What does eyeforpharma do?

• Global provider of **pharmaceutical business intelligence**
• Draw subject experts and decision-makers **out of their silos**
• Provide trusted hub for pharma leaders to exchange ideas and **stay up-to-date with shifting practices** within industry
• Help senior-level executives define future strategy and direction and provide them with the **insights and relationships to shape innovation** and encounter disruptive industry trends
Research-based Client Engagement
How we Broker Knowledge

Conversations and Strategic Consultations ➤ Continuous involvement with the industry through series of semi-structured in-depth interviews, systematic coding and analysis

Competitive Screening ➤ Benchmarking studies, direct comparisons with a peer group of companies, internal gap analyses

Case Studies ➤ Sharing of best practices and innovative pilots from leaders in the field

Survey Research ➤ Various scales, cross-industry to customized with key job titles

Focus Groups and Facilitation ➤ Measurement of perceptions, opinions, and attitudes

Policy Research and Regulatory Analysis

Leadership Panels, Executive Symposia, or large Industry Summits
Part of UK-based FC BI Group

Global Project Director at eyeforpharma, US Office

• Leads cross-industry research and strategic projects within the biopharma sector, also manages portfolio of executive forums as well as key vendor accounts
• Successfully launched eyeforpharma’s clinical trials division, currently responsible for global brand positioning and growth strategy
• Previously held Roger Silverstone Fellowship at University of Southern California
• Past client consulting work in market entry, communications, and political strategy. Former accounts include a cloud/telco infrastructure provider, a national cancer trial foundation, a multinational energy firm, a US aircraft manufacturer as well as an industry group of bottled water brands in Europe.
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PCCT Project Milestones

• 8 months market research, incl. 95 executive interviews ✓
• 2 cross-industry surveys on the business rationale for PCCT ✓
• Executive Symposium, 100 senior representatives ✓
• 2 focus group discussions with patient advocates ✓
• Ongoing working group with key pharma leaders
• Production of interactive global seminar

• Publication of 1st white paper on Patient-Centered Innovation ✓
• Discussion in trade press: i.a. International Clinical Trials Magazine, Applied Clinical Trials, CenterWatch ✓
• Publication of book of ideas: 10 Thought Leaders speak out ✓
• Publication of 2nd white paper: PCCT Compass for the Industry
• Publication of thought paper: Patients at Heart of the Organization
Participating Industry Leaders

Mike Collins, Vice President - Global Clinical Operations, Alexion Pharmaceuticals
Marie Eckerd, Feasibility & Recruitment Partner, AstraZeneca
Bonnie Brescia, Principal, BBK Worldwide
Sharon Hanlon, Director - Clinical Trial Partnerships, Bristol - Myers Squibb
Paul Ivsin, Director, IMS
Bray Patrick-Lake, Director - Stakeholder Engagement, Clinical Trials Transformation Initiative
Thomas Krohn, Business Lead of Lilly Clinical Open Innovation Team, Eli Lilly & Co.
Paulo Moreira, Vice President - GCO & Head - External Innovation, EMD Serono
James O’Leary, Chief Innovation Officer, Genetic Alliance
Barbara Bierer, Faculty Co-Director, Harvard Medical School

David Vulcano, AVP & Responsible Executive for Clinical Research, Hospital Corporation of America
Andreas Koester, Vice President - Clinical Trial Innovation & External Alliances, Janssen
Laura Lee, Special Assistant to the DDCC - Patient Safety and Clinical Quality, NIH Clinical Center
Jeanne Regnante, Executive Director - Office of the Chief Medical Officer, Merck
Colin Scott, Clinical Trial Leader, Novartis
Susan Sheridan, Director Patient Engagement, Patient-Centered Outcomes Research Institute
Roslyn Schneider, Global Patient Affairs Lead Pfizer
Christine Pierre, President, The Society for Clinical Research Sites
Tomasz Sablinski, CEO, Transparency Life Sciences
Ken Getz, Director - Sponsored Programs, Tufts Center for the Study of Drug Development
Material for this presentation has solely been selected by the presenter for educational purposes without involvement, financial, promotional or otherwise, of any of the industry organizations, individuals or initiatives mentioned.

Statements, facts and opinions stated are attributable to the presenter and must only be interpreted in context with the oral presentation. They may not necessarily reflect opinion of Rutgers School of Business, eyeforpharma, or any of the organizations involved in their meetings.
Starting with the Facts

* Get the latest research figures where the clinical industry stands on trial challenges, patient recruitment and retention
Share of Americans who think it is very important that the USA are a global leader in medical research 75%

Share of Americans who say they have little to no knowledge about medical research and the participation process 75%

Share of Americans who say they would consider getting involved in an appropriate clinical trial if asked 77%

Share of Americans who say their doctor told them about the opportunity to participate in a clinical trial 7%

Source: Research America (2007), Society for Women’s Health Research (2008), CISCRP
Are clinical trials even safe?

