Translational Medicine & Therapeutics Journal

ISSN: 3117-6372
https://inkwise.org/index.php/TMTJ/index

Inkwise Press

Review Open Access

Master Protocols and Platform Trials: Operational Complexity Against Statistical Efficiency

Karlo Barisic-Lug[1*], Christos Theocharous[2] and Vangelis Kontogianni-Rap[3]

[1]Centre for Clinical Trials Methodology, Podravina Centre for Experimental Therapeutics, Koprivnica, Croatia
[2]Department of Biostatistics, Karpasia Centre for Experimental Therapeutics, Protaras, Cyprus
[3]Centre for Regulatory Science, Phocis Institute of Translational Medicine, Amfissa, Greece

*Correspondence to: Karlo Barisic-Lug, Centre for Clinical Trials Methodology, Podravina Centre for Experimental Therapeutics, Koprivnica, Croatia, E-mail: k.barisiclug@pcet.hr

Received: 20 November 2021; Accepted: 27 February 2022; Published: 17 July 2022

Copyright: © 2022 Karlo Barisic-Lug, et al. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.

Abstract

Master Protocols and Platform Trials is an area of active development in translational medicine, with evidence that has accumulated unevenly across its component questions. We review the current evidence base for master protocols and platform trials, spanning analytical, clinical, implementation, