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Disclaimer

The views and opinions expressed in this presentation are those of the individual presenter and do not necessarily reflect the views of the Clinical Trials Transformation Initiative.

The presenter is an Employee of Medtronic.
Expert Interviews Overview

Purpose: Gather expert opinions regarding the feasibility of using clinical registries for prospective clinical trials

Interviews conducted for CTTI by RTI International
- From October 13, 2015 to November 23, 2015
Interviewee Selection and Recruitment

- CTTI project team identified experts
  - Inclusion: knowledge regarding the use of registry data in clinical trials

- CTTI Project Manager sent email invitation

- RTI followed up to schedule interviews

37 Experts identified → 29 Agreed to participate → 25 Interviewed
### Who was interviewed?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academia</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other*</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patient Groups</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharm Industry</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRO</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>25</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Patient Advocates
- Physicians
- Clinical Trial Investigators
- Statisticians
- Epidemiologists
- Lawyers
- Existing Registry Managers/Sponsors
- Regulators
## Thank you Interviewees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ron Bartek</th>
<th>Sharon-Lise Normand</th>
<th>Rich Platt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elise Berliner</td>
<td>Stefan James</td>
<td>Sunil V. Rao</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ralph Brindis</td>
<td>Javier Jimenez</td>
<td>Kristen Rosati</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greg Daniel</td>
<td>Jeffrey S. Kasher</td>
<td>John Rumsfeld</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Dowd</td>
<td>Mitchell Krucoff</td>
<td>Bob Temple</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy Dreyer</td>
<td>Beverly Lorell</td>
<td>Carol Ann Wallace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ole Frobert</td>
<td>Danica Marinac-Dabic</td>
<td>Bram Zuckerman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharon Hesterlee</td>
<td>Evan Myers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louis Jacques</td>
<td>Bray Patrick-Lake</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Interview Guide and Process

- 14 question structured guide
  - Many open-ended questions
  - Questions could be skipped if covered in response to previous question or not relevant to interviewee
  - Probe questions to gain more detail when applicable

- Verbal informed consent provided

- Interviews recorded, transcribed, and coded to summarize responses and identify themes
Topics Covered

- Confirming Registry Definition
- Feasibility of Using Registries for Embedded Clinical Trials
- Strengths and Weaknesses of Registries
- Barriers and Potential Solutions (divided into 2 tiers of priority)
- Device Registries and Trials: Experience, Differences between Drug and Device Trials
- Adapting Registry (Tools, Experience, Regulations) for drug or device Trials
- Operational Adjustments for Registries to be Used in Clinical Trials
- Prioritized Issues
- Actionable Items: Near-term and Long-term
Items with broad agreement

Definition of registry

An adapted version of the EMA’s definition of registry is being used for this project: “An organized system that uses observational methods to collect uniform data on specified outcomes in a population defined by a particular disease, condition or exposure. A registry can be used as a data source within which studies can be performed. Entry in a registry is generally defined either by diagnosis of a disease (disease registry) or prescription of a drug, device, or other treatment (exposure registry).” [Source: EMA: Guideline on good pharmacovigilance practices (GVP).] The majority of the interviewees agreed with this definition.

Caveats: Different from AHRQ definition (esp. predetermined purpose); ties to demographic information, communication, and recruitment
Items with broad agreement

Registries can be more widely used to facilitate embedded clinical trials

Comments:
Primarily valuable for recruitment
Ideal to better design a study
Help to track long term outcomes
Some concern with bias and variability, esp. for rare diseases
Items with broad agreement

Some adaption of registry items would work for clinical trials

Comments:

Concerns about quality of data (including monitoring related issues)

Registries should be set up from the beginning to support trials

Regulatory guidance, appropriate informed consent, IRB and DMC operations, and contractual niceties are all potential considerations
Items with broad agreement

Sufficiency of data (answer: it depends)

Comments:

Concerns about the extent to which the design of the registry adequately supports the research question

Several concerns about various aspects of data quality
Items with broad agreement

Data quality is a potential weakness for registries

Comments:

This is a recurring concern, and is also present in responses to tier 1 and tier 2 barriers, as well as the earlier question on sufficiency of data.
Topics without broad consensus

Strengths of registries

Multiple strengths seen, but spread across several broad categories

Not necessarily an item for which we need to achieve broad consensus
Topics without broad consensus

Determining the most pressing issues for registries

Lack of will question could be chicken and egg scenario

Harmonization and standardization are related data issues, though distinct from quality

Reliability of data may be a facet of data quality

We will address data quality, registry design, regulatory, and governance issues in breakout groups later today
Suggested items for further discussion

What should we encourage for near term actionable items?
- Variety of suggestions from experts
- Mostly around how to improve using registry data from trials
- Also some specific items around data and regulations

What should nature of these items be?
- Publications
- Consensus building/meetings
- Infrastructure
- Other
- Coordinated or dispersed
Suggested items for further discussion

What should we encourage for longer term action items?

- Three major themes from expert interviews: development of registries, costs, and data issues

Development: domestic or international? Legislative mandate or voluntary cooperation? Organized by CTTI, MDEpiNet, professional societies, other?

Costs: Elements of a sustainable, scalable business model?

Data issues: drive change or leverage change? Relationship to other initiatives?
For additional details, please refer to “Interview report” item
- Link from meeting materials email from Kimberly Smith at CTTI
Thank you.
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