- 17% generally believe clinical research studies are very safe
- 51% believe them to be somewhat safe
- 11% believe them to be not very safe
- 7% believe them to be not safe at all
- 14% say they don’t have any knowledge

1/3 of people believe clinical trials are not safe or don’t know that they are

So, who get’s involved?

- 2% of the US population
- 4% of physicians in the US

Share of research sites in a given clinical trial that typically under-enroll patients: 37%

Share of research sites in a given clinical trial that typically fail to enroll even a single patient: 11%

Average extension of the original study timelines necessary to meet enrollment levels across all therapeutic areas (2013): +100%

# Clinical Trials: Rising Complexity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unique procedures per protocol (median units)</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>28.2</td>
<td>30.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total procedures per protocol (median units)</td>
<td>105.9</td>
<td>158.1</td>
<td>166.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total investigative site work burden (median units)</td>
<td>28.9</td>
<td>44.6</td>
<td>47.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total eligibility criteria</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>number of case report form pages per protocol (median units)</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>180</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average increase of trial per patient cost since 2008: +70%

Source: Tufts CSDD, Cutting Edge Information (2011)
### Share of later stage clinical trials procedures solely conducted to collect extraneous data

20%

### Average cost of these procedures per trial

> $1 million

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A Typical Phase III Protocol</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Endpoints</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Procedures</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Eligibility Criteria</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Countries</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Investigative sites</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Patients Randomized</td>
<td>729</td>
<td>597</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of Phase III data collected that is ‘Non-Core’</td>
<td></td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Data Points Collected*</td>
<td></td>
<td>929,203</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dangers of protocol non-adherence

**Significant study delays** – recruitment will have to be prolonged to maintain an adequate sample size to power the study

**Increased costs** – due to extended resource utilization of medicine, labs, personnel and processing

**Failure to win approval** – missing data may call into question reported results, as drug safety may be overestimated while risks, adverse effects as well as medication effectiveness could be underestimated
Average Trial Retention Rates

69% in 2003
48% in 2006
30%* in 2013

Drop in patient enrollment rates for clinical trials conducted between 2000 and 2006 -16%

Drop in patient retention rates for clinical trials conducted between 2000 and 2006 -21%

Drop in patient retention rates for clinical trials conducted between 2003 and 2013 -56%*

Source: PhRMA
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The Financial Implications

* Realize the economic burden of the lack of patient centricity in drug development and understand why it must be seen as a revenue driver
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The bottom-line

Average yearly cost spent on patient recruitment by clinical study sponsors, investigators and their partners

$2-3b

Approximate average cost spent on recruitment and retention in a clinical trial, per enrolled subject

$7,600

Estimated loss of a sponsor’s sales revenue due to the delay of a drug in clinical trials, per month

$40m

Opportunity costs

Estimated time a sponsor loses due to enrollment delays on average per trial: 4.6 months

Estimated cumulative yearly time loss for a sponsor due to enrollment delays across all trials: 26 years

Collaborations to Spread Risk (2000-2011)

Share of New Drugs Approved

- Single Firm: 45%
- Multi-Firm: 55%

Type of Collaboration

- Licensing: 49%
- Co-Development: 25%
- M&A: 24%
- Joint Ventures: 2%

Source: Tufts CSDD 2013
Proliferation Pre-Competitive Alliances

Number of New Consortia Launched within Drug Development

- Integration of research professionals from multiple sectors who have historically been ‘competitors’
- Shared mission and operating plan that can be used by each stakeholder jointly or independently
- Shared governance and risk
- Leverage each participant’s resources, knowledge and expertise

Ken Getz, Tufts CSDD, 2014, Source: FasterCures Consortiapedia
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**Definition & Measurement**

* Hear definitions of patient centricity and explore how to measure the concept for clinical quality management
A paradigm shift

**Established Trial Model**
- Linear, sequential
- Compartmentalized
- Insular
- Vertical ownership and centralized risk
- Rigid, transactional, reactive
- Proprietary clinical data at the core
- Focus on great science
- Participant as study subject

**Patient-Centered Clinical Trial**
- Multi-directional, interactive
- Open
- Integrated
- Horizontal ownership and shared risk
- Flexible, adaptive, proactive
- Patient experience at core
- Focus on great and feasible science
- Participant as partner, lead customer

*From Ken Getz, Tufts CSDD, 2014*
What is your working definition?


“providing care that is respectful of and responsive to individual patient preferences, needs, and values, and ensuring that patient values guide all clinical decisions.”
“There are two areas of focus regarding patient centricity in research: patient centeredness and patient engagement. Patient centeredness is defined as research that is based on outcomes that are important to patients. Patient engagement in research is the active participation of patients throughout the entire research process – the planning, the conduct and the dissemination. Patient engagement is the means to the patient centeredness.”
What is your working definition?

Tomasz Sablinski

Founder and CEO, Transparency Life Sciences

“A trial that measures outcomes that patients care about. It needs to measure or collect outcomes, broadly speaking, in a way that’s least intrusive to patients’ daily lives. If you can accomplish both of those things it’s going to be a quantum leap compared with where we are today.”
What is your working definition?

