

#### **DDF and Breaking Down the Document Barrier**

Bob Brindle, VP Product Management, Nurocor Frederik Malfait, SVP Information Architecture, Nurocor







#### **Meet the Speakers**

**Bob Brindle** 

Title: VP Product Management

**Organization:** Nurocor

Frederik Malfait Title: SVP Information Architecture Organization: Nurocor



### **Disclaimer and Disclosures**

- The views and opinions expressed in this presentation are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official policy or position of CDISC.
- The author(s) have no real or apparent conflicts of interest to report.



## Agenda

- 1. The road to digitalization
- 2. Upstream and downstream
- 3. Breaking down the document barrier
- 4. Clinical document authoring

## The road to digitalization

It's a dangerous business, Frodo, going out your door. You step onto the road, and if you don't keep your feet, there's no knowing where you'll be swept off to.

J.R.R. Tolkien

## The Journey (so far)



cdisc

## **Adoption versus Standardization**





## **Upstream and downstream**

There comes a point where we need to stop just pulling people out of the river. We need to go upstream and find out why they're falling in. Desmond Tutu







#### **Upstream possibilities**



#### **Upstream study definition builder**





## Breaking down the document barrier

Disrupt yourself before someone else does.

Jay Samit

## Codify the study design into components

- Components are well defined entities
- Components have well defined relationships
- Components can be templated
- Components can receive, carry, and send information
- Components can have many representations
- Components can be tracked
- Components can be reused (write once, read many)
- Components are actionable
- Components can be assembled



#### **Study dashboards**

IES DO	CUMENTS	CHAN	GE REQUE	STS													
	Filter By:	None Ap	plied					•	Cre	ation Date	9	•	a≡	CREA	ATE NEW S	STUDY -	
AMENDI	original	In Progr		col		202301W 2023		<sup>Original</sup>	In Progress			SDR Integ	T1	Original	In Progress	8	
	on Septemb	er 14, 2023				created	on August	24, 2023				created	on August 2	24, 2023			
Å	Ē		đ	Ð	:	Å	f		U	Ð	:	Å	Ē		U	P	:
2023016	2E Origina	I In Pro	gress			SPECMC	OHORT	Original	In Progress			SPECMPA	ARTIAL	Driginal II	n Progress		
	-01 End t		est				men Ma	-	ent Coho	rts Setu	ıp	Study	men Ma Setup on July 19,	-	ent Demo	o - Parti	al
A	Ē	<b></b>	E	Ę	:	A	Ē	Ē	E	Ð	:	A	Ē		E	Ð	:





.......

#### **Trial design schematic**





### **Interventions and products**





## **Eligibility criteria**

Eligibility Criteria	
Inclusion Criteria	
Protocol Text	Submission Text
Participant must be male or a postmenopausal female	Males and postmenopausal females
Aged >= 50 year(s), at the time of signing the informed consent	At least 50 years of age
Meets the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders Version 5 (DSM-5) criteria and/or National Institute of Neurological and Communicative Disorders and Stroke-Alzheimer's Disease and Related Disorder Association's (NINCDS-ADRDA) criteria for probable AD	Diagnosis of probable Alzheimer's Disease



#### **Objectives and endpoints**





.......

#### **Schedule of Activities**

reatment 2 arms 🗸			Ev	ents & Timepo	ints 🛃 🛃	xport Schedu
	Screening	Baseline	Week 4	Week 8	Week 12	Week 24
<ul> <li>Disposition - Randomization</li> </ul>	•	0	0	0	0	0
<ul> <li>Prior and Concomitant Medications</li> </ul>	•	٠		•	•	
✓ Exposure		٠				
∧ Vital Signs	•	•	•	•	•	
✓ Vital Signs - General	•	٠	•	•	•	٠
✓ Vital Signs - Systolic Blood Pressure	٠	٠	•	•	•	
✓ Vital Signs - Diastolic Blood Pressure	•	٠	•	•	•	
✓ Vital Signs - Height						
✓ Vital Signs - Weight	•	٠		•	•	
✓ Vital Signs - BMI						



## **Specimen Management Plans**

Specime	en Management			Manag	e collection groups
Subject group	ps 0 Biospecimens 0	Plans 0			
Q Search	h				≂ Filter
State	Name	Description	Collection matrix	Assay count	
Valid	Laboratory Panels 1	A sample description for Specimen A.	1 Matrix 1	3	i
Invalid	Laboratory Panels 2	A sample description for Specimen B.	Matrix 2	4	i
Valid	Laboratory Panels 3	A sample description for Specimen C.	XMatrix 3	5	i
Invalid	Laboratory Panels 4	A sample description for Specimen D.	Y Matrix 4	6	i
Valid	Laboratory Panels 5	A sample description for Specimen E.	Matrix 5	7	i
ems per pag	je: 10 -			1-10 of 5 r	esults <



