

SPECIAL SESSION REPORTING CLINICAL TRIALS

Faculty of Principles of Clinical Trials and Systemic Therapy

INTRODUCTION

CHRISTIAN DITTRICH

3rd Medical Department – Centre for Oncology and Haematology

Kaiser Franz Josef-Spital, Vienna, Austria

Applied Cancer Research – Institution for Translational Research Vienna (ACR-ITR VIenna)



DISCLOSURE

I have no Conflicts of Interest to declare

STANDARDS FOR ACCURATE PUBLICATION AND PRESENTATION OF RESEARCH

International Society for Medical Publication Professionals (www.ismpp.org)	Code of ethics
Association of American Medical Colleges (www.aamc.org)	Position statement: the role of the professional medical writer
American Medical Writers Association (www.amwa.org)	Report of task force on industry funding of medical education
Committee on Publication Ethics (http://publicationethics.org)	Code of ethics
Council of Science Editors (www.councilscienceeditors.org)	Position statement: the contribution of medical writers to scientific publications
Elsevier (www.elsevier.com/wps/find/editorshome.editors/Introduction)	Multiple resources for editors
European Medical Writers Association (www.emwa.org)	White paper on promoting integrity in scientific journal publications
EQUATOR Network (www.equator-network.org)	Publishing ethics resource kit
Federation of American Societies for Experimental Biology (www.faseb.org)	Guidelines on the role of medical writers in developing peer reviewed publications
International Committee of Medical Journal Editors (www.icmje.org)	Reporting guidelines—for example, CONSORT, STROBE, QUOROM/PRISMA, STARD, MOOSE
Institute of Medicine (www.iom.edu/CMS/3740/47464/65721.aspx)	Conflicts of interest in biomedical research—the FASEB guidelines
International Federation of Pharmaceutical Manufacturers and Associations (www.ifpma.org/fileadmin/pdfs/webnews/Revised_Joint_Industry_Position_26Nov08.pdf)	Uniform requirements for manuscripts submitted to biomedical journals: writing and editing for biomedical publication
International Society for Pharmacoeconomics and Outcomes Research (www.ispor.org/PEguidelines/index.asp)	Conflict of interest in medical research, education, and practice
Pharmaceutical Research and Manufacturers of America (www.phrma.org)	Joint position on the disclosure of clinical trial information via clinical trial registries and databases
World Association of Medical Editors (www.wame.org/resources/policies)	Pharmacoeconomic guidelines around the world
Wiley-Blackwell (www.wiley.com/bw/publicationethics)	Principles on conduct of clinical trials and communication of clinical trial results
	WAME policy statements prepared by the editorial policy committee, including conflict of interest in peer reviewed medical journals
	Best practice guidelines on publication ethics: a publisher's perspective

ADVERSE EVENT REPORTING IN CANCER CLINICAL TRIAL PUBLICATIONS

Review of publications 2009-2011 (PubMed, Medline, Embase)

Assessment for 14 adverse event-reporting elements derived from CONSORT

175 publications: Data on 96,125 patients

96%: AEs reported above a threshold rate or severity

37%: Criteria used for selection of reporting on AEs not specified

88%: AEs of varying severity grouped together

Development of oncology-specific standards for AE reporting required

NEW DEVELOPMENTS IN PRO ASSESSMENTS

Discussion about current use of (HR) QoL measures in cancer clinical trials as they include large, multi-domain assessments that attempt to evaluate a broad concept

FDA Criticism about 'static' (HR) QoL measures that include the same questions, irrespective of stage or therapy being studied (Kluetz P, *et al.* AACR 2016):

- ◆ Increased flexibility can be obtained to adapt to differing disease and therapy contexts when measuring PRO-CTCAE in combination with physical functioning

EORTC advocates a combination of standardised (HR) QoL measures with validated items from item libraries like PRO-CTCAE, EORTC or other libraries

- ◆ This approach ensures evaluation of side effects and their impact on functional health problems reported by patients

SUBGROUP ANALYSES IN RANDOMIZED TRIALS

Review of publications 2011-2013 (Medline via PubMed)

Assessment of prespecification of subgroup analyses, number, subgroup factors, interaction test use, claim for subgroup difference

221 publications: Data on 184,500 patients

85% (188): RCTs reported with subgroup analyses

92% (173): Number of subgroup analyses not determined

31% (59): RCTs reported with fully prespecified subgroups

34% (64): Trials reported with interaction tests

54% (102): RCTs reported with claims of subgroup differences

18% (18): Claims of RCTs based on interaction test results

Problems: Large number of subgroups, subgroups without prespecifications, inadequate use of interaction tests

META-ANALYSES

British Journal of Cancer (1996) 74, 496–501

© 1996 Stockton Press All rights reserved 0007–0920/96 \$12.00

GUEST EDITORIAL

Meta-analyses of randomised trials: when the whole is more than just the sum of the parts

MKB Parmar¹, LA Stewart¹ and DG Altman²

META-ANALYSES

VOLUME 25 • NUMBER 29 • OCTOBER 10 2007

JOURNAL OF CLINICAL ONCOLOGY

ORIGINAL REPORT

Surrogate End Points for Median Overall Survival in Metastatic Colorectal Cancer: Literature-Based Analysis From 39 Randomized Controlled Trials of First-Line Chemotherapy

Patricia A. Tang, Søren M. Bentzen, Eric X. Chen, and Lillian L. Siu

PFS an appropriate surrogate for OS

VOLUME 25 • NUMBER 33 • NOVEMBER 20 2007

JOURNAL OF CLINICAL ONCOLOGY

ORIGINAL REPORT

Progression-Free Survival Is a Surrogate for Survival in Advanced Colorectal Cancer

Marc Buyse, Tomasz Burzykowski, Kevin Carroll, Stefan Michiels, Daniel J. Sargent, Langdon L. Miller, Gary L. Elfring, Jean-Pierre Pignon, and Pascal Piedbois

PFS an acceptable surrogate for OS

THESIS

Stopping early because of benefit is claimed
to be ethically justified:

Inacceptable to withhold a more effective remedy
from a patient in the control arm

ANTITHESIS

“A good intention is still far from being a good deed”
(Alfred Polgar)

Some initially asked questions may become unanswered but will never more be approached although being important

This may be even more unethical !