James O’Leary

In its purest form, patient-centricity is the creation of a direct link between the goals of clinical trials and the needs of patients on an individual and global scale. It is not simply designing trials to meet the needs of participants, but rather creating systems and tools that allow participants to inform and influence the trials themselves.”
What is your working definition?

Jeremy Gilbert

VP, Product and Strategy, PatientsLikeMe

“Measuring what matters to the patient in the trial itself, and designing the trial as much as possible to accommodate the impact on the patient’s life.”
What is your working definition?

Rhonda Kost

“Designed with the patient’s experience and priorities in mind (having asked real patients, and NOT having presumed to know their experiences/priorities). Those priorities might include convenience, expense, pain, risk, benefit, etc.”
“Patient centricity is a dynamic process through which the patient regulates the flow of information through multiple pathways to exercise choices consistent with his/her preferences, values and beliefs.

[It entails] more than just the patient’s voice; it involves the patient’s thoughts, values, preferences, strengths and shortcomings”

How to measure the construct

1. Define Constructs
2. Generate Items
3. Statistical Validation
4. Predictive Models

From Howley, Michael, Associate Clinical Professor, LeBow College of Business, Drexel University
How to measure the construct

Patients participate in:

• Formulating research questions
  • Assess patient participation in:
    • Identifying the RQ
    • Designing the intervention
    • Identifying the goals & outcomes
    • Describe the qualifications of subjects

• Study design
• Trial conduct
• Disseminating study results

From Howley, Michael, Associate Clinical Professor, LeBow College of Business, Drexel University
Established Measures: SERVQUAL

Rate your agreement with the following statements (1-10)

- **Reliability**
  - “When they said they would do something, they always did it.”
  - “There were no mistakes in the care I received.”

- **Assurance**
  - “They were very knowledgeable.”
  - “They gave me confidence by the way they provided my care.”

- **Tangibles**

- **Empathy**
  - “They gave me individual attention.”
  - “The treated me as a person.”

- **Responsiveness**
  - “When I requested a change, they were able to accommodate.”
  - “When something went wrong, they quickly made it right.”

A Model for Measurement

From Howley, Michael, Associate Clinical Professor, LeBow College of Business, Drexel University
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Metrics to measure the construct

- Focus groups, surveys and retention rates
- Study metrics and quality measures
- Referred to randomized conversion rates
- Data quality and patient reported outcomes
- Satisfaction with care scores, level of site support
- Patient advocate feedback
- Investigative site feedback
- Social media monitoring
- Share of voice, perception
- Enrollment timelines

“We currently don’t employ a reliable way of measuring it“
Customer-Centered Approaches

* Explore customer-centered approaches for informing and engaging patients
Participant Demographics

Your average trial subject

- Non-Hispanic White
- Married
- Male
- Middle Aged
- Middle Class

Common Attributes

1. Health insurance
2. Have their own physician
3. Interested in personal health
4. Medically literate

Source: Colin Scott, Novartis, 2014 Presentation, at eyeforpharma PCCT
Participant’s Real Concerns

Comments Rank Ordered by Frequency of Reporting

5. I don’t have insurance
4. I don’t have a doctor
3. I don’t have the time or money to go to doctor
2. I think clinical trials are dangerous
1. What’s in it for me?

Source: Colin Scott, Novartis, 2014 Presentation, at eyeforpharma PCCT
Underserved Patients

1. Community Clinic in the ‘Barrio’ in San Antonio

2. Mario’s Independent Pharmacy in the ‘Barrio’

3. Social Work Departments in the Medical Center

Source: Colin Scott, Novartis, 2014 Presentation, at eyeforpharma PCCT
Some Practical Findings

Achieving the highest potential of clinical trials depends on the incorporation of clinical research into the broad scope of practice of health care delivery

- Participation is a drain on time without obvious short term benefit  
  ➔ Provide short term benefit: Financial incentive

- Management of chronic health problem is not a priority  
  ➔ Intensive medical management ‘trains’ patient why and how to be well

Source: Colin Scott, Novartis, 2014 Presentation, at eyeforpharma PCCT
Customer experience as the core
Alternative methods of recruitment

• Leveraging **Commercial Market Research Insights**
• **Extensive Surveying and Data Analysis**
• Drawing on **Psychological Profiling**

  • Methods to allow for the classification of patients along their intrinsic behavior patterns. Segmentation to provide a prediction of anticipated compliance issues that can be addressed via personalized interventions

• **STRATUM™ by**

  **MASSINE BOECKER**
  Personalized Population Management
Window into the Future?

• **STRATUM™ method**

**MassineBoecker**
Personalized Population Management

Our science has the ability to reveal:

• The **positively motivated patient** who takes responsibility and sees himself as a proactive manager of his own health

• The **resigned patient** characterized by sadness, who often exhibits low competence levels and shows little responsibility (=learned helplessness)