#### Lean Protocol™

All Processes 🗸 🔛		Level 1: (DM) Draft	In F	Progress 😑
		Conditions		
LEVEL 1 Level 1: (F) Early Indication Feas	0	Schedule of Activities	Completed	C4
		Study Model Elements	Completed	C.
Level 1: (M) Draft		Trial Arms	Completed	Cì.
Level 1: (SAP) Draft	•	Study Planning	Completed	C4
Level 1: (SM) Draft	•	Study Extensions	Completed	C.
LEVEL 2		Study Interventions and Products	Completed	Cì.
Level 2: (F) Protocol Feasibility	•	Objectives and Endpoints	In Progress	D.
	•			
Level 3: (DM) Final	•			
Level 3: (M) Final	•			
Level 3: (SAP) Final	•			
Level 3: (SM) Final	•			



## Workflow driven system integrations (SDR)

ean Protocol Gate Ap	proval Request	t	Comments and	l discussions (1 Comme i)
Protocol Lead	Fred	erik 👻	Frederik Malfa Posted 1 minute ago	it :
Attachments (0)		~	General discussion	
Disposition		roving will submit the y from NCP to SDR.		0 REPLIE
	CANCEL	CHOOSE AN ACTION V		
		Approve		
		Reject		
		Save		
				NEW COMMENT



# **Clinical document authoring**

Every writer I know has trouble writing. Joseph Heller



## **Documents in a Digital Data Flow**

- Documents in traditional published formats (pdf, docx) are still required as part of many regulatory processes
- Content of documents MUST be consistent with the digital study definition
- Current document authoring processes and tools will need to adapt
- ICH M11 is leading us in the right direction



#### Statement of the Perceived Problem

The clinical protocol describes the processes and procedures directing the conduct and analysis of a clinical study. Currently there is no internationally harmonised standard template for the format and content of the clinical protocol document to support consistency across sponsors and exchange of protocol information. This lack of harmonization contributes to inefficiencies and difficulties in reviewing and assessing clinical protocols by regulators, sponsors, ethical oversight bodies, investigators, and other stakeholders. An international guideline and template would support consistency in the development of structured and unstructured protocol content, and a technical specification will facilitate its electronic exchange.

Issues to be Resolved

#### cdisc

## **Templates in a document-based process**

		AutoSave		3 9 -	- U			cx + Last Mo	dified: 25 J							۲		
	File	Hom	e Insert	Draw	Design	Layout	References	Mailings	Reviev	View	Zotero	Help	EndNo	ote	Cor	nments	🖉 Editi	ng 🖌 🛃
	Pas	an X te ि ooard ∿s	A - 4	<u>U</u>		A° A″		≣ I≣ ~ 2↓ ¶ agraph	rs s	yles 😼	ř	Uictate Voice	Editor Editor	Add-ins				
	L						1 • 4 • 1 • 5 •	1 · 6 · 1 · 7	• 1 • 8 • 1	9 • 1 • 10	0 - 1 - 11 - 1	· 12 · 1 ·	13 · + · 14 ·	1 - 15 - 1	· 16 · 📥 ·		1.1.1	
				i d s E E	his-sectio ocuments eveloped ide effect stablished Briefly ref	n-should-l Include : for the dis profile). S I class, an er to litera	round¶ be brief (1/2.to a 1- to 2-sente case (eg, unn tate whether 1 whether this ture and data unlicensed in	nce descrip net medical this is a nov class of co relevant to t	tion of wh need, easi el-class o mpounds he-study.	y the inv er admini Compou has been f	estigation istration, 4 nds-or-a-n used-befo	al interv better ef ew-com re in the	ention is ficacy exp pound wit therapeut	being- bected, be thin-an- tic-area.				
				r f I r b	onclinical indings-th B/IDFU/p eferencing o-the-secti	/clinical c at support ackage in g informat on or tabl	ata relevant t development sert, a referen ion in the IB/ e where the d	o the develo for the indi ice to the sp IDFU/packa ata are prese	pment of cation. D ccific IB/J ge insert mted.¶	the comp o not dupl DFU/pac or other r	ound and licate data kage inse elevant do	pharma a already rt-sectio ocument	codynami • summari n is suffic s, provide	c/efficac zed in th ient. Wh a referen	e-			
				r 1	eference i nfringeme	n-Section-	rketed compo 11) or provid t include a co c>¶	e a brief des	cription o	frelevant	t-informat	ion. To	avoid-cop					
				F n	lesearch + ew-classe	efforts in r	has been wid ecent years h otics with mo ins.¶	ave become	-increasi	igly-geare	ed toward	s-discov	ering and	develop				
				1 ( 9 <i>P</i>	opoisome homologo uinolone roteins; h	rase inhib us type II family of a owever, th	vention name tors (BTIs). T topoisomeras ntibiotics. The ley recognize of the target (	he BTIs sele es), which a e BTIs and o distinctly di	ectively∙in re∙clinica µinolone	hibit bact ly validat bind to e	erial DNA ed antibad a similar n	gyrase cterial-ta egion-of	and topois rgets inhi the same	somerasi bited-by-l target	he∙			
age 28 of	f 12	6	195	57 w	ords	in 9X	n of the chem the [investiga t>¶ t/Risk•Ass	itor's-brochu	re/IDFU/j			∙of-[inve	stigationa	ıl interver	ntion ·			
					ali	ovide a br gn with th	ef assessmen e IB, package investigation	t of the bene insert/press	fits and r ribing in	ormation	(if applic	able), I	OFU (for :		ġ.			
L	Page 2	28 of 126	19567 word	is 📿	English (U	nited State:	) Text Predict	tions: On		िक्क Disp	olay Setting	s (D) F	ocus 🖺				-	- + 10

