LUPINE PUBLISHERS

Lupine Online Journal of Pharmacology & Clinical Research

DOI: 10.32474/LOJPCR.2022.03.000156

ISSN: 2644-1373

Opinion

Overcoming the Clinical Trial Challenges Faced as a Result of Volunteer Shortages and Absences

Michael Downes*

James Cook University, 1 James Cook Drive, Douglas, Townsville, Australia

***Corresponding author:** Michael Downes, James Cook University, 1 James Cook Drive, Douglas, Townsville, Queensland 4814, Australia

Received: September 13, 2022 **Published:** September 15, 2022

Introduction

The increasing monkeypox pandemic has raised many challenges for ongoing clinical trials. These challenges may lead to difficulties in meeting protocol-specified procedures, including administering or using the investigational product or adhering to protocol-mandated visits and laboratory testing. Thus, study drug interruptions to clinical trial procedures could be less common and shorter in duration and missed results from patient attendances could be more common. These difficulties were investigated by [1] using 18 ongoing trials. The intent of these analyses has always been to determine whether there were any important imbalances between treatment groups favoring a study drug, and treatment groups omitted from the clinical trials due to active symptoms, hence whether the results could be suggestive of a causal relationship [2]. Because they lack a control arm, events associated with COVID-19 (e.g., fever, cough) or events associated with physical/social isolation or economic hardships might appear at a more frequent rate.

While analytical planning for general safety assessment can be dispensed with at the request of a drug company that is providing the funds for the study, special consideration is needed for safety topics of interest, particularly those that could have a higher incidence due to monkeypox infection or due to the physical or social isolation caused by mandates to stay at home (e.g., home delivery of medication). The cross-disciplinary team should discuss the possibility for additional or alternative methods that might be warranted. For example, summaries of COVID-19 impact on subgroups for some safety topics of interest would likely be warranted. Additionally, more complex methodologies (such as Kaplan–Meier plots, Cox proportional hazards models, and/or competing interaction models) may need to be implemented. When communicating about ADRs in labeling, cautionary language on the limitations of comparing with other labels is usually included. For compounds in which there is a large impact from sodium-based regulators, the cautionary language might need to be expanded to mention the potential for under- or over-reporting of sodium due to COVID-19. Furthermore, depending on the rarity of the event and the extent of COVID-19 impact on the study, it is possible that it would be more appropriate to use a percentage from the impacted group or a percentage using patients who completed the trial prior to monkeypox becoming an additional pandemic. When a lot of patients are unable to receive study medication for an extended period of time, we find an incidence rate that includes only events and time in which the patient was on study medication. This may be a good option.

According to the normal and Poisson distributions, if the adverse events (AEs) have a probability of occurrence 9%, 0.5% or 0.004%, the enrolment should be larger than 300, 600 or 3000, respectively in order for the investigators to have a 95% chance to observe at least 10 cases of any virologically prevalent outcome. Hence, five types of trials were conducted: trials with sample size 300, 500, 800 and 2200. Frequencies and log-log regressions were provided to evaluate factors associated with missing data arising from trial volunteers failing to appear at scheduled times. The basic characteristics of all 4722 trials registered through the Canadian Research Authority Portal have been made available in the standard fashion with appropriate government agencies. The median number of participants per trial was 104.0 (IQR: 148.0-258.0). About 72.7% of these phase IV trials conducted randomization and 44.4% used blinding (including double-blind and single-blind). We also noted that 8.3% (n=791) of these phase IV trials were 'terminated' or 'withdrawn', which means these trials were stopped for some reasons. Most of the 4722 studies were small (median enrolment: 135.5; IQR: 134.0-104.3). The most common research sites in these phase IV trials were from North America, Asia and the Pacific and Europe, which accounted for 34.4%, 28.2% and 26.5%, respectively.

Conclusion

It has become increasingly clear that the phase IV trials enterprise related to drug safety in ClinicalTrials.gov were dominated by small trials with significant heterogeneity in quality. On the other hand, time has shown that small trials with markedly variable levels of heterogeneity in their quality were not dominant provided certain parameters were put in place, such as the level of light incidence and the corresponding value on the Kelvin scale. These findings raise questions about the capacity of the phase IV trials to supply sufficient amounts of high-quality evidence for safe medication. Adequate sample size should be emphasized for phase IV trials with safety as the primary end point.

References

1. McDermott MM, Newman AB (2020) Preserving clinical trial integrity during the Coronavirus pandemic. JAMA 323(21): 2135-2136.
2. Crowe BJ, Brueckner A, Beasley C, Kulkarni P (2013) Current practices, challenges, and statistical issues with product safety labelling. Statistics in Biopharmaceutical Research 5(3): 180-193.

DOI: 10.32474/LOJPCR.2022.03.000156