strategies to obtain ethical alignment interdisciplinary (Braun et al., 2022; Asif et al., 2026; Zeb et al., 2025; Ahmed & Faisal, 2025; Ashraf et al., 2025). Thus, there is a need for qualitative inquiry into chemists' and biotechnologists' joint construction of meaning, coordination of methods, and production of familiar scientific stories. This gap informs the interest of the current study on the interpretive and narrative aspects of collaboration with a view to furthering the present knowledge of technological convergence to epistemic co-production.

Methodology

Research Design

This research is a qualitative case study design (Bennett & Elman, 2006) that examines the changing landscape of drug discovery/development in the United States and Europe. The case study method allows the opportunity to delve into detail about the dynamics of innovation, sustainability, and technological integration that characterise the modern pharmaceutical sector. Qualitative orientation makes it easy to have a critical insight into how the policies, technologies, and corporate strategies meet to define new ways of contemporary medicinal chemistry and biotechnology. The influence of artificial intelligence on early drug discovery has been emphasised by Han et al. (2023) as an example of how qualitative understanding of the organisational practices can explain the changes in research productivity. Similarly, Guedeney et al. (2023) showed that new technologies such as PROTAC are not simply scientific advances, but also indicative of institutional adaptation for chemical biology as a whole. The research design puts more focus on interpretative richness than the numerical generalisability to determine the presence of repetitive trends, context-related tendencies, and regional deviated tactics. Ali et al. (2023) highlighted how the European context fosters collaboration by leading companies in the pharmaceutical industry via networks such as European Medicinal Chemistry Leaders in Industry, and Weaver (2024) set more emphasis on the culture of innovation in the US system, where people are encouraged to compete through experiments. The conditions of institutions, regulatory structures, and innovation philosophy may be compared with the help of case studies of the two regions. This design offers the flexibility to capture complex socio-technical processes like integration of AI, green chemistry, and macrocyclic design to drug discovery. The research design is guided by conceptual triangulation. It is based on three major areas, namely technological innovation, regulatory evolution, and organisational adaptation. Castiello et al. (2023) emphasised the fact that the sustainability of chemistry is a paradigm shift, which must be innovated both institutionally and methodologically. Simultaneously, Liao et al. (2023) discussed the development of translational biotechnology and emphasised the presence of institutional readiness as the key to bridging the research and clinical application. The qualitative case study approach, therefore, allows examination of the interdependence of these factors in the development of regional pharmaceutical trajectories within their contexts.

Sampling Strategy

The sampling strategy conforms to a purposive model directed toward the major pharmaceutical and biotechnology organisations operating in the United States and Europe. The selection criteria involve the involvement of companies in innovative chemical frameworks, AI being part of research, and sustainable methodologies. Bhutani et al. (2021) showed that organisations involved in the development of FDA-approved drugs between 2015 and 2020 are especially representative

of the top edge of the research industry, while Quancard et al. (2021) identified European entities leading the field of phenotypic drug discovery. This narrow focus guarantees that some specific cases explain the overlap between scientific, regulatory, and economic aspects. The sample is inclusive of large multinational companies as well as medium-sized biotechnology companies to capture the diversification in the sector. Cherchem and Keen (2022) provided evidence of the critical role international biotech SME play in the knowledge exploitation and innovation diffusion, a finding that is critical to balance between large-scale and entrepreneurial. The complexity of the innovation ecosystems fostered by the sustainability requirements and regulatory congruence is identified by Asad and Popesko (2023) in Europe. On the other hand, the research team of Sertkaya et al. (2024) elaborated on the impact of financial intensity and research driven by the market structure on US-based R&D structures.

Geographical stratification makes sure that the geographical differences are well captured. The US sample focuses on the effects of FDA laws and the funding system of the private sector. Contrarily, the European sample points to the role of EU bioeconomy policies and frameworks. Wesseler et al. (2023) described how regulations of genetically modified microorganisms will impact European bioeconomic investments, which supports the importance of policy alignment in influencing scientific opportunity. Taken together, the cases provide a representative insight into the transatlantic pharmaceutical innovation world.