- Pushing content into a traditional Word-based document template risks breaking the digital data flow
  - · Hard to maintain template structure
  - Hard to control access
  - · Hard to control edits
  - Copy/paste culture
  - · Versions can proliferate and diverge
- Document preparation overheads
  - Review cycles and comment resolution
  - Formatting and styling
  - Links and cross-references
  - Consistency checking
  - Bibliography



## **Templates in a digital data flow**



- Components are well defined entities
- Components have well defined relationships
- Components can be templated
- Components can receive, carry, and send information
- Components can have many representations
- Components can be tracked
- Components can be reused (write once, read many)
- Components are actionable
- Components can be assembled





#### **Examples**

Treatment 2 arms 🗸 🎤				Ev.	ints & Timepo	ints 🙆	Export Schedule
		Screening	Baseline ©	Week 4	Week 8	Week 12	Week 24
<ul> <li>Disposition - Randomization</li> </ul>	11	•	0	0	0	0	0
<ul> <li>Prior and Concomitant Medications</li> </ul>		•	٠	•	•	•	•
✓ Exposure			٠				0
∧ Vital Signs		•	•	•	٠	•	•
<ul> <li>Vital Signs - General</li> </ul>		•	٠	•	٠	•	•
<ul> <li>Vital Signs - Systolic Blood Pressure</li> </ul>		•	•	•	٠	•	•
<ul> <li>Vital Signs - Diastolic Blood Pressure</li> </ul>		•	٠	•	٠	•	•
✓ Vital Signs - Height							0
<ul> <li>Vital Signs - Weight</li> </ul>		•	•	•	•	•	•
✓ Vital Signs - BMI							
✓ Adverse Events			•	•	•	•	•

	Enterprise												Ц <sup>430</sup>	ss
· ·	×	Construction In Progress Protocol do	cument							New revi	iew cycle	Editing 💊		i
• •		$\begin{array}{cccc} \text{Styles} & & \checkmark & \text{AI} & \checkmark & \text{A} \\ \mathcal{I}_{x} & & & & & \\ \end{array} & & & & & \\ \end{array} \begin{vmatrix} \mathbf{F}_{x} & \mathbf{F}_{x} & \mathbf{F}_{x} \\ \mathbf{F}_{x} & \mathbf{F}_{x} \\ \end{array} \begin{vmatrix} \mathbf{F}_{x} & \mathbf{F}_{x} \\ \mathbf{F}_{x} $			$\underline{\cup} \times_2 \times$	<2   ≡ ~	<u></u>	:= v 1 2	⊂ ∨ List S	tyles 🗸	C 0		×Ω×	õ
	and Definitio	<b>B</b> save	Activitie	es (So <i>l</i>	A)							Ð	G	
1.3 Schedule of Acti	vities (SoA)	e									Configu	re View	]	
3 Objectives, Endpoin	nts, and Estir		Scre	ening				Trea	tment					
<ul><li>4 Study Design</li><li>5 Study Population</li></ul>		Activities	Visit 1 Week -2	Visit 2 Day -2 4	Visit 3 Week 0	Visit 4 Week 4	Visit 5 Week 8	Visit 6 Week 12	Visit 7 Week 16	Visit 8 Week 20	Visit 9 Week 24	Visit 10 Week 26		
<ul> <li>6 Study Intervention(s)</li> <li>7 Discontinuation of s</li> </ul>	Study Interve	Study Day	-14 (+2/-0)	-2 (+1/-1)	1 (+3/-3)	29 (+3/-3)	57 (+3/-3)	85 (+4/-4)	113 (+4/-4)	141 (+4/-4)	169 (+4/-4)	183 (+3/-3)		
<ul> <li>8 Study Assessments</li> <li>9 Statistical Consider</li> </ul>		Disposition - Informed Consent	~											
10 Supporting Docum	nentation an	Patient Information	~											
11 References		Demographics	~											
		Medical History	~	C	+ Citation	+ Comp	onent	+ Element	)					



