STM JOURNALS

Research & Reviews: A Journal of
Drug Design & Discovery

https://journals.stmjournals.com/rrjoddd/

ISSN: 2349-9036
Volume 11, Issue 1, 2024
January–April
DOI (Journal): 10.37591/RRJoDDD

Research RRJoDDD

Navigating the Horizon: Current Trends in Elevating Quality Assurance in Clinical Research

Patil Divyashree Kantilal[1,*], Patil Bhagyshri Sandip[2], Patil Bhushan Ravindra[3], Patil Divyani Rajendra[4]

Abstract

The landscape of clinical research quality management has evolved significantly in recent years, driven by stringent regulatory frameworks and globalization of trials. This evolution underscores the importance of integrating quality into all aspects of the clinical trial process from design to post-research activities. Concepts such as Good Clinical Practice (GCP) and Quality by Design (QbD) are central to ensuring the reliability and accuracy of trial data while safeguarding patient safety and welfare. Challenges in quality assurance include the complexity of studies, outsourcing of trial activities, and the need for continuous monitoring and improvement. The convergence of emerging technologies and evolving regulatory frameworks, complemented by collaborative endeavors among industry, academia, and regulatory bodies, significantly influence the trajectory of clinical research quality management. This collective effort aims to enhance the integrity, efficiency, and safety of global clinical trials, fostering continual advancements in the field. Moving forward, integrated quality management plans, end-of-research reporting, and knowledge sharing will be the key to advancing the quality and integrity of clinical trials worldwide.

Keywords: Data integrity, inspection, quality systems, risk-based monitoring, subject protection.

INTRODUCTION

The ability to address concerns effectively and quickly regarding the benefits and risks of a pharmaceutical product or process while ensuring the safety of human subjects is what defines quality. Sponsors must raise the quality by enhancing systems with clear standards for each clinical test procedure to meet regulatory expectations. Sponsors of clinical research and contract research organizations are required to establish, manage, and oversee quality control and quality assurance systems, along with their essential SOPs and other quality documents, as well as deliver high-quality goods and services that fully satisfy customers' needs and expectations. Scientifically acceptable and ethically sound experimental design; sufficient protection of subjects' rights, safety, and welfare; qualified personnel; sufficient surveillance; and current, comprehensive, and accurate data are all essential elements of high-quality clinical studies.

***Author for Correspondence**
Patil Divyashree Kantilal
E-mail: divyashree2609@gmail.com

[1-4]Student M Pharm, Department of Pharmaceutical Quality Assurance, P.S.G.V.P. Mandal's College of Pharmacy Shahada, Maharashtra, India

Received Date: March 03, 2024
Accepted Date: April 04, 2024
Published Date: April 15, 2024

Citation: Patil Divyashree Kantilal, Patil Bhagyshri Sandip, Patil Bhushan Ravindra, Patil Divyani Rajendra. Navigating the Horizon: Current Trends in Elevating Quality Assurance in Clinical Research. Research & Reviews: A Journal of Drug Design & Discovery. 2024; 11(1): 1–8p.

In recent years, the regulatory framework for clinical research has changed because of the addition of stringent procedures to ensure patient security and data reliability. Traditionally, quality management has been separated. To prevent failure, maximize the use of reliable resources, and ensure consistency and dependability of results, health research must use the concepts of vitally crucial quality management.

Concept of Quality in Clinical Trial

Good clinical practice (GCP) is the global standard for ethical and scientific excellence in

clinical trials. The entire clinical trial procedure was performed in accordance with the GCP standard. According to GCP regulations, quality is a continuum that starts with design, is crucial when conducting and recording, and continues during the reporting of trials. Consequently, a poor procedure or case record form (CRF) would result in more monitoring findings and data requests. The rights, integrity, and confidentiality of the trial participants were protected when the GCP quality standard was followed throughout the clinical trial process. This ensured that the data and reported results were reliable and accurate.

Benefit concepts have been added to the GCP idea of quality, such as the risks associated with novel pharmaceutical entities (NME). Quality is defined as "the ability to successfully answer the intended question about the benefits and risks of a medical product (therapeutic or diagnostic) or treatment, while ensuring the protection of human subjects" by the Clinical Trials Transformation Initiative (CTTI). Although the quality requirements for clinical trials have not changed over time, compliance with these requirements has become more difficult to attain as a result of the evolving environment in which clinical trials are conducted.

Quality Issues in Clinical Research

Traditionally, sponsor audits and regulatory inspections appraise the quality of clinical research guided at an investigator site. The main reasons for the downfall during clinical progression are as follows:

- Safety concerns
- Lack of effectiveness
- The inability to disclose failures before human testing or at an early stage of development.