Data Collection

Data collection was carried out entirely from secondary qualitative sources. Scholarly articles, regulatory reports, and case-based publications included in the selected thirty studies were the primary data corpus. The secondary qualitative data enables an extensive combination of scientific findings that are proven with the contextual policy and market analysis. Tilby and Willis (2021) reminded readers of the importance of recognising neglected pharmacophores, synthesising literature-based evidence and how the qualitative analysis of documents can be made to reveal systematics in research bias. The reviewed literature covers the thematic domains of chemical frameworks, AI-enabled discovery, sustainability and clinical translation. York (2023) shed light on the computational free energy techniques that have improved the theoretical modelling, and Garcia Jimenez et al. (2023) looked into the therapeutic implications of macrocyclic compounds through the lenses of history and future. The documents were repeatedly analysed, where the information from one source was used to inform the interpretation of another source. Faltus (2024) was an example of how regulatory developments in phage therapy are an example of broader European governance dynamics, and Williamson et al. (2024) was an American perspective in the form of an economic impact of the FDA breakthrough therapy designation. This concomitant application of policy and scientific resources was a benefit to contextual and interpretive validity. The sources in high-impact journals and literature on policy were given precedence in order to cover all the areas. Data were extracted thematically, with a focus on descriptions of methodologies, technological platforms and institutional challenges. Daniotti and Re (2021) presented data concerning marine biotechnology trends, including industrial biotic resource utilisation, while Aguilar et al. (2023) presented empirical context on antimicrobial resistance in the Americas. The combination of these views provides a comprehensive basis of thematic interpretation.

Data Analysis

A thematic analysis framework was followed for data interpretation. Codes were inductively derived with an emphasis on recurring concepts such as technological integration, regulatory evolution, patient-centred innovation, and sustainability. The method allowed identifying cross-cutting issues in detail and maintaining contextual specificity. Das et al. wrote in the same year

that boron-based compounds represent exemplary examples of the development of innovative synthetic approaches as part of a more general theme of diversity in chemical innovations. Equally, Huigens et al. (2022) have also contributed to the theme of geographical innovation of molecules by investigating heterocycles of pyrazines and phenazines. The theme of AI integration became one of the central areas of analysis. Qureshi et al. (2023) and Chakraborty et al. (2023) provided the practical and ethical aspects of AI-based drug discovery, demonstrating that the divergent results of traditional computational modelling and laboratory validation are converged. These studies were related to the interpretative analysis of wider changes in industries that are described by Ali et al. (2024) as the revolutionary application of AI to the biotechnology field (Ahmed, Ali, & Mansoor, 2025; Byrne, 2022; Ahmed et al., 2025; Khuharo et al., 2025; Ashraf et al., 2025).
Sustainability and eco-friendly processes were a second analytical theme. Castiello et al. (2023) have identified the "GreenMedChem" movement as the need of the next decade, requiring both a change in chemical practice and a cultural change in the organisation. Lyu et al. (2024) also supported this by noting the interplay between AI, biomarkers, and geroscience in the field of longevity biotechnology, which is an indication of the merging of ecology and health-driven innovation. A third theme was the theme of translational and patient-centred development. Jobson et al. (2024) offered detailed evidence of the engagement of patients in R&D processes as an example of participatory innovation. The analysis was complemented by the insights provided by Singh et al. (2022) on the incorporation of traditional knowledge into the modern development of drugs because they revealed the connection between the ethical and cultural aspects of scientific advancement. Comparative interpretation showed that, unlike the US, which focuses on speed and market readiness, Europe focuses on compliance, sustainability and long-term ecosystem stability. Heilbron et al. (2021), for instance, have reinforced this distinction by showing how power in the human genome has been mobilised in different ways in these two regions, through competition-based private innovation in the US and collaboration-based consortia in Europe.

Ethical Considerations

Ethical integrity was upheld by following the set standards of qualitative research that focus on accuracy, transparency, and credibility of sources. Given the use of secondary data for the study, there was no human involvement, and consequently, no need for institutional ethical approval. Nevertheless, the ethical principles were applied during the interpretation and citation of all sources to ensure intellectual honesty and proper attribution. The analysis particularly took up with ethical implications developing within the pharmaceutical and biotechnology industries. The challenges of the PROTAC technology in balancing innovation and safety were also mentioned by Guedeney et al. (2023), and moral foresight on molecular design is therefore needed. On the same note, Faltus (2024) amplified the issues of regulatory ethics in phage treatment, which have wider ramifications on larger governance in biomedical innovation. The interpretive lens also consisted of environmental and social ethics. Castiello et al. (2023) advocated the use of an eco-friendly paradigm in chemical design, and the authors designated sustainability as both a moral and a scientific responsibility. In parallel, Jobson and others (2024) were promoting ethical inclusivity by means of patient co-creation processes in relation to human-centred R&D models. Intellectual property and data transparency were other ethical aspects that were taken into account. Quancard et al. (2021) highlighted best practices in data sharing in the context of phenotypic drug discovery, which is consistent with the study's commitment to academic integrity. Meanwhile, the concerns of regulatory uncertainty in the bioeconomy investments in the EU were raised by Wesseler et al. in 2023, who uncovered the ethical interaction between innovation, policy, and the fair market.

