In clinical research, electronic Patient Reported Outcomes (ePRO) adoption is moving steadily. In clinical practice, Patient Reported Outcomes (PRO) are extensively used in evaluating disruptive medical technologies in an effort to optimize patient outcomes. Therefore, MaRS EXCITE was able to deploy across multiple participating sites. In an attempt to promote consistency in Quality Assurance (QA) amongst MCs and participating sites for EXCITE studies, EXCITE has developed SOPs, through the Clinical/Trial Methodology Committee, that relate to standard one-on-one interview and focus groups. These have been introduced as an analysis of host institution SOPs and developing overarching SOPs that were either unique to the EXCITE QA program, or where deemed appropriate though lacking from some host institutions. This harmonization of SOPs across the five current EXCITE MCs has allowed EXCITE to address one of the main goals of clinical trial QA that is integrity of data. The second goal of clinical trial QA, patient safety, is achieved through the Safety Advisory committee, which sets safety standards that must be adhered to by the MCs evaluating the technological risk of clinical trials. The committee reviews all protocols to ensure that patient safety issues are addressed. The committee recommends general patient safety suggestions and specific, ongoing training requirements. EXCITE compromises five Methodological Centres (MCs) across Ontario, Canada with demonstrated excellence in methodologies for designing and implementing multi-centre trials and HTAs. The MCs develop the protocol collaboratively with industry and expert stakeholders oversee the clinical trials. Placing the MCs in a collaborative environment to optimize patient outcomes.
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BACKGROUND: Systematic reviews (SRs) are critically important to support decision making in health care. Interest in reliable and quick evidence synthesis has sparked development of “rapid reviews” yet no clear consensus exists on what these are or what processes they use. The goal of this project was to understand and describe practices of conducting rapid reviews. METHODS: We searched the literature to identify rapid review methods, guidance, and empiric evidence, and conducted in-depth interviews with producers to identify current practices, and understand the evolution of their programs and products. We analyzed the data qualitatively, integrating information gathered from the literature and interviews. RESULTS: We identified 36 rapid products from 20 organizations (production time, 5 minutes to 8 months). Almost all products used four approaches to save time (restricted database searching, inclusion criteria, data abstraction, and dual review); with faster products tending to employ more of these approaches. Methods also varied by synthesis type, with some products (inventories) avoiding synthesis completely, while others (rapid reviews) performed syntheses similar to full reviews but with limited scope and review to achieve deadlines. Interviews with producers varied in insight across these innovations. Most rapid products are produced to support specific decisions in an identified timeframe within the context of a close relationship between researcher and end-user. This allows selection of methods that best fit the timeframe and end-user needs, and help the end-user understand resulting limitations. Almost no empirical evidence exist comparing rapid reviews and SRs CONCLUSIONS: Rapid products have tremendous methodological variation, but categorization based on timeframe or type of synthesis reveals some patterns that can be used in methodological frameworks. The current study has been the first to describe the usefulness of resource modelling along with examples from the literature. Resource modelling is especially useful if there are significant changes in the amount or type of resources provided in the environment, its related resource requirements and capacity constraints. While regulatory authorities recognize ePRO benefits, additional regulatory support is needed. The novel project of ePRO fRO can pose an overall positive ROI when looking at the costs savings associated with higher quality data. While regulatory authorities recognize ePRO benefits, additional regulatory support would also render higher ePRO adoption rate.