Some Usual Shortages Observed Throughout Site Inspections (According to Allen, 2012) [1]

- Abandoning the investigative program and failing to sign the investigator declaration or consent
- Deviations from the Protocol
- Inadequate record keeping, weak subject security, including concerns about informed consent.

However, sponsors and their teams are crucial for the effectiveness of the website. According to a previous study, some often-occurring sponsor deficits are as follows:

- Inability to verify investigator adherence,
- Inadequate monitoring,
- Failure to present progress reports,
- Failure to notify the United States Food and Drug Administration (US FDA),
- Inadequate investigational product responsibility,
- An unsigned investigator agreement, and a failure to get the FDA,
- IRB approval is an example of failure [2–3].

Quality—the Changing Landscape

Audits and site inspections of clinical trial sites have historically been the foundation of quality assurance systems. Several factors have put pressure on this system. The protocols for clinical trials have become more intricate. Getz found that between 1999 and 2005, the number of distinct study methods increased by 6.5% a year after studying over 10,000 protocols. The average number of inclusion criteria nearly tripled over the same period. As a result, the burden on the investigator's site significantly increased. The site burden increased by 10.5% per year. The CRF length increased by 227% from an average of 55 pages in 1999 to 180 pages in 2005. Dr. Getz concluded that such a considerable increase in the burden on the investigator would be detrimental to the operation of the site.

Globalization of clinical trials is an important aspect. Since 2002, the number of active FDA-regulated investigators based outside the US has increased by 15% annually, according to Glickman et al. Between 1995 and 2005, the number of nations outside the United States that participated in clinical

trials doubled. There are concerns regarding the ethical and scientific ramifications of the globalization of clinical trials, because many of these trials are in developing nations. The quality of trials may be impacted by stark variations between industrialized and developing nations' educational, social, and healthcare systems, as well as those between their standards of care, clinical practice, and medical education.

The present outsourcing strategy and business models make quality management even more challenging. According to Getz and Vogel's study of global outsourcing, pharmaceutical businesses outsource a wide range of tasks and responsibilities. In addition, there was a trend towards the use of various outsourcing partners, the internal recruitment of clinical research specialists, and the use of various relationship structures. Pharmaceutical sponsors work with a variety of clinical research organizations (CROs), including full-service and specialized CROs. In addition, Favor used practical CROs for outsourcing. This means that many CROs managing various tasks, including regulatory approval, protocol development, site management, monitoring, data management, statistics, and medical writing, may share the responsibility of managing the entire clinical trial process. This could entail CROs using various standard operating procedures (SOPs) or the sponsor requesting that each CRO adhere to the sponsor's SOPs. Inadequate documentation, a murky line between what sponsors and CROs are responsible for, and a limited ability to review the CRO function in real time are consequences of fragmented outsourcing. Conducting a thorough root-cause analysis and taking appropriate corrective measures are also challenging. The FDA is concerned that the involvement of so many third parties in clinical studies could compromise data integrity and/or human subject protection.

Site Monitoring Includes

- For any monitoring pattern, it is almost impossible to completely rule out on-site visits, which serve as the main support for traditional monitoring.
- Central monitoring, statistical risk analyses, and/or other techniques may provide hints about the frequency and focus of visits.
- Site visits are crucial for training procedures, processes, and relevant legislation. They also validated the availability of site resources and ensured that submissions adhered to policies and regulations.

The current system has not evolved to meet changing demands. The complexity of studies has increased over time, thereby increasing the demand for resources. In accordance with CFR-21, third parties such as contract research firms are hired to perform the sponsor's duties. Institutional review boards are becoming more central to clinical research in accordance with the recent FDA guidelines (2010). According to Glickman et al. (2009), sponsors are increasingly incorporating locations across numerous nations into a single clinical trial project, affecting resources and having effects that may not become fully apparent for many years.

Quality by Design (QbD) in Clinical Research

To capitalize on the success of bringing new products to the market quicker, safer, smarter, and less expensive, QbD is a strategic and systemic approach to better product development.

A new product progression toolkit from the QbD in clinical research includes new evaluative and predictive tools. Enhancing predictability and efficiency along the crucial path with new predictive tools includes the early identification of product candidates with maximum efficacy versus molecular and biological processes and early estimation of product safety. The effectiveness of clinical research and healthcare can be improved by using new evaluation tools. A paradigm shift towards learning or verifying structure and creative research design, or adaptable clinical research, was launched as a result of QbD transitioning the research and error landscape in clinical research and studies to a mechanistic-based approach. They pave the way for a new phase in the development of pharmaceuticals that includes an experimental phase before preclinical research and before commercialization.