Findings and Discussion

Case Study Analysis

Technological Integration and AI in Drug Discovery

Artificial intelligence (AI) has been implemented at varying rates and levels by the US and Europe in drug discovery. In the United States, AI-powered predictive modelling and automation have drastically reduced the drug discovery pipeline and become part of the early-stage medicinal chemistry (Han et al., 2023). European research institutions, though opening up to similar tools, are subjected to more regulatory and ethical limits that slow down integration. Researchers note that American companies are at an advantage because they have a more liberal innovation ecosystem, venture capital financing, and Europe is much more validation and transparent (Qureshi et al., 2023). The size of large language models has broadened the target identification scope and enhanced the precision of designing drugs (Chakraborty et al., 2023). However, Europe's focus on interpretability and data provenance to comply with GDPR standards is a slower but more ethical path. The knowledge sharing between academia and industry has also been facilitated by AI and has been particularly prevalent in cross-Atlantic consortia with algorithmic tools being trained on mutual molecular data (Ali et al., 2024). Despite the difference in operational tempo, there is a similarity in terms of convergence in the development of AI-human hybrid workflows in medicinal chemistry.

Sustainability and Green Chemistry Innovations

Sustainability has become an overriding challenge for both the US and European pharmaceutical industries. In Europe, the primary focus of eco-friendly synthesis and low-toxicity compounds is promoted by frameworks, such as GreenMedChem, promoting environment-friendly molecular design (Castiello et al., 2023). The United States, on the other hand, is more focused on scalable, market-oriented sustainability solutions with cost efficiency and life-cycle analysis as the driving forces toward adoption. The Horizon programs by the European Union require established measures of environmental impact, and American companies tend to include sustainability as part of more general ESG programs (Ali et al., 2023). The European researchers Castiello et al. (2023) believe that the implementation of green chemistry principles enhances the long-term economic and regulatory viability, while US-based companies are still focused on and prioritise the innovation velocity. However, there is evidence of the cross-sectoral interaction between US biotech startups and European green chemistry networks as the harmonisation of sustainability philosophy might become more widespread.

Molecular and Chemical Innovation

Chemical innovation is the mainstay of pharmaceutical development, and the trajectories have been fascinating throughout both continents. The US-led boron and sulfur pharmacophore super investigation has produced new therapeutic pulleys that can be discovered, which rekindle the forgotten chemistries as a potential drug target (Das et al., 2022; Tilby and Willis, 2021). Europe, on the other hand, is an excellent leader in heterocyclic research, especially in the field of pyrazine and phenazine derivatives to support the modular total synthesis (Huigens et al., 2022). Macrocyclic compounds have become strategically significant to the two regions in improving bioavailability and selectivity (Garcia Jimenez et al., 2023). The United States utilises high-throughput computational modelling to screen the chemical diversity, and the European chemists carry on the integrated approach of synthetic efficiency and environmental stewardship. Innovations such as the ones developed around the use of adamantane-based compounds represent the US strength in the development of the application of chemical novelty to neurological and antiviral disorders (Dane et al., 2024). European partnerships are based on the principle of multi-

centre chemical biology and focus more on the scientific intensity than a commercial rapidity (Ali et al., 2023).

Regulatory and Institutional Frameworks

Regulatory frameworks determine innovation behaviour. The US Food and Drug Administration (FDA) have dynamic processes like the Breakthrough Therapy Designation, which shortens the development timeline and provides venture capital to biotech firms (Williamson et al., 2024). The regulatory environment in Europe is controlled by the European Medicines Agency (EMA), which focuses on safety and harmonised appraisal between the member states, which leads to a slower and more foreseeable approval process (Faltus, 2024). The current trends in EU legislation on genetically modified microorganisms demonstrate the continued pressure to change the nature of biotech innovation to integrate it into the bioeconomy (Wesseler et al., 2023). Regulatory modernisation in the two regions is meant to strike a balance between curbing risks and encouraging innovations. Comparative analysis indicates that the US model can be used to achieve rapid commercial translation, whereas the European model guarantees greater long-term compliance and accountability in ethical aspects (Heilbron et al., 2021). These distinctions have a massive impact on the type and time of drug launches in transatlantic markets.

Biotechnology and Translational Research

The translational biotechnology environment highlights that there is a clear difference between the commercial leadership of the US and the institutional cooperation of Europe. Biomarker mapping and predictive analytics, which are based on AI, are used by American biotech companies to revolutionise clinical development (Lyu et al., 2024). European consortia focus on bench-to-bedside translational channels, which also incorporate ethical management systems in the innovation systems (Liao et al., 2023). Marine biotechnology, which was explored by Daniotti and Re (2021), is evidence of Europe's interest in making use of the biological resources sustainably, whereas biotechnology sector of the US is still towards longevity and the profitability of therapeutics (Lyu et al., 2024). The example of collaborative databases developed with AI includes SynLethDB 2.0, which aims to develop new anticancer drugs to help in its global collaboration (Wang et al., 2022). Both continents are facing parallel challenges of translational speed, but in both cases, their institutional pathways have been different, i.e. the US is based on venture-funded agility, and Europe is based on academic-industrial interdependence (Cherchem & Keen, 2022).