• The **defensive patient** (fearful, aggressive) who is often competent, but fails to take responsibility for herself and her condition

• The **submissive, serving patient**, characterized by a lack of self-confidence, who demonstrates a high degree of compliance but little self-determination

Massie Boecker, *Exhibition at eyeforpharma PCCT*
Regionally varied recruitment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Modules</th>
<th>Country feasibility and enrollment forecasting</th>
<th>Managed service for site readiness</th>
<th>Managed service for patient recruitment</th>
<th>Country/site regulatory maintenance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Key Output</td>
<td>• Optimal countries</td>
<td>• Quintiles identified sites</td>
<td>• Eligible patients</td>
<td>• Ongoing updates to country &amp; site documents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Forecasted patient enrollment rates</td>
<td>• Site selection visits</td>
<td>• Strategy &amp; tools to enable conversion to enrolled patients</td>
<td>End of trial notifications to authorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Operational challenges / opportunities</td>
<td>• Clinical Trial Agreements</td>
<td>• Essential document management for Trial Master File</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Negotiated contracts</td>
<td>• Country paperwork complete</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Regulatory &amp; Ethics start-up</td>
<td>• Sites ready to receive IP &amp; activate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


10/22/2014

Quintiles
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Regionally varied recruitment

Source: Quintiles Research Presentation, at eyeforpharma PCCT
Patients 2 Trials Consortium

• Using electronic health records (EHRs), the aim is to devise a target health profile for each clinical trial that is machine-readable, so that software can match patients to specific inclusion criteria.

• Patients can search for trials using their own Blue Button data
  • A patient creates an account on a patient portal, sets up a direct address and receives a secure copy of her Continuity of Care Document and then uses our platform to search for clinical trials based on individual health record.

• Platform has been tested with a number of different clinical research studies sponsored by Lilly, Novartis and Pfizer, using a database of anonymized patient health records.
Proposed Approach

“Target Profile” for automated filtering

“Augmented Content” for additional patient centric content

Clinicaltrials.gov as foundation

• What studies do I qualify for?
• What does the study do?
• How often will I have to take off from work to participate to this study?

Copyright: Patients 2 Trials Consortium, 2014 Presentation, at eyeforpharma PCCT
Proposed approach - detail

• The **Target Profile** is a machine readable query, that can be executed against an electronic file (or “record”) with patient health data – such as an Electronic Health Record (EHR), an Electronic Medical Record (EMR) or Personally Controlled Health Record (PCHR).

• **Augmented Content** is public, IRB approved information about the study that has not been published on clinicaltrials.gov, and that is shared with / targeted for patients with a matching Target Profile.
Proposed Architecture

Study Sponsors

Patient Study “Target Profiles”

Open

Daily Updates

ClinicalTrials.gov

Patients Platform

Open Web REST API

Match Process

Matching Studies Report

Consent to Match

Personal Electronic Medical Records

Copyright: Patients 2 Trials Consortium, Presentation, at eyeforpharma PCCT
Patient App Prototype
Proposed End State

• An open platform, where:

1. Study sponsors can login, and upload Target Profile, Augmented Content for their research studies

2. Public matching services are available, to which patients or organizations can send de-identified electronic health data and find matching studies

3. Open standards for those who wish to develop their own matching services against the Target Profiles
**Timelines**

**Test version of platform**
1. Initial controlled testing
2. Target Profiles for ~ 50 studies
3. Ready for market testing

**July – Oct 14**

**Platform/API Publically available**: does this help better inform patients about trials?

**Identify partner organizations and test drive the platform.**
- Does it work for them?
- Does it help them match patients to trials?
- How can we improve the platform?

**Project Start**
- Oct'13
- April – May’14

**Project End**
- Oct’14

**Long Term Sustainable Model Development**
- Who will host?
- Who will pay?
- Content governance?

**Broad Sponsor Support**
- Q1 2015
- Q2 2015

*Copyright: Patients 2 Trials Consortium, 2014 Presentation, at eyeforpharma PCCT*
Experiences to date

“Not all Eligibility Criteria are created equal”:

We are finding there are different types of eligibility criteria, e.g.

1. Things that the patient knows
2. Things that the doctor knows (and you could expect to find in the patient electronic health record)
3. Things that are assessed during screening

So our process for developing Target Profile, is to:

1. Sit down with the Study Responsible Physicians
2. Find out which of the eligibility criteria are in category 2
3. Discuss whether and how criteria from the other categories can be replaced or approximated by additional criteria in category 2
Realize why trial design is becoming a competitive differentiator for successful enrollment and trial management.
Approach to recruitment feasibility

- Objective: Forecasting and managing the probable randomization rate for a specific protocol, determine realistic parameters for site enrollment months

- Involves planning how each group of study stakeholders would respond to the protocol – regulators, investigators, coordinators, project managers, monitors, and patients
  - In what way would protocol measures be off-putting to one or more of these groups? Can it be afforded to prioritize one stakeholder over the other?

