



EUROPEAN
HEMATOLOGY
ASSOCIATION

Good Clinical Practice: patient-centered, investigator-friendly

Martin Dreyling

EHA



EHA initiative: Increasing patient safety and reducing bureaucracy in clinical trials

Following a bottom-up initiative, EHA is working with key stakeholders to find solutions to the challenges posed by bureaucratic obstacles in clinical trials, mainly:

1. Excessive safety reporting
2. Comprehensibility of Informed Consent Forms
3. Regulatory ambiguity

[Reducing Bureaucracy in Clinical Research: A Call for Action](#)



Safety reporting

- **Leave safety reporting with the (medical) experts**
- **Simplify and (partially) standardize safety reporting forms**
 - prevent sponsors from making their own reports
 - devise the process as a ‘friendly request’; no unnecessary steps or signatures (Australasian experience as inspiration)
- **Clear definition of SAE with grading** is necessary. Without serious and effective modifications, it will be impossible to **reduce the amount of work** due to overinterpretation of SAEs.



Informed consent forms (ICFs)

- ICFs should be **short and understandable**, as stated in ICH E6
However, **the list of items in 4.8.1 is excessively long.**
- **A two-step document with 1 or 2-page summary** plus explanations, including biologic assessment, could be helpful.
- **Patient organizations** must be involved.



Sponsors and CROs

- ICH E6 recommends to “**avoid unnecessary complexity, procedures, and data collection**” (addendum 5.0 Quality Management). What is lacking: clear guidance for implementation
- Good idea: a **risk-based process** with SOPs that are shared with the investigator
- Transfer of all duties to the CRO by the sponsor is a risk (section 5.2) Safety-related responsibilities should not be transferred and should be agreed **between the sponsor and the investigator.**



How to implement these recommendations?

Over-interpretation of Good Clinical Practice guidelines, mainly by CROs, perverts the initial aim of optimizing patient safety.

Therefore, **more clarity** about how, who, where, when to implement these recommendations would be helpful.

Could abbreviated guidelines, alongside the revised full version, be a solution?