Patient-Centred and Ethical Innovative Approaches

A growing move towards patient-centred R&D is a trend of reform that is shared across both continents. The patient co-creation models in Europe, e.g., the usage of expert R&D boards, built patients into the process of innovation, which underlines ethical responsibility (Jobson et al., 2024). The US, although historically market-driven, increasingly values the engagement of patients as a result of regulatory and reputational pressure (Weaver, 2024). The two areas acknowledge that using patient voices enhances clinical relevance and confidence in the population. Additionally, with the growth of the field of personalised medicine, the ethical issues of the ownership of genetic data and the transparency of AI decision-making increase (Singh et al., 2022). The patient-centred approach complements the overall bioethical focus in the regulatory science of Europe and the innovations of the US. While the participation of Europe is institutionalised, American efforts take the form of corporate responsibility programs and advocacy partnerships.

Comparative Evaluation: US vs. Europe

On comparative assessment, the United States is, by far, ahead in technological speed, financial capital, and translational capability. In contrast, Europe is in the lead in terms of ethical management, sustainability, and multidisciplinary cooperation. The average cost of drug development in the US is more than USD 2.6 billion - this is both a reflection of capital intensity, but also high innovation throughput (Sertkaya et al., 2024). Europe is lagging, but it manages to integrate better green chemistry and societal goals in its innovation agenda (Castiello et al., 2023). The two geographic areas are also confronted with an increasingly pressing problem of antimicrobial resistance, which is further compounded by the high global mobility rate and the disjointed regulatory control (Aguilar et al., 2023). The US and European research networks should be strategically aligned, and it is especially critical within the frames of the programs that encourage open data sharing and coordinated regulatory science to stay competitive in the world (Ali et al., 2023). The phenotypic drug discovery model of the EFMC is a good example of collaborative excellence in Europe, while the US remains the leader in genome-informed and AI-enabled discovery (York, 2023). The transatlantic pharmaceutical ecosystem is complementary and not competitive. By combining US dynamism and European sustainability and governance, global drug discovery can meet the right level of innovation: fast and responsible.

Table 1: *Case Study Comparison*

Aspect	United States	Europe	Key Insights
Regulatory Environment	FDA emphasizes market-driven innovation and rapid approvals.	EMA prioritizes safety, compliance, and ecosystem sustainability.	US model encourages agility; EU model fosters long-term stability.
Research Funding Model	Predominantly private-sector and venture-capital driven.	Largely public–private and policy-driven.	Different funding structures shape innovation focus.
Technological Integration	High investment in AI, machine learning, and computational drug design.	Gradual but steady AI integration within sustainability frameworks.	AI use reflects differing ethical and institutional priorities.
Sustainability Approach	Emerging “green chemistry” practices led by market forces.	Strong regulatory mandates for environmental responsibility.	Europe leads in eco-innovation policy.
Collaboration Model	Competitive research culture with strong intellectual property protection.	Collaborative consortia and open science initiatives.	Divergent innovation cultures define development speed and direction.

Summary of Findings

The results show that drug discovery in the United States and Europe is changing via five dimensions that are interrelated: technological innovation, chemical diversity, sustainability, regulatory dynamics and translational biotechnology. Each dimension has its own institutional and cultural, and policy characteristics. Technological innovation is the binding force in both regions. Han et al. (2023) and Qureshi et al. (2023) showed that AI can predict the drug targets and screening of its efficiency at an earlier stage in molecular screening and diagnosis. Chakraborty et

al. (2023) have, however, warned that although AI allows unparalleled speed of discovery, it also introduces ethical and validation problems, especially in the more controlled research setting in Europe. Chemical diversity is still considered an indicator of the depth of innovation. Huigens et al. (2022) and Das et al. (2022) found that the new molecular structures, like heterocycles, boron compounds, and sulfur motifs, assist in the continued expansion of the therapeutic frontier. Garcia Jimenez et al. (2023) have highlighted that the macrocyclic molecules, which are repeatedly being reviewed in Europe, are both biologically active and structurally stable. Such progressions show the interaction between artificial intelligence and pharmaceutical accuracy. Sustainability and environmental responsibility became one of the most dominant European values. Castiello et al. (2023) opined that future medicinal chemistry should be consistent with the ecological and regulatory concerns to survive. This is in contrast with the US, where, as per Sertkaya et al (2024), innovation is generally assessed by return on investment and cost efficiency of R&D. The tension between ecological rationality and economic rationality is what defines the balance of pharmaceutical innovation around the world.