- Established feasibility planning sequence is country > sites > patients while it is rare that sponsors consistently ask patients directly for input. Mostly relying on investigators, KOLs, country heads as surrogates
Alternative Trial Designs

Lack of patient-centeredness in clinical trials can be partially addressed through innovative study designs

- **Pragmatic Trial Design** to evaluate the effectiveness of interventions in real-life routine practice conditions

- **Bayesian Statistics** use available patient-outcome information, including biomarkers that accumulating data indicate might be related to clinical outcome. They also allow for the use of historical patient data for synthesizing results of relevant trials.

- **Adaptive Trial Design** allow features of the trial to change while in progress, allowing for evaluation of competitive effectiveness, especially useful in long-running rare disease trials

Trial designers can affect the patient

Crowdsourcing the protocol

The world's first drug development platform based on open innovation

- **Protocol Builder** is TLS’s crowdsourcing survey tool to help develop our clinical protocols.
- **Indication Finder** is a crowdsourcing tool that invites participants to identify potential new applications for stalled compounds.
Execute through remote monitoring

The world's first drug development platform based on open innovation

- **Remote monitoring and mobile health** allow for decentralized trials, improved data collection and reduce costs by 50%
- **Pilot study with Genentech** on the effectiveness and ease-of-use of telemonitoring technology in patients with inflammatory bowel disease
Share data with all

The world's first drug development platform based on open innovation

- Awarded $1.4 Million NCATS/NIH Grant to conduct innovative trial of Lisinopril in Multiple Sclerosis with Mount Sinai
- Protocol developed with crowdsourced input from MS researchers, physicians, and patients
Pioneers: LillyCOI

App Lab: labs.lillycoi.com (sample apps)
Twitter: @Lilly_COI

A focus on “Informed”
1. Make CT information (clinicaltrials.gov) easier to access
2. Enabled real-time pre-screening for patients
3. Provide clear, patient-centric information to patients BEFORE they have to travel to the site

PATIENT-CENTERED CLINICAL TRIALS
Campbell Pharmaceutical Seminar Series 2014 at Rutgers Business School
Patients at the Center of Clinical Trials Workshop: portal.lillycoi.com/paccr/
Patient-Centered Systems

* Learn about innovative patient-centered trial management, systems and technology that lie at the operational heart of effective patient engagement
Moore’s vs. Eroom’s Law

Microprocessor Transistor Counts 1971-2011 & Moore’s Law


FDA tightens regulation post-thalidomide

FDA clears backlog following PDUFA regulations plus small bolus of HIV drugs

First wave of biotechnology-derived therapies

Number of drugs per billion US$ R&D spending*

Source: Nature
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Lilly’s Innovative Study Design Platform

• Platform that digitizes the entire study design process
• Fully integrated Clinical Plan functionality
• User-Centered Design
• Engaging internal and external stakeholders

• Once the data is categorized, Lilly initiates ‘Interactive Jam Sessions’
  • Internal stakeholders from different groups (i.e., project management, drug safety, data monitoring committee, etc.) convene in a virtual room, where Lilly facilitators assist internal stakeholders with strategizing and organizing their thoughts on designing robust studies.

Source: Eli Lilly Case Study 2014, at eyeforpharma PCCT
Integrated Study Design Canvas

Source: Eli Lilly Case Study 2014, at eyeforpharma PCCT
Interactive & Virtual Collaboration

Source: Eli Lilly Case Study 2014, at eyeforpharma PCCT
Simulating the Site

- Lilly’s performance mandates now require study teams to build protocols using the innovative digital approach

Source: Eli Lilly Case Study 2014, at eyeforpharma PCCT
Proof Of Concept: Patient Portal

Source: From Janssen Case Study 2014, at eyeforpharma PCCT
Making the idea reality

- Top idea for pt. engagement innovation
- Used Creative Design Lab to ideate website
- Internal focus group - features, design
- No one doing this yet

- Finalized website
- IRB approved
- Ready for FPI
- Mobile apps on market

2012

- US English-Only Pilot planning
- Application development & eDC integration
- Patient panel & media consultant input
- External landscape has evolved:
  - One generic portal now on market
  - 2 other pharma’s exploring this

2013

2014

Source: From Janssen Case Study 2014, at eyeforpharma PCCT
Lessons learned to date

• Patient-Facing Innovation Takes Time
  • Ensure adequate time for stakeholder review & approval

• Internally developed & hosted website
  • Pro: cheaper, 100% control
  • Con: burden of ownership

• Central IRB + local IRB approval
  • Good preparation pays off – no IRB objection or changes

• Timelines of pilot depend on timelines of trial
  • If trial is delayed, so is the pilot (ours delayed 9 months)

Source: From Janssen Case Study 2014, at eyeforpharma PCCT
New Frontiers for Patient Portals

- Live communication?
- 1-way communication $\rightarrow$ 2-way?
- Site $\leftrightarrow$ Patient communication (e.g. 1:1 “chat hours” with study nurse or investigator; webinar with PI)
  - Challenges – unsolicited safety reporting, security, privacy, site staff burden
- Patient to patient communication
  - Worst nightmares: bias, un-blinding, sharing of signs and symptoms, speculation of treatment assignment, drop outs, unsolicited safety reporting, privacy violations ….