ŝ



### **Examples**

		<b>_</b>						
nterventions								
Xanomeline high dose     Arm     Arm     Administered Products		:	Enterprise					Ļ
Intervention Details	Related Items:		$\times$	← In Progress Protocol docume	ent	New	w review cycle Editing	· ~ [
Intervention Name: Xanomeline high dose Intervention Type: Drug	Arms: • <b>High dose (†</b> Administered Products:			Styles $\sim AI \sim A \sim \blacksquare \sim$ $T_x   - H   \Box \sim \boxdot   \diamondsuit   \blacksquare$	$\begin{array}{c c} \mathbf{B} & I  \oplus  \underline{\cup}  \mathbf{X}_2  \mathbf{X}^2 \end{array} \equiv \mathbf{\nabla}  \underline{\oplus}  \mathbf{\nabla}  $	$\rightarrow$ $=$ $\begin{vmatrix} \vdots \\ \vdots \\ \end{vmatrix}$ $\checkmark$ $\begin{vmatrix} 1 \\ 2 \\ - \end{matrix}$ $\checkmark$ List Styles	- V 0 🖬 🖩	Ω×Ω
Description: 81 mg xanomeline, given by daily application of 2 patches, 1x50cm <sup>2</sup> 54mg xanomeline and 1x25cm <sup>2</sup> 25mg xanomeline. Patches to be worn continuously throughout the day for 12-14	Xanomeline 25cm 27mg patch      Xanomeline 50cm 54mg patch	ar	nd Definitior		ntion(s) and Conco	mitant Therapy		
hours and removed in the evening Intervention Alias: LY246708			$\backslash$		specified, investigational and non-inves behavioral) intended to be administere			
		▶ 2 Introduction	ities (SoA)					
				Save				
		3 Objectives, Endpoints	s, and Estim		on(s) Administered		Ę	3 ()
		<ul> <li>3 Objectives, Endpoints</li> <li>4 Study Design</li> </ul>	s, and Estin	6.1 Study Interventi	on(s) Administered		સ્	9 ()
		<ul> <li>3 Objectives, Endpoints</li> <li>4 Study Design</li> <li>5 Study Population</li> </ul>			on(s) Administered			
		<ul> <li>3 Objectives, Endpoints</li> <li>4 Study Design</li> <li>5 Study Population</li> <li>6 Study Intervention(s)</li> </ul>	) and Conco	6.1 Study Interventi	on(s) Administered		Configur	
		<ul> <li>3 Objectives, Endpoints</li> <li>4 Study Design</li> <li>5 Study Population</li> </ul>	) and Conco	6.1 Study Interventi	on(s) Administered	B: Low dose		
		<ul> <li>3 Objectives, Endpoints</li> <li>4 Study Design</li> <li>5 Study Population</li> <li>6 Study Intervention(s)</li> </ul>	) and Conco on(s) Admin	6.1 Study Interventi		B: Low dose Experimental	Configur	
		<ul> <li>3 Objectives, Endpoint:</li> <li>4 Study Design</li> <li>5 Study Population</li> <li>6 Study Intervention(s)</li> <li>6.1 Study Intervention</li> </ul>	) and Conco on(s) Admin dling, Storag udy Interven	6.1 Study Interventi	A: High dose		Configur	
		<ul> <li>&gt; 3 Objectives, Endpoint:</li> <li>&gt; 4 Study Design</li> <li>&gt; 5 Study Population</li> <li>&lt; 6 Study Intervention(s)</li> <li>&gt; 6.1 Study Intervention</li> <li>6.2 Preparation, Hand</li> <li>6.3 Assignment to Study</li> </ul>	) and Conco on(s) Admin dling, Storag udy Interven n Complianc	6.1 Study Interventi Arm Title Arm Type Arm Description Associated Intervention Labels (with associated	A: High dose Experimental High dose xanomeline TTS for 26 weeks Xanomeline high dose (Xanomeline 25cm 27mg patch,	Experimental Low dose xanomeline TTS for 26 weeks Xanomeline low dose (Xanomeline 50cm 54 mg	Configur C: Placebo Placebo Placebo patches for 26 weeks Placebo (Placebo 50cm patch, Placebo	re
		<ul> <li>3 Objectives, Endpoints</li> <li>4 Study Design</li> <li>5 Study Population</li> <li>6 Study Intervention(s)</li> <li>6.1 Study Intervention</li> <li>6.2 Preparation, Hand</li> <li>6.3 Assignment to Stu</li> <li>6.4 Blinding/Masking</li> <li>6.5 Study Intervention</li> </ul>	) and Conco on(s) Admin dling, Storag udy Interven n Complianc on	6.1 Study Interventi arm Title Arm Type Arm Description Associated Intervention	A: High dose Experimental High dose xanomeline TTS for 26 weeks Xanomeline high dose (Xanomeline 25cm 27mg patch, Xanomeline 50cm 54 mg patch)	Experimental Low dose xanomeline TTS for 26 weeks Xanomeline low dose (Xanomeline 50cm 54 mg patch, Placebo 25cm patch)	Configur C: Placebo Placebo Placebo patches for 26 weeks Placebo (Placebo	re