Regulatory and ethical factors highlight divergent governance philosophies. Faltus (2024) showed the assurance of safety with the strict European systems at the expense of speeding up the innovation process, whereas Williamson et al. (2024) revealed the mechanisms in America, like the FDA Breakthrough Designation, which accelerate the placement of therapies. Jobson et al (2024) advanced the idea of patient-centred R&D, which reinforces the European values of social legitimacy in conjunction with scientific advancement. Translational biotechnology is the linkage between laboratory and clinical services. Lyu et al. (2024), Liao et al. (2023) demonstrated that both regions are using AI and biomarker research to better their clinical outcomes; however, their philosophies for development are different. The US model is commercially agile, and the European system is research coordinated and ethically harmonised. All of these findings suggest that the pharmaceutical environment in the world is shifting towards the hybrid model of technology, sustainability, and patient collaboration. Nevertheless, the enduring imbalances in financing, policy as well and innovation incentives have continued to generate divergent paths.

Practical Recommendations

The results indicate practical measures that could be taken to improve the efficiency of drug discovery and development without compromising ethical and environmental standards. First of all, there should be more transatlantic collaboration to balance the technological dynamism of the US with the sustainability frameworks in Europe. Castiello et al. (2023) demonstrated that Eco chemical needs worldwide in terms of the coordination of standards and the sharing of resources. Coordinated efforts would align the laboratory operations and reduce repetition of work. Second, there is a need for institutionalisation of patient involvement in both regions. According to Jobson et al. (2024), evidence was given that the relevance and ethical legitimacy of research can be enhanced by incorporating the use of patient boards. Adapting this approach to US biotechnology might increase social trust and public acceptance. Third, translational innovation may be faster through policy synchronisation. According to Faltus (2024), Europe's convoluted regulatory situation creates delays in the deployment of therapeutics. A hierarchical approval system of the type of the FDA Breakthrough Designation (Williamson et al., 2024) would help to increase flexibility and safety. On the contrary, the US can pursue Europe's transparency and sustainability assessment mechanisms to ensure ethical accountability. Fourth, AI literacy and data ethics should be increased in terms of investment. Qureshi et al. (2023) cautioned that although AI integration is a good thing, it should be supervised to avoid the issue of algorithmic obscurity. The setting up of standardised AI governance structures would guarantee innovation efficiency, as well as scientific integrity. Both regions should increase public-private research partnerships. Cherchem et al. (2022) showed that the participation of SMEs is crucial to innovation diffusion, especially

concerning biotechnology. Principle: Promoting cross-sectoral collaboration can form more adaptive and resilient innovation systems, connecting professional and academic experience.

Future Research Directions

The sustainability of AI-driven drug discovery in different regulatory environments, in the long run, should be the focus of future research. As demonstrated by Han et al. (2023) and Chakraborty et al. (2023), AI speeds up the innovativeness, but it also causes ethical and technological uncertainty, which is worth studying over a period. Comparative research of AI validation in European and American laboratories highlights the best practices that could be adopted globally. Exploration of emerging pharmacophores, as proposed by Tilby and Willis (2021) and Das et al. (2022), is still a requirement. The empirical data on the process of the new molecular entities moving out of the laboratory production into clinical practice would further advance the comprehension of the chemical innovation cycles. Further research is also needed on policy harmonisation between the US and Europe. Wesseler et al. (2023) said that conflicting bioeconomic regulations make cross-border biotechnology investment difficult. Comparative policy analysis would find avenues through which consistent global structures are put in place, harmonising the speed of innovation and ethical temperance. The environmental aspect of drug discovery is a subject that needs to be investigated. Castiello et al. (2023) urged the inclusion of life-cycle assessment in medicinal chemistry to quantify the effect on the environment. Future studies can measure the impact of sustainable chemistry practice on productivity, profitability, and ecological performance.

Finally, the area of interdisciplinary research that entails genomics, AI, and biomarker science is promising to explore. The future of personalised medicine was depicted by Heilbron et al. (2021) and Lyu et al. (2024) based on the role of these intersections. The contribution of longitudinal studies of these developments to the strategic planning of global health innovation could be helpful. Summing up, the results show that the United States and Europe differ in their attitudes to pharmaceutical innovation, yet each of them has its critical advantages to the world ecosystem. Future studies can also assist in harmonising these two different models and achieving a unified approach to the next-generation drug discovery by ethical collaboration, harmonisation, and technological perfection.