Source: From Janssen Case Study 2014, at eyeforpharma PCCT
But what if they talk to each other...

- Participants talking to each other about their experiences within a trial might accidentally unblind them.
- “We needed to find a way to help patients talk safely about their clinical hopes and experiences” Joe Kim, Shire
- Shire partnered with UK agency Langland and CISCRP to create “Speak out, but speak smart”
Speak Out, But Speak Smart.

ABOUT US

ABOUT CLINICAL TRIALS IN GENERAL

SMART TALKING ABOUT CLINICAL STUDIES

LINKS

VIDEO GALLERY
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Social Media/ Networks

* Get cross-industry data on the usage of social media in trials, as well as insights from particular networks on how to engage trial participants and capture data to recruit volunteers.
Tufts Working Group on Social Media

- Limited FDA guidance on use of social media in clinical research
  - FDA draft guidance released in January 2014 – focus on postmarketing submissions
  - FDA draft guidance released in June 2014 – Two documents concerning company behavior on social media platforms like Twitter and when correcting misinformation on third-party sites
- Among Tufts working group companies, social media (including ad placement) is on average being used in ~11% of trials
- While 14/15 companies have posted ads on social media websites, only 3/13 biopharmaceutical companies and 2/2 CROs have used it to “interactively” engage patients.

From Tufts CSDD Briefing, at eyeforpharma PCCT
Platforms Used for Recruitment

- Facebook: 11
- Patient Community: 7
- YouTube: 7
- Twitter: 5
- Mobile Apps: 3
- Blog: 1

From Tufts CSDD Briefing, at eyeforpharma PCCT, n=14
Top Challenges in Using Social Media

1. Concerns about AE reporting: 8
2. Internal challenges: 6
3. Concerns about country specific...: 6
4. Not targeting appropriate patient...: 4
5. Concerns about site...: 4
6. Concerns about patient privacy: 4
7. Not using appropriate forums or...: 3
8. Concerns about personal data...: 2
9. Other: 2

From Tufts CSDD Briefing, at eyeforpharma PCCT
Legal and Regulatory Challenges

- Lack of clear guidance from FDA makes internal reviews/approvals more difficult
- Concerns over AE reporting and safety issues/pharmacovigilance
- Concerns about unblinding patients to their treatments or sites/sponsors to patients’ treatments
- Concerns over intellectual property
- Not being able to effectively monitor/moderate when a site is set-up for 2-way communication
- Lack of organizational experience or alignment
- Off-label marketing

From Tufts CSDD Briefing, at eyeforpharma PCCT
MyHealthTeams and Biogen Idec

- Social networks are the best way to reach niche audiences
- Narrowing inclusion criteria requires targeted outreach
- The most engaged patients are on social networks, not patient registries, databases, Google, or health sites
- Communication through the social network, not directly to its members
- Thinking beyond just patient recruitment

Can a social network recruit MS patients for Phase III trial (37 sites)?

Source: Biogen/ MyHealthTeams Case Study, at eyeforpharma PCCT
MyHealthTeams and Biogen Idec

The social network for those who have multiple sclerosis.

Source: Biogen/MyHealthTeams Case Study, at eyeforpharma PCCT
MyMSTeam’s: Patient Recruitment

1. Target the Right People
- RRMS
- Interferon beta 1a/1b
- City
- Age

2. Notify Them of the Trial
Dear Eric,

Many members of MyMSTeam have urged relevant MS clinical trials as they arise, to share news of the ALLOW study which MS who are currently taking a standard AVONEX® (interferon beta 1b), BETASEL® (interferon beta 1a).

People living near any of the study could be eligible and choose to participate in this

*1. Have you been diagnosed
- Cancer
- Hepatitis B or C
- HIV/AIDS
- Multiple Sclerosis (MS)
- Seizure disorder/epilepsy

Source: Biogen/ MyHealthTeams Case Study, at eyeforpharma PCCT
Results After Two Weeks…

798 screeners taken, 66 people passed who live near a site and asked to be contacted.

Source: Biogen/ MyHealthTeams Case Study, at eyeforpharma PCCT
MyHealthTeams and Biogen Idec

Lessons Learnt

• Partner with a social network focused on your therapeutic area
• Coordinate with sites and CRO to ensure buy-in & site readiness before launching social
• Submit patient recruitment materials to IRB early
• Consider your patient value proposition
• Discover quickly why leads drop out
• Recruit qualified patients quickly and cost-effectively
• Identify locations that could be opened

Source: Biogen/ MyHealthTeams Case Study, at eyeforpharma PCCT

PATIENT-CENTERED CLINICAL TRIALS
Campbell Pharmaceutical Seminar Series 2014 at Rutgers Business School
Our Data are everywhere...

