

































## **Key Observations (1/2)**

- EFPIA welcomes the paper and recognizes the importance of establishing clear scientific principles for confidence in RWE.
- Reflection Paper should provide a balanced assessment of clinical trials and non-interventional studies, recognising that both have a role, depending on the research question.
- Scope, definitions and terminology scope is not always clear (e.g. are disease epidemiology studies in scope?), NIS are defined by what they are not rather than what they are, does the definition cover a subset rather than the totality of NIS? Consultation on the RP provides an opportunity to enhance mutual understanding of terminology across stakeholder groups.



## **Key Observations (2/2)**

- Predictability and consistency of interpretation will be important how can this be supported in implementation plans? Fitness for purpose framework with criteria identifying where RWE may be suitable? Shared learnings?
- Transparency EFPIA agrees that study /results registration is one component of building trust and confidence in research and has made proposals (Acha V et al; Principles for Good Practice in the Conduct of Noninterventional Studies: The View of Industry Researchers. Ther Innov Regul Sci. 2023 Nov;57(6):1199-1208.)
- Structure of the reflection paper could clarify applicability of relevant text to primary and secondary research, respectively.