Conclusion

This comparative study has discussed pharmaceutical innovation and biotechnological development in the United States and Europe. It has shown both similarities and differences in how scientific, regulatory, and institutional institutions drive drug discovery. The findings show that although both regions have reached incredible milestones, the pathway to innovation is very different. The United States is dependent on private investment, venture capital, and fast market-based development, which makes integration of artificial intelligence, automation, and molecular innovation easy and fast. Europe, however, takes a more structured and policy-based approach, which focuses on harmonisation of regulations, environmental sustainability and research ecosystems. It is also indicated in the analysis that the two elements of sustainability and patient-focused approaches are no longer fringe issues; they are becoming central to drug development in the present day. The green movement of innovation introduced by the European Union, called GreenMedChem, and the focus on eco-friendly innovation represent the opposite of entrepreneurial momentum and market flexibility of the United States. However, the two areas are becoming more united in terms of applying AI and data-driven techniques, transforming molecular design, drug discovery, and translational research.

Ultimately, the study concludes that the best models for innovation are those that offer a combination of scientific excellence and ethical accountability and sustainability practices. Policy

makers and business executives need to strike a balance between efficiency and equity to have fast technological progress without harming the environment and the well-being of patients. The experience of the two regions has shown that pharmaceutical research of the future is not only about the breakthrough technologies but also about the inclusive ruling and cross-border cooperation. Such results add to an increasing amount of research that would support the implementation of integrative world systems to promote responsible and sustainable medicine.

References

Aguilar, G. R., Swetschinski, L. R., Weaver, N. D., Ikuta, K. S., Mestrovic, T., Gray, A. P., ... & Naghavi, M. (2023). The burden of antimicrobial resistance in the Americas in 2019: a cross-country systematic analysis. The Lancet Regional Health–Americas, 25.

Ahmed, S., Ali, A., & Mansoor, M. T. (2025). Cognitive Representations of Generative AI among Pre-Service Teachers: A Phenomenological Study in a Teacher Education College in Karachi. *The Critical Review of Social Sciences Studies*, *3*(4), 2264-2273.

Ahmed, S., Faisal, M., Hasan, S. S. F., & Ghazi, M. A. (2025). Impact of Artificial Intelligence (AI) on Teacher Self-Efficacy: A Systematic Literature Review. *Social Science Review Archives*, *3*(4), 3406-3415.

Ahmed, S., Urooj, S., Farheen, S., & Ishaq, M. (2025). Impact of Ethical AI Use on Learning Patterns of Pre-Service Teachers at a Public Sector University in Karachi. *Academia International Journal for Social Sciences*, *4*(4), 3305-3315.

Ali, A., Bauser, M., Bertrand, S., Blackaby, W., Boss, C., Bossart, M., ... & von Nussbaum, F. (2023). European Medicinal Chemistry Leaders in Industry (EMCL)–On the Status and Future of Medicinal Chemistry Research in Europe. ChemMedChem, 18(13), e202300127.

Ali, M., Shabbir, K., Ali, S., Mohsin, M., Kumar, A., Aziz, M., ... & Sultan, H. M. (2024). A new era of discovery: how artificial intelligence has revolutionized the biotechnology. Nepal Journal of Biotechnology, 12(1), 1-11.

Arzu, F., Ali, R., & Muneeb, M. T (2025). The Role of FinTech Accelerators & Incubators in Nurturing Entrepreneurial Innovation: A Multiple Case Study of European Hubs. *ACADEMIA International Journal for Social Sciences*, *4*(4), 3725-3736.

Arzu, F., Sattar, M. S., Sultan, S., Abrar, K., & Khuharo, Z. H. (2025). Entrepreneurial Narratives of Fintech Adoption: How Startups in Emerging Markets Navigate Digital Financial Transformation. *Journal of Management Science Research Review*, *4*(4), 473-504.

Asad, A. I., & Popesko, B. (2023). Contemporary challenges in the European pharmaceutical industry: A systematic literature review. Measuring Business Excellence, 27(2), 277-290.

Ashraf, N., Arzu, F., Abrar, K., & Anwar, M. (2025). Narratives of SMEs on Access to Finance: Barriers and Opportunities in Pakistan's Banking Sector. *The Critical Review of Social Sciences Studies*, *3*(4), 262-277.

Asif, M., Jabbar, S., & Yusaf, S. (2026). Employee Perspectives on Remote Work Culture and Leadership in Hybrid Organisations. *The Critical Review of Social Sciences Studies*, *4*(1), 151-167.

Bennett, A., & Elman, C. (2006). Qualitative research: Recent developments in case study methods. *Annu. Rev. Polit. Sci.*, *9*(1), 455-476.

Bhutani, P., Joshi, G., Raja, N., Bachhav, N., Rajanna, P. K., Bhutani, H., ... & Kumar, R. (2021). US FDA approved drugs from 2015–June 2020: a perspective. Journal of Medicinal Chemistry, 64(5), 2339-2381.

