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Clinical Trial Quality-by-Design

- Objectives: To more effectively and efficiently
  - Protect trial participants
  - Ensure the reliability of study results to benefit future patients
- Systematic, prioritized, risk-based approach to trial design, conduct, and monitoring that is “fit for purpose”

“How can a small company implement quality-by-design?”
Quality-by-Design is Ideal for Small Companies

**Small Companies**

- Limited resources
  - Money
  - Time
  - People
- Can’t do everything so forced to prioritize and focus
- Little tolerance for errors or second chances
  - Have to get it right the first time
- Flexible and agile with rapid decision-making

**Quality-by-Design**

- More efficient and therefore less costly
  - Cornerstone is prioritization and focus
  - Proactive, not reactive
- Real-time risk management and corrective action plans so problems stay small rather than become large and pervasive
- Rapid decision-making and adaptation/adjustments
## Quality-By-Design Terminology

### Signature Features:
- Set up in advance and continuous improvement
- Effective and efficient

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pharmaceutical Development</th>
<th>Clinical Trial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Critical Quality Attributes</td>
<td>Critical Success Factors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process Measures and Controls</td>
<td>Proactive Design, Training and Tracking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Space</td>
<td>Risk-Based Targeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuous Improvement</td>
<td>Corrective Action Plans</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Critical Success Factors

- Those clinical trial factors most likely to impact patient safety and data reliability
  - Phase 1: Safety monitoring and accuracy of PK timepoints and sample handling
  - Phase 2: Safety monitoring and accurate data collection for biomarker or efficacy endpoint(s)
  - Phase 3: Reliable efficacy endpoint collection; targeted safety monitoring
Critical Success Factors

- Will vary by phase of development, patient population and therapeutic area
  - Phase 3 Prostate Cancer Trial with overall survival as primary endpoint
    - Enroll the right patients: meet inclusion/exclusion criteria; not so ill that drug has no chance
    - Keep patients on study drug as long as possible
    - No patients lost to follow-up
  - Phase 3 Alzheimer’s Disease Trial with more subjective outcome measures
    - Experienced and well-trained raters
    - Reliable reporters/caregivers
    - Low discontinuation rate
Key Check Points for Critical Success Factors

- **Randomization Authorization Form**
  - Requires prior approval by a medical monitor to enroll a trial participant; proactive check for site error
  - Medical monitor checks central labs, ECGs, and information filled out on a brief form

- **Contact form**: requires contact information for 3 people who will always know the patient’s whereabouts

- **Track reasons for early discontinuations**: medical monitors contact investigators and limit enrollment at sites that are poorly compliant

- **Rater qualification and certification**
Proactive Design, Training, and Tracking

- **Protocol Design**
  - “Fit-for-purpose” design: simple elegance
  - Sponsor, key investigators, key study coordinators

- **Training**
  - Select the right people “fit for purpose”
  - Prioritized training based upon critical success factors
  - Train at central investigators’ meeting and at site initiation visits for later phase trials
  - Monitor training; investigator training; study coordinator training
  - Continues until the trial is over
Monitors and Site Personnel

- Interview, select and train
  - Ensure adequate experience for complexity of trial
  - Personally interview all monitors
  - Select sites; don’t outsource that task

- Review trip reports
  - Are action items closed in a timely fashion?
  - Does the PI meet with the monitor?
  - Is there adequate PI oversight?
  - Is the study coordinator experienced and effective?

“If you have adequately trained the right people, quality is usually not an issue”
Data Tracking: A Rich Source of Information About Overall Trial Quality

- Data Tracking is now easy and very do-able with electronic data capture
  - Enrollment rates
  - Timeliness of data entry
    - Is the site adequately staffed?
  - Timeliness of source data verification
    - Is the monitor experienced, efficient and organized? Enough time?
    - Are the site personnel experienced and committed enough to enter high-quality data with organized and adequate source documentation?
  - Listing and patient profile review; overall data quality
  - Number of queries
  - Timeliness of answering queries
  - Adverse event rates
  - Early discontinuation rates
Safety

- Monitoring at site
  - Adequacy of informed consent
  - Investigator oversight and involvement
  - Missed adverse event reporting
  - Adherence to protocol
  - Study drug accountability

- Data Review
  - Timeliness of SAE reporting
  - Outliers for adverse event reporting
  - Responsiveness to AE queries

- Safety Management Committee for signal detection
- Independent Data Monitoring Committee as indicated
Audits

- Quality is an integrated part of study team
  - Trusted advisor; shares responsibility; regularly attends team meetings
  - Audit plan set up at outset but responsive to trial data and realities

- Audits occur early in study
  - To identify gaps/oversights of monitors and study team
  - To identify areas in need of re-training; suboptimal processes
  - At sites in new regions
  - At sites expected to be high enrollers

- Adaptive auditing
  - High enrolling
  - Site/monitor personnel issues
  - Data quality issues
Quality-by-Design: No Silos
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Continuous Improvement
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Risk-Based Approach to Quality

- The primary source of data quality occurs at the individual site
  - This is where data are collected, entered, and verified
- All sites are not equal
- Sites are prioritized for level of risk based upon cumulative data
  - Qualification and experience of site personnel (monitor, PI, SC)
  - Enrollment
  - Data timeliness (data entry, source data verification)
  - Adherence to protocol/GCP
  - Data quality and responsiveness to queries
Risk-Based Approach to Quality

- Actions taken to improve quality
  - Direct interaction with monitors
  - Call to investigator by medical monitor
  - Co-monitoring by sponsor; direct interaction with site personnel and monitor
  - Audits

- Monitoring, training, and auditing plans are adapted based upon findings over time

- Currently do not allow less than 100% source data verification of every patient at every site: one size fits all
Challenges

- Risk-based approach to auditing is well-defined by regulators

- Risk-based approach to monitoring is not well-defined
  - Companies don’t want to take risk as inadequate monitoring uncovered at an inspection is catastrophic

- Level of required documentation
Potential Solution

- Define a “design space” for clinical trial monitoring
  - Risk-based targeting for monitoring could be defined
  - Sponsor could be allowed to make adjustments to the monitoring and quality management plans “real-time” during the course of the study based upon accumulating data
    - Increased monitoring at selected sites based upon issues
    - Decreased monitoring at selected sites based upon data quality
    - Random monitoring to keep everyone alert
    - Incentive for sites to do an excellent job
Potential Solution

- **Examples**
  - Site visits can be discontinued at lower enrolling sites with timely data entry, excellent investigator oversight and high data quality based upon review of eCRF and initial site visit(s).
  - Alternative: 100% SDV can be decreased to key data fields at highly rated sites
  - Every site must have at least one on-site monitoring visit. The number and frequency of subsequent monitoring visits should be determined by:
    - Enrollment, investigator and coordinator experience, data quality, trial complexity, drug safety
    - A percentage (10%?) of sites should always be selected at random
Conclusions

- Quality-by-design in clinical trials can be accomplished by companies of all sizes, for each phase of development, and for all therapeutic areas.

- Regulatory guidance is needed to define the “design space” for trial monitoring
  - Allow real-time decision-making by the sponsor during the conduct of the trial based upon accumulating data:
  - “Risk-based Targeted Monitoring”