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Strategy

Sample beliefs and expectations of patients concerning AE monitoring and communication

Sample different ways AE monitoring is presented to subjects
Focus Group Study

Identify variety of beliefs and expectations

Goal is not to establish prevalence of beliefs and expectations
4 Groups

Clinical Trial Experience

No

- White (n = 5)
- African-American (n = 8)

Yes

- White (n = 6)
- African-American (n = 8)
## Sample Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Mean (SD)</th>
<th>Min - Max</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>34.4 (11.95)</td>
<td>22 - 60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Male gender (%) | 48 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race (%)</th>
<th>59</th>
<th>41</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African-American</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education (%)</th>
<th>30</th>
<th>22</th>
<th>26</th>
<th>22</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(\leq) High school diploma</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some college</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s degree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced degree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Groups conducted at Duke’s Social Science Research Institute

90 minute discussion

$100 compensation

Groups video recorded and transcribed

Discussion guide adjusted after each group
Understanding of Terms

medical or clinical research
clinical trial
blind or double-blind trial
role of investigator in a clinical trial
sponsor of a trial
adverse event
serious adverse event
IRB
DSMB
Sample Queries

How do investigators monitor patient safety?

Who should be responsible for monitoring?

What should be done when AEs occur?

How and when should other trial participants be informed?
Results
Preview of Findings

Satisfactory understanding of terms

Investigators should be told about all SAEs

Wide variability in whether and when trial participants should be told

Variability in how participants should be told

And a loud, surprising result . . .
Understanding

Pretty good
Understanding

Unfamiliar

IRB
DSMB
Understanding

Confusing

monitoring patients in multicenter or multinational trials
Reporting SAEs

Investigators should be told about all SAEs.
Notifying Research Participants

I need to know about every SAE, because it may affect me.

...when an SAE happens to a person like me.

...when there is a trend of SAEs that are linked to the study drug.
Notifying Research Participants

- Phone call within 24 hours after SAE is reported
- Email, within 2-3 days
- Next clinic visit
...the physician talks to the investigator, the investigator talks...well, that’s a mass e-mail. That’s one day.

That’s a couple hours everyone could be notified.
Concerns about Independence / COI

Who polices the investigators when SAEs occur? “... because there’s a lot of money on the line for this drug to get passed.”

What happens to research personnel salaries if study is ended early due to SAEs?

Sponsor should not be responsible for monitoring or reporting safety, because of a conflict of interest.
Summary of Findings

Decent understanding of terms

Investigators should be told about all SAEs

Wide variability in whether and when trial participants should be told

Variability in how participants should be told

Serious concerns about financial conflicts of interest in monitoring and reporting
Consent Document Review

Sample ways in which AE monitoring and reporting is described to potential research participants at Duke

Provide point of reference for focus group results
Consent Document Review

Prospective RCTs coordinated by the Duke Clinical Research Institute

Identified and coded language about SAE disclosure

Readability diagnostics
Sample of Consent Documents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding</th>
<th>N=15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combination</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I/II</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
All forms contained language regarding monitoring and communicating safety information

Sample:

“You will be told of important new findings or any changes in the study or procedures that may affect you or your willingness to continue in the study.”
# Location of Language

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section of Consent Document</th>
<th>N=15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Risks or Side Effects</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Information</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rights</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Readability of AE-related Language

Grade-Level Equivalent
Content of the Language

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Content Code</th>
<th>N = 15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New Information</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant information</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affect willingness to participate</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timeframe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“as soon as possible”</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“in a timely manner”</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
NEW FINDINGS

If important new findings come up that might change your decision to be in this study, you will be given information about those findings as soon as possible. If you choose to stay in the study, you may be asked to sign a new version of the consent form.
3 Conclusions
1. Increase understanding about clinical trials and how risks are managed.
2. Language in consent forms should reflect reality.
3. Need to address conflicts of interest to restore/maintain trust.

Cannot assume disclosure is sufficient

Make the system trustworthy

Tell patients why it’s trustworthy
Conclusions

1. Increase understanding about clinical trials and how risks are managed.

2. Language in consent forms should reflect reality.

3. Need to address conflicts of interest to restore/maintain trust.