- Streamline, organize, and increase the effectiveness of clinical drug development.
- Enhancing product understanding at an early stage would improve science.
- More reliable and reproducible products.
- Improving effectiveness while lowering patient safety barriers.

Barbara Leishman of Chiltern claims that QbD establishes a clear linkage between the safety and effectiveness of the therapeutic product in patients. The preparation procedure has a direct impact on product quality. It is necessary for QbD to have a clinical understanding of the product's safety and effectiveness in humans as well as a process understanding of the relationship between the drug product and process features. Determining the intended indication, route of administration, and target patient group is a feasible QbD clinical technique. Reliable new methodologies are also being developed to harness the potential of clinical product development.

Quality Assurance in Clinical Research

Quality assurance (QA) is a crucial component of clinical research because the collected data must be acceptable and error-free, and the research methodology must follow the protocol. This information is intended to be used as a crucial body of evidence when a new pharmaceutical product is assessed by a government regulatory authority. The industry complies with the required QA procedures and is completely aware of regulatory requirements, ensuring that marketing authorization is given in a timely and unquestionable manner.

QA Activities During the Research

Throughout the research project, many QA activities were conducted. The investigator's reporting of adverse events to the sponsor and, as necessary, the ethics committee (EC), as well as the interpretation of data inquiries and drug accountability, are the most important activities. The sponsor was responsible for facilitating the reporting of all adverse medication reactions, both serious and unanticipated, to all relevant investigators and regulatory authorities. These safety reports should be compliant with all relevant legal standards. Any unexpected and connected adverse events that may affect the overall risk-benefit balance should be reported to the ethics committees (ECs). The goal of research monitoring is to ensure that subjects' rights and interests are protected, that the research data are precise, unambiguous, and verifiable from source documents and that the research is conducted in accordance with the protocol, GCP, and the necessary regulatory requirements. The designated monitors should have the necessary training and knowledge of the test article(s), protocol, signed informed consent document, and sponsor.

SOPs, GCP, and other applicable regulatory requirements were included. The monitor serves as the primary conduit for communication between the investigator and sponsor. The monitor should follow both the sponsor's established written SOPs and any additional guidelines they may have provided to oversee a particular research project. Following each visit to the research site or communication pertaining to the research, the monitor submits a written report to the sponsor.

Data management for clinical research is crucial and strictly regulated, because the information acquired will be used for statistical analysis, report authoring, and regulatory assessment. The information must be accurate, that is, it must match the source data as it was gathered and kept at the research site. All collected data were checked for missing, singular, or inconsistent values. The research site receives data requests from the data management team and the monitor responds to the decisions.

Post-research QA Activities

Except for summarizing the research results, publishing the research findings, and archiving the research papers, the sponsor should handle most post-research QA tasks. The latter is necessary because a regulatory body can elect to conduct an on-site inspection later to look over all the research source data.

Monitoring of Site Performance

Despite the careful articulation of research requirements in documents such as authorized research protocols, data management plans, and accompanying project plans, expectations and needs can vary throughout a research project. The FDA's human resource protection organizations claim that to ensure that the research was conducted in accordance with the proper procedures and regulations, internal audits of the site selection and management processes require qualified people. Internal process evaluations following the research began, considering research-related variables to assess site performance.

To ensure participant safety and welfare, check for protocol and regulatory compliance, and ensure that issues highlighted by research monitors have been resolved, the QA group oversees site evaluations during research. High participant registration, high staff turnover, and/or an unusually high or low number of adverse events (high or low) were among the QA factors for site selection. Building an understanding of what should be monitored at each site and how much attention should be given to each activity is crucial for successful monitoring. It is helpful to be aware of where issues are most likely to occur during research.

Research During Site Audits and Inspections

The following items are most frequently lacking

- Failure to follow the procedure.
- Failure to maintain accurate and complete records.
- Discomfort with the informed consent form.
- Failure to report adverse events as required by the law, regulation, or sponsor.
- Failure to account for the disposition of study drugs.

Most sponsors developed a set of general monitoring SOPs. The protocol also specifies the processes that participants must follow and the timeframe for evaluation, which orders the conduct of the study. More monitoring will be required, more flaws will likely be discovered, and more activities will be conducted during a study visit.

Site monitoring visits are scheduled regularly, ranging from daily for phase I research to monthly or less frequently for straightforward research such as phase II or III vaccination research. Each time the monitor visits, they write a report and send it to the investigator and their supervisors, who are typically project managers from the sponsor or CRO. In line with a recent trend, the institution requests that the sponsor give the EC a copy of each monitoring report for the institution's research locations whenever the findings of the monitor could affect the safety of the research participants or the way the research was conducted. This demand has been included in the clinical research agreements of several institutions because it is a requirement of their QA program.

