Questions and Answers on Data Monitoring Committees issues

Biostatistics working party, especially

Peter Volkers, PEI Steven Teerenstra, Radboudumc / CBG-MEB Kit Roes (chair BSWP), Radboudumc / CBG-MEB Armin Koch, MHH

European Medicines Agency, Methodology, Data Analytics and Methods Task Force, especially,

Ina-Christine Rondak Frank Pétavy (workstream head)

Disclaimer

Apart from presenting (shortened versions of) the verbatim text of the Q&A, statements in this presentation are my own and do not necessarily represent the opinion of BSWP or EMA.

Context

- Draft published August 2018
- Public consultation August 2019
 - comments from 10 stakeholders
- Q&A was officially adopted by CHMP on 17 September 2020

The Q&A is not a standalone document but should be read in conjunction with the DMC guideline.

GCP IWG is planning to revise the DMC guideline, after CHMP agrees to that

Principles DMC

- <u>Independent</u> members, external to the Sponsor
- evaluating/monitoring accumulating data with an objective to <u>safeguard safety</u> of current and future participants, and <u>progress</u> of the trial
- Advisory role to the Sponsor (regarding modification, continuation, termination)
- Maintain trial integrity and credibility (as DMC may have access to unblinded data)

Questions on:

- Decision power of DMC
- Communication by DMC
- Disagreement between DMC and Sponsor representative on stopping the trial
- Need for (non-)DMCs in early development

Decision power

Advisory principle ===> decision power

Question	Answer (shortened)
1. Are DMC recommendations binding for a Sponsor?	No. However, not following DMC recommendations should be documented and justified.
2. Can a DMC stop a study ?	No. Of the DMC and the Sponsor, only Sponsor can stop study.

Advisory + trial integrity principle ===> decision power

Question	Answer (shortened)
3. Can a DMC change study design aspects (e.g. increase sample size, drop treatment arms)?	No. Of the Sponsor and DMC only the Sponsor can change design aspects Preplanned changes (e.g. adaptive designs): Operationalize such that the DMC can maintain its advisory role • without making direct decisions and can maintain trial integrity • DMC may look at unblinded data, but Sponsor should be kept blinded (DMC could 'help out' to execute a properly pre-planned decision-rule, but in principle this could also be another independent committee.) Unplanned changes: Can be proposed by DMC, but such that trial integrity is maintained.

Communication

trial integrity principle+ advisory role ===> communication

Question	Answer (shortened)
4. Is a direct communication and exchange of information between competent regulatory authorities and a DMC possible?	 As a general rule: no, communication via Sponsor. DMC is advisory Sponsor final responsibility In exceptional circumstances (public health threats) affecting the conduct current trial or other trials, competent reg.auth. may need information of the DMC: Sponsor should be involved in request for exchange If possibility that trial can continue: Exchange from DMC to reg.auth. directly to preserve trial integrity (not breaking the blind) If reg.auth. wants to inform DMC of safety concern: via Sponsor
5. Is a direct communication between Ethics Committees and a DMC possible?	In some nations, Ethics Committees monitor specific AE, risk/benefit, and can change/stop a trial. This combination of knowledge and decision power may give risk of introducing bias. Therefore, same principles as above.

trial integrity principle ===> communication

Question	Answer (shortened)
6. Should the Investigators be informed about the outcome of DMC meetings?	Yes. DMC can communicate the following* 1) Continue without changes 2) Continue with modifications: a) Quality improvement measures b) Measures for safety/negative risk-benefit: - patient care - patient recruitment 3) Stop the trial Trial integrity preserved if 1), 2a) or 3). For 2b) communication should be such that trial integrity is preserved as much as possible *if recommendation adopted by Sponsor

safeguard safety ===> communication

Question	Answer (shortened)
7. When shall competent regulatory authorities be notified of DMC outcomes?	Unexpected safety finding: immediately. Other outcomes: together with planned safety/interim analysis reporting.

Disagreement DMC vs Sponsor's trial steering committee on stopping

trial integrity ===> reconcile disagreement

Question	Answer (shortened)
8. How should the DMC proceed when contemplating the recommendation to stop the trial?	Minimize impact on trial integrity as trial might still continue, Applies to Degree of involvement Sponsor Communication to investigators 1) When DMC is considering recommending stopping Recruitment on hold and involve external experts DMC and experts discuss in closed sessions all evidence in and outside the trial 2) Should DMC recommend stopping and Sponsor's representative disagrees All efforts from both sides to reconcile 3) If not resolved in 2), then Closed session with DMC, external experts and senior Sponsor personnel with decision power and independent of the trial Reach common decision Important to present a common decision as otherwise trial integrity damaged (operational bias)
13	

(non-)DMCs in early phase trials

trial credibility + safety protection

Question	Answer (shortened)
9. When is there a need for a DMC in early development phases? (Combines answer to question "Do DMC members have to be external in relation to the Sponsor in early development phases?")	 Sponsor's product knowledge may be needed in early phase safety monitoring => (some) non-independent members in an safety monitoring Trial credibility => sufficient independent members for objective decision making non fully independent safety monitoring committee are not called DMCs, but different: e.g. safety review committee (Also) installing a DMC can still be in interest of sponsor, as early development may include complex and possibly controversial decision making. E.g. in case of unexpected / critical findings that require objective, but not urgent decision making, a DMC can provide (additional) assessment that enhances credibility of the decision making.