Source: Genetic Alliance Case Study 2014, at eyeforpharma PCCT
“How can we share the clinical and genetic data of millions of individuals and still respect their diverse wishes?”

**Conditions Under Which the Public is Willing to Have their Data Used for Health Research**

Dr. Alan F. Westin, Institute of Medicine (2009)

- **1.5%**
  - Okay for researchers to use my data without my consent at all...

- **10%**
  - Willing to give general consent in advance for use of my data without being contacted...

- **24%**
  - Consent is not needed if my identity will never be revealed and the study is IRB supervised...

- **48%**
  - Want each study seeking to use my data to contact me in advance and to get my specific consent each time...

- **16.5%**
  - Would not want researchers to contact me or to use my data under any circumstance...

*Percentages shown reflect the views of those persons expressing an opinion. An additional 20% of the persons surveyed indicated that they were “Not sure.”

Source: Genetic Alliance Case Study 2014, at eyeforpharma PCCT
Platform for Engaging Everyone Responsibly (PEER)

- launched in 2014 as a major effort to give individuals a powerful way to contribute to translational and participant-centered outcomes research
- committed to accelerating research through access to health information that remains in the control of the participants.
- Currently in development for a wide range of organizations and uses, including a **PCORI funded project** and **Patient Powered Drug Development projects** associated with the FDA mandate to engage a number of communities.

*Source: Genetic Alliance Case Study 2014, at eyeforpharma PCCT*
**Privacy Settings:** For John Doe

**You are currently viewing privacy settings for John Doe**

**What types of information can be shared?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DISCOVER</th>
<th>EXPORT &amp; USE</th>
<th>CONTACT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.discover and view my anonymous information</td>
<td>export and use my anonymous information</td>
<td>view and use my personal information to contact me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(click for details)</td>
<td>(click for details)</td>
<td>(click for details)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Who can access it?**

### Support Groups
- XYZ Foundation: Allow
- Foundations supporting my conditions: Allow
- Any foundations: Allow

### Medical Researchers
- NIH funded researchers studying XYZ: Allow
- Researchers studying XYZ: Allow
- Researchers studying ABC: Allow
- All researchers: Allow

### Data Analysis
- "Compare with others" feature: N/A
- "Show related content" feature: N/A
- Genetic Alliance Translational Research Network: Allow
- PCORnet: Patient-Centered Outcomes Research Network: Allow
- Newly released data analysis platforms: Ask Me

### Newborn Sequencing (future pilot?)
- Allow

**And may change these preferences over time**

**Source:** Genetic Alliance Case Study 2014, at eyeforpharma PCCT
“Gamified” Interface for Questions and Answers

Questions appear in a dynamic user interface, and provide immediate feedback on how others responded to the same question...

Participants can review their prior answers, make updates and/or remove the data at any time.

Source: Genetic Alliance Case Study 2014, at eyeforpharma PCCT
PEER is Completely Customizable

Source: Genetic Alliance Case Study 2014, at eyeforpharma PCCT
Regulatory Players

* Review how regulatory and policy players support the patient’s role in drug development
FDA has encouraged and fostered the use of patient-reported outcome measures in clinical trials, such as impact on quality of life or pain control, to support labeling claims in medical product development.

**FDA's Patient-Focused Drug Development initiative** is a commitment under the fifth authorization of the Prescription Drug User Fee Act (PDUFA V) that aims to more systematically gather patients’ perspectives on their condition and available therapies to treat their condition.

FDA is holding at least **20 public meetings** over the course of PDUFA V, each focused on a specific disease area.

**Richard M. Klein** is the Director of the Patient Liaison Program

Meetings: [http://www.fda.gov/ForIndustry/UserFees/PrescriptionDrugUserFee/ucm347317.htm](http://www.fda.gov/ForIndustry/UserFees/PrescriptionDrugUserFee/ucm347317.htm)
• Independent, non-profit health research organization authorized by the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act of
• Funded to do comparative clinical effectiveness research on patient-centered outcomes
• PCORI’s patient engagement and industry’s patient engagement are parallel efforts

Patient-Centered Outcomes Research Institute
Patient and Family Engagement Rubric

Planning the Study

Conducting the Study

Disseminating the Study Results

PCOR Engagement Principles

Patient-Centered Outcomes Research Institute
Patient Engagement in Data Network Development (PCORnet)

**Enrollment and diversity**
- Increasing size of the network
- Increasing the diversity of the network
- Retention of network members

**Governance**
- The development of the network governance structure, roles and responsibilities
- Development of procedures, bylaws and policies for the network

**Data collection**
- The development of data collection tools
- Identification of Patient Reported Outcomes (PROs) for inclusion in database

**Data sharing, privacy and**
- The development of consent processes and policies
- Development of data sharing agreements
- Development of privacy policies
Concluding Thoughts