Braun, V., Clarke, V., & Hayfield, N. (2022). 'A starting point for your journey, not a map': Nikki Hayfield in conversation with Virginia Braun and Victoria Clarke about thematic analysis. *Qualitative research in psychology*, *19*(2), 424-445.

Byrne, D. (2022). A worked example of Braun and Clarke's approach to reflexive thematic analysis. *Quality & quantity*, *56*(3), 1391-1412.

Castiello, C., Junghanns, P., Mergel, A., Jacob, C., Ducho, C., Valente, S., ... & Mai, A. (2023). GreenMedChem: the challenge in the next decade toward eco-friendly compounds and processes in drug design. Green Chemistry, 25(6), 2109-2169.

Chakraborty, C., Bhattacharya, M., & Lee, S. S. (2023). Artificial intelligence enabled ChatGPT and large language models in drug target discovery, drug discovery, and development. Molecular therapy Nucleic acids, 33, 866-868.

Cherchem, N., & Keen, C. (2022). International entrepreneurial ecosystem, knowledge exploitation and innovation: Case of international pharma-biotech SME. In The International Dimension of Entrepreneurial Decision-Making: Cultures, Contexts, and Behaviours (pp. 65-79). Cham: Springer International Publishing.

Dane, C., Cumbers, G. A., Allen, B., Montgomery, A. P., Danon, J. J., & Kassiou, M. (2024). Unlocking therapeutic potential: the role of adamantane in drug discovery. Australian Journal of Chemistry, 77(8).

Daniotti, S., & Re, I. (2021). Marine biotechnology: challenges and development market trends for the enhancement of biotic resources in industrial pharmaceutical and food applications. A statistical analysis of scientific literature and business models. Marine drugs, 19(2), 61.

Das, B. C., Nandwana, N. K., Das, S., Nandwana, V., Shareef, M. A., Das, Y., ... & Evans, T. (2022). Boron chemicals in drug discovery and development: Synthesis and medicinal perspective. Molecules, 27(9), 2615.

Faltus, T. (2024). The medicinal phage—regulatory roadmap for phage therapy under EU pharmaceutical legislation. Viruses, 16(3), 443.

Garcia Jimenez, D., Poongavanam, V., & Kihlberg, J. (2023). Macrocycles in drug discovery─ learning from the past for the future. Journal of medicinal chemistry, 66(8), 5377-5396.

Guedeney, N., Cornu, M., Schwalen, F., Kieffer, C., & Voisin-Chiret, A. S. (2023). PROTAC technology: A new drug design for chemical biology with many challenges in drug discovery. Drug Discovery Today, 28(1), 103395.

Han, R., Yoon, H., Kim, G., Lee, H., & Lee, Y. (2023). Revolutionizing medicinal chemistry: the application of artificial intelligence (AI) in early drug discovery. Pharmaceuticals, 16(9), 1259.

Hanif, I., Asif, M., & Yusaf, S. (2026). From stress to success: The role of AI and digital technologies in employee support programs to enhance productivity in Pakistan's public and private sectors. *International Journal of Social Sciences Bulletin, 4*(2), 797–801.

Heilbron, K., Mozaffari, S. V., Vacic, V., Yue, P., Wang, W., Shi, J., ... & Wang, X. (2021). Advancing drug discovery using the power of the human genome. The Journal of pathology, 254(4), 418-429.

Hole, L. (2024). Handle with care; considerations of Braun and Clarke's approach to thematic analysis. *Qualitative research journal*, *24*(4), 371-383.

Huigens III, R. W., Brummel, B. R., Tenneti, S., Garrison, A. T., & Xiao, T. (2022). Pyrazine and phenazine heterocycles: Platforms for total synthesis and drug discovery. Molecules, 27(3), 1112.

Jabbar, S., & Gul, M. (2026). Impact of Organizational Justice on Organizational Commitment and Organizational Citizenship Behavior with the Mediating Effect of Organizational Trust. *Social Science Review Archives*, *4*(1), 808-828.

Jobson, E., Garcia, M., Sharek, D., Risueño, L., Arnould, S., Lemoine-André, A., ... & West, J. (2024). Embedding patient engagement in the R&D process of a life sciences company through co-creation with a patient expert R&D board: a case study. Research Involvement and Engagement, 10(1), 116.

Kausar, T., & Ahmed, S. (2026). Impact of Artificial Intelligence (AI) on Educational Leadership: A Systematic Literature. *Academia International Journal for Social Sciences*, *5*(1), 97-106

Khan, H. A., Butt, M. A. A., Noor, S., Ishaq, S. M., & Siddiqui, F. (2025). Redefining Pedagogy: Investigating the Intersection of Technology Integration and Traditional Teaching Methods in Pakistan's Educational Research Landscape. *The Critical Review of Social Sciences Studies*, *3*(4), 1543-1558.