Quality—Methods of Improvement

The application of an organization's methodology, methods, and patterns is necessary to improve the calibration of clinical research. The FDA recommends a four-step system approach:

The sponsor requires a capable and dependable management team to maintain control over the entire clinical research process. To ensure sound judgment, project team members should work in harmony and under the strict supervision of contracted research. All important clinical research processes, from protocol evolution to clinical research report creation, should be described in detail in guidelines and SOPs. SOPs must also concentrate on anticipated potential dangers. This stage primarily describes the uniform instruction and training of all sponsors, CROs, and site personnel regarding the research protocol, study requirements, policies, and procedures. Each team member must be aware of their responsibilities.

The monitor was the primary source of assistance for the sponsor and CRO to ensure the quality of the site. Although the GCP specifies a monitor's training requirements, it is important to remember that monitoring involves more than just data matching and document list maintenance. The monitoring problem is mentioned in numerous recent FDA warning letters.

Most of these findings pertain to the patients chosen, procedure adherence, and reporting of clinical estimations in the source data. According to Bhatt (2008), a research project's quality requires a guarantee of the safety of the subjects. The ethics committee's role is crucial in ensuring subject protection, although all stakeholders are responsible for upholding this ethical duty. The EC mandates training in laws, morals, and technicalities of clinical research. The most important point is to "take on a week of thorough training in vital thinking [4]."

The trend investigation included techniques such as statistical monitoring to gauge data trends among locations and research or data mining with the intention of anticipatorily identifying and estimating compliance signals rather than anticipated dangers. As a practical instrument to validate quality compliance, a method of centralized monitoring that directs or targets sites for monitoring is beginning to take shape. To ascertain how the problem occurred, the system and processes were re-evaluated. The Deming Cycle, a four-step quality model, has been approved by the FDA Society for Quality (2014) and is one of the most used instruments for subsequent improvements [5].

Advancing New Technologies in Clinical Research (FDA Guidelines, 2012)

- Surrogate indicators and biomarkers
- Unique clinical study architecture Design adaptation
- Micro-dosing research
- Bayesian adaptive designs
- Simulation trials
- Bayesian statistics
- Data mining in critical research areas
- Safety and efficacy research

Quality—New Regulatory Accesses and Initiatives

Until recently, quality control has frequently been inconsistent according to the FDA's Quality Management System (QMS) system. For the grant selection process, for instance, there was a quality check at the beginning of a novel research development and another at the end through peer-reviewed publications.

However, quality control was routinely entrusted to researchers and their institutions for the remainder of the study. The CTTI, a public-private partnership established in 2008 by the FDA and Duke University, is another significant FDA enterprise. The CTTI was established with the intention of identifying procedures that, if widely used, would improve the calibration and proficiency of clinical research. The CTTI has produced recommendations for incorporating quality into scientific and operational designs, as well as the conduct of clinical research. Some of these include:

Focusing on what is important, errors that materially affect patient safety or interpretation of results should be avoided.

- Create a quality management strategy that concentrates on the areas with the highest potential for producing mistakes.
- The error rates of the important parameters will be measured in the future.
- A monitoring strategy that is central, statistical, and customized to the research design and important quality objectives.

- Streamline procedures and training.
- Describe any quality issues you find, any remedial steps you have taken, and how they have affected your analysis and explanation of the data.

Arun Bhatt (2011) [6] asserts that the FDA's most recent actions underline the significance of prospectively integrating quality into the scientific and operational design, as well as the carrying out and overseeing of clinical research. Any worries during regulatory assessment concerning ethical standards, GCP compliance, or the integrity of clinical data can result in expensive

Delay in completing marketing authorization. By using the right measures to continuously check the calibration of the contributing research operations, this risk can be minimized to the greatest extent possible. Metrics can be used to monitor activities throughout this stage of development as they are affordable instruments [7–10].

Continuum monitoring can be used to prevent problems from escalating into regulatory issues. In combination with an electronic information management system, research and reports aimed at data-driven quality management are used to track and control expenses and delivery schedules while guaranteeing the effectiveness of clinical research activities. Monitoring is employed as a communication tool with an investigator according to the FDA's Scientific and Regulatory Committee (2009). Sponsors, however, struggle to make full use of the potential of these data because of the volume of data collected by the monitors. The overall cost of the research was decreased by using a simulation model, lowering the frequency of monitoring, and utilizing central monitoring. The availability of information serves as the foundation for the creation of processes by making it simpler for a clinical investigator and research sponsor to communicate monitoring data. Additionally, it helps to reject trivial issues and move forward with a forward-focused approach to pertinent issues and feedback for better training programs at all organizational levels.

The actual strength of a data-driven QMS can be found in the combination of processes and systems that allow for early signal identification and subsequent intervention.

CONCLUSIONS AND FUTURE DIRECTIONS

Guidance from the FDA: It would be beneficial if the FDA made it clear that there is no requirement to use any specific monitoring method. Guidance guides should highlight important concepts (guarantee human subject protection, data quality, and compliance with regulations) without focusing on a specific methodology and instead provide instances of diverse methods that have been used to accomplish these goals.

Integrated quality management plans: In addition to the protocol, sponsors should create an integrated quality management plan (QMP). This needs to show that the risks have been fairly evaluated and that mitigation strategies have been implemented. An extensive description of monitoring operations, the specifics of which may and frequently should alter over time, should not be the focus, instead of important high-level issues. This strategy would motivate funders of research to plan and consider critical considerations, risk reduction, and quality control methods. Sponsors ought to consider having more QMP-related conversations with FDA reviewers and inspectors. (The FDA is currently testing these interactions, but to meet demand, staffing may need to be increased.)

End-of-research reporting of quality management issues: It was suggested that after research is finished, a report outlining any problems (either with the research's performance or with the QMP itself) should be prepared, along with an explanation of how such problems might affect the analysis and interpretation of the findings. This could be mentioned in submissions to regulatory bodies and in the publication of research findings.

Sharing Quality Management Knowledge, Methodologies, and Data

Industry, academia, and regulators are creating various quality management strategies. These developments would proceed more quickly with increased cooperation.

Education and awareness: To ensure that the care of the research participants and the validity of the results are prioritized, all stakeholders must be aware of the essential components of a high-quality clinical research study. This is true for everyone participating in clinical research, including those who use the findings, such as healthcare professionals, doctors, and patients. It also applies to those who analyze, interpret, regulate, and inspect clinical research. The meeting clarified the importance of spreading knowledge and understanding these problems.

REFERENCES

1. U.S. Food and Drug Administration. (2024). First-of-kind Pediatric ECG Data Warehouse. [online] U.S. Food and Drug Administration. Available from: https://www.fda.gov/drugs/spotlight-cder-science/first-kind-pediatric-ecg-data-warehouse-use-pediatric-product-development-programs-and-prevention
2. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. (2016). Human Research Protection Program (HRPP) Resources. [online] HHS.gov. Available from: https://www.hhs.gov/ohrp/education-and-outreach/human-research-protection-program-fundamentals/index.html
3. Meeker-O'Connell A, Glessner C, Behm M, Mulinde J, Roach N, Sweeney F, et al. Enhancing clinical evidence by proactively building quality into clinical trials. Clin Trials. 2016;13:439-444. DOI: 10.1177/1740774516643491. PubMed: 27098014.
4. Ajay S, Bhatt A. Knowledge and skills at the study site-requirements for clinical research professionals in India: A survey. CR Focus. 2008;19:36-39.
5. American Society for Quality. (2023). What are Project Planning & Implementation Tools? [online] ASQ. Available from: https://asq.org/quality-resources/project-planning-tools
6. Bhatt A. Quality of clinical trials: A moving target. Perspect Clin Res. 2011;2:124-128. DOI: 10.4103/2229-3485.86880. PubMed: 22145122.
7. Kurdi MS, Ramaswamy AH. Current scenario of clinical research exposure and practice in developing countries including India. Indian J Clin Anaesth. 2016;3:488-491. DOI: 10.5958/2394-4994.2016.00065.2.
8. Gadgil D, Sengar M, Pramesh CS, Badwe R, Ranganathan P. Building research capacity in India: The Masters in clinical research program at the Tata Memorial Centre. Perspect Clin Res. 2021;12:189-192. DOI: 10.4103/picr.picr_48_21. PubMed: 34760645.
9. Eisenstein EL, Collins R, Cracknell BS, Podesta O, Reid ED, Sandercock P, et al. Sensible approaches for reducing clinical trial costs. Clin Trials. 2008;5:75-84. DOI: 10.1177/1740774507087551. PubMed: 18283084.
10. Glickman SW, McHutchison JG, Peterson ED, Cairns CB, Harrington RA, Califf RM, et al. Ethical and scientific implications of the globalization of clinical research. N Engl J Med. 2009;360:816-823. DOI: 10.1056/NEJMsb0803929. PubMed: 19228627.