PATIENT-CENTERED DRUG DEVELOPMENT
REVENUE DRIVER AND PARADIGM SHIFT?
Reality Check: Patient Engagement

• In **preparatory phase**: setting of the research agenda, prioritization of topics and funding

• In **execution phase**: study design and procedures, recruitment, data collection, data analysis

• In **translational phase**: dissemination of results, implementation and evaluation

• Mostly convenience sampling, rarely randomization

• Engagement methods: Focus groups, interviews, surveys, study boards

• Few conceptual frameworks, poor quality of reporting

• Involvement is possible but insufficient data to evaluate positive impact

**Tokenism? Scope creep? Frustration over lengthy process?**

*Domecq et al. BMC Health Services Research 2014, 14:89, including other systematic meta reviews*
Crux of the Problem with Data

patient-centric information

• The principle of patient-centered trial data – the outcomes and evidence that are most relevant to all patients with the condition.

• more data from trials, not less.

patient-centric studies

• The principle of patient-centered trial design – re-engineering our studies to make them friendlier and more accessible to the patients who will actually enroll in them

“Our attempts to make our clinical trials more patient friendly have, for the most part, been subverted by our need to collect more comprehensive and more patient-relevant data.”

Paul Ivsin, IMS
The Crucial Trial Challenges

- **Patient/Caregivers Education**: Lack of understanding of trial procedures
- **Patient Engagement**: Long duration of trials, patients going through personal, psychological & emotional factors leading to drop out rates
- **Protocol Complexity**: Patients need to take multiple medications, come for multiple visit that they can miss
- **Focus on individual patient**: Patients need a patient focused and pleasant experience
- **Physician Communication**: Investigators have less time in person with patients. Patients cannot travel for long distances, decreasing time with investigators
- **Medication Adherence**: Number of medications to be taken per day can influences, the adherence rates dropping to as low as 20%*
- **Support**: Patients need a reliable person to call to for questions about medications
- **No reporting mechanism**: No mechanism to report if patient has taken/not taken medications

*Cognizant Life Sciences Solutions (2014)*
Direct to patient, no site in sight?

High Cost  
High Skill  
High Burden  

Low Cost  
Low Skill  
Low Burden  

Bring the trial closer to the patient

Venue: Sites → Pharmacies → In-home → On person  
People: Doctors → Pharmacists → Nurse or self → Self  
Tech: EDC → Adjusted EDC → Connected Devices → Mobile / Wearable

Industry Priorities for next 2 years

1. Meaningful integration of patient reported outcomes and quality-of-life metrics
2. Emphasis on data sharing throughout the overall trial process
3. Recruitment materials that speak to the patient's health concerns
4. Systematic patient input in protocol design
5. Focus on patient friendly and patient-focused endpoints
6. Integration of healthcare-related systems with clinical research systems, leverage EMR data
Industry Priorities for next 2 years

7. Cloud computing to access patient information and medical history
8. Defining patient centricity and defining framework for patient interaction
9. Industry-wide commitment to sharing patient engagement best practices
10. Placebo-controlled studies with a follow-up extension study which guarantees active study drug is a good example of study design with patient involvement in mind.
11. Easing patients' burden by making it easy to provide high quality data (i.e. using smartphones and tablets that fit into their daily lives)
# Patient-Centered Trials Initiatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Stage</th>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Specific Initiatives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Study Planning and Start Up** | ✓ Development planning  
✓ Protocol design  
✓ Site identification  
✓ Study start-up | ✓ Patient/patient-advocacy input into research agendas, funding and participation  
✓ Input into planning and protocol design  
✓ Patient-willingness driven site selection |
| **Ongoing Study Activity** | ✓ Patient recruitment  
✓ Study conduct/data collection  
✓ Informed consent form review  
✓ Ongoing informed consent  
✓ Interaction during participation | • Direct-to-patient clinical trial participation  
• Mobile device data collection and patient reported outcomes  
• Video and iPad informed consent  
• Ongoing study volunteer assessment |
| **Study Close Out** | ✓ Volunteer completion  
✓ Communication and disclosure | • Blue button initiative  
• Dissemination of trial results to study volunteers and broader publication |

*Adapted from Ken Getz, Tufts CSDD, 2014*
Engagement across the Clinical Trial Continuum

Based on material from Parkinson Disease Foundation, CTTI, other patient advocacies
Questions & Discussion
Will there be a lesser role for clinical trial sites in the coming era of “direct-to-patient” studies and mobile technologies? Do you support it?

As SVP of Global Clinical Operations at a big pharma, which area would you prioritize for investment to become more patient-centered?

What is the impact of outsourcing clinical operations when it comes to pharma’s relationship with patients? From an economic POV, would you change the current model?
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Please get in touch if you have any questions about our clinical trials initiative, upcoming executive meetings or other projects:

Ulrich Neumann
Director
+1 (201) 204-1688
ulrich@eyeforpharma.com
linkedin.com/in/uneumann