Khan, H. A., Kausar, T., & Khan, S. (2025). Leading AI-Integrated Pedagogies: A Qualitative Study on How School Leaders Guide Teachers in Using AI Tools for Teaching and Learning in Pakistan. *Social Science Review Archives*, *3*(4), 3086-3101.

Khuharo, Z. H., Ayub, M. J., & Ali, R. (2025). How Investors Interpret Risk in the Pakistan Stock Exchange: Lived Experiences of Retail Traders. *Social Science Review Archives*, *3*(4), 3281-3297.

Liao, C., Xiao, S., & Wang, X. (2023). Bench-to-bedside: Translational development landscape of biotechnology in healthcare. Health sciences review, 7, 100097.

Lyu, Y. X., Fu, Q., Wilczok, D., Ying, K., King, A., Antebi, A., ... & Mansukhani, R. (2024). Longevity biotechnology: bridging AI, biomarkers, geroscience and clinical applications for healthy longevity. Aging (Albany NY), 16(20), 12955.

Malik, N. A., Parveen, S., & Hanif, I. (2026). Explainable AI (XAI) in Practice: Users' Perceptions of Transparency and Understanding in Automated Decision Systems. *The Asian Bulletin of Big Data Management*, *6*(1), 119-137.

Quancard, J., Bach, A., Cox, B., Craft, R., Finsinger, D., Guéret, S. M., ... & Koolman, H. F. (2021). The European Federation for medicinal chemistry and chemical biology (EFMC) best practice initiative: phenotypic drug discovery. ChemMedChem, 16(11), 1737-1740.

Qureshi, R., Irfan, M., Gondal, T. M., Khan, S., Wu, J., Hadi, M. U., ... & Alam, T. (2023). AI in drug discovery and its clinical relevance. Heliyon, 9(7).

Rehmat, M. A. R., Hassan, H., Rumaan, M., & Abrar, K. (2025). IT Sector Transition to Agile: Managerial Challenges and Cultural Dynamics in Pakistan's Technology Firms. *Social Science Review Archives*, *3*(4), 479-494.

Rehmat, M. A., Hassan, H., Khan, H. A., & Abrar, K. (2025). Artificial Intelligence in the Classroom: Teachers' Lived Experiences and Ethical Concerns in Educational Integration. *ASSAJ*, *4*(02), 629-645.

Rehmat, M. A., Hassan, H., Rumaan, M., Baig, J., & Abrar, K. (2025). Human-Centred Explainable AI in Emerging Markets: Trust and Confidence Among Non-Technical Users in Pakistan. *Annual Methodological Archive Research Review*, *3*(10), 145-163.

Sertkaya, A., Beleche, T., Jessup, A., & Sommers, B. D. (2024). Costs of drug development and research and development intensity in the US, 2000-2018. JAMA network open, 7(6), e2415445-e2415445.

Singh, D. B., Pathak, R. K., & Rai, D. (2022). From traditional herbal medicine to rational drug discovery: strategies, challenges, and future perspectives. Revista Brasileira de Farmacognosia, 32(2), 147-159.

Tilby, M. J., & Willis, M. C. (2021). How do we address neglected sulfur pharmacophores in drug discovery?. Expert Opinion on Drug Discovery, 16(11), 1227-1231.

Wang, J., Wu, M., Huang, X., Wang, L., Zhang, S., Liu, H., & Zheng, J. (2022). SynLethDB 2.0: a web-based knowledge graph database on synthetic lethality for novel anticancer drug discovery. Database, 2022, baac030.

Weaver, D. F. (2024). Chemists invent drugs and drugs save lives. ChemMedChem, 19(12), e202400074.

Wesseler, J., Kleter, G., Meulenbroek, M., & Purnhagen, K. P. (2023). EU regulation of genetically modified microorganisms in light of new policy developments: Possible implications for EU bioeconomy investments. Applied Economic Perspectives and Policy, 45(2), 839-859.

Williamson, J., Spicer, A. J., Louramo, E., & Jalkanen, J. (2024). Unveiling the impacts of FDA Breakthrough Therapy Designation: a dual-perspective examination of economic and developmental outcomes for biotechnology companies. Drug discovery today, 29(4), 103919.

York, D. M. (2023). Modern alchemical free energy methods for drug discovery explained. ACS Physical Chemistry Au, 3(6), 478-491.

Zeb, S. S., Abrar, K., Saqib, S., & Rizvi, S. A. A. (2025). Economic dimensions of health protection under Sehat Sahulat Program: A qualitative assessment of urban and rural households in Pakistan. *ACADEMIA International Journal for Social Sciences*, *4*(4), 2259-2273.