		<ul> <li>3 Objectives, Endpoints</li> <li>4 Study Design</li> <li>5 Study Population</li> <li>6 Study Intervention(s)</li> <li>6.1 Study Intervention</li> <li>6.2 Preparation, Hand</li> <li>6.3 Assignment to Stu</li> <li>6.4 Bilnding/Masking</li> <li>6.5 Study Intervention</li> <li>6.6 Dose Modification</li> <li>6.7 Continued Access</li> </ul>	) and Conco on(s) Admin dling, Storag udy Interven n Complianc on s to Study In	6.1 Study Interventi Arm Title Arm Type Arm Description Associated Intervention Labels (with associated	A: High dose Experimental High dose xanomeline TTS for 26 weeks Xanomeline high dose (Xanomeline 25cm 27mg patch,	Experimental Low dose xanomeline TTS for 26 weeks Xanomeline low dose (Xanomeline 50cm 54 mg patch, Placebo 25cm patch)	Configur C: Placebo Placebo Placebo patches for 26 weeks Placebo (Placebo 50cm patch, Placebo	re
		<ul> <li>3 Objectives, Endpoints</li> <li>4 Study Design</li> <li>5 Study Population</li> <li>6 Study Intervention(s)</li> <li>6.1 Study Intervention</li> <li>6.2 Preparation, Hand</li> <li>6.3 Assignment to Studies</li> <li>6.4 Blinding/Masking</li> <li>6.5 Study Intervention</li> <li>6.6 Dose Modification</li> </ul>	) and Conco on(s) Admin dling, Storag udy Interven n Complianc on s to Study In	6.1 Study Interventi Arm Title Arm Type Arm Description Associated Intervention Labels (with associated	A: High dose Experimental High dose xanomeline TTS for 26 weeks Xanomeline high dose (Xanomeline 25cm 27mg patch, Xanomeline 50cm 54 mg patch)	Experimental Low dose xanomeline TTS for 26 weeks Xanomeline low dose (Xanomeline 50cm 54 mg patch, Placebo 25cm patch)	Configur Configur Placebo Placebo patches for 26 weeks Placebo (Placebo 50cm patch, Placebo 50cm patch, Placebo 25cm patch)	re

#### Copyright 2024 Nurocor

## A complete digital authoring solution

- To achieve success, we need more than templates and standards
- Authors must be supported in developing content that does not flow from components and in producing a polished document as an end product
- A digital authoring solution should focus on improving user experience compared to current processes and tools
  - Collaborative authoring with guard rails to prevent loss of content
  - Review functionality structured reviews, traceability of outcome
  - Automatic formatting / styling use output templates to create final documents
  - Automatic generation of structural items title page, table of contents, bibliography etc.
  - Opportunities to embed AI for "assisted authoring"
  - · Seamless integration into existing approval workflows and document repositories
- Technology is not a problem, change management is key to success





American sub-contracting, but by a private investor and a good idea

Source: Scientific American





## Conclusion

- DDF has been long in the making
- Standards organizations and regulators are embracing the concepts and developing standards, templates and specifications (e.g. USDM and M11)
- Vendors are increasingly developing technology
- Production grade software is available today it's time to get started
- Change management and willingness to standardize are the remaining challenges
- Adoption of the tools drives further improvement
- An adoption case study is coming up!





#### **Thank You!**

Bob Brindle bob.brindle@nurocor.com

Frederik Malfait frederik.malfait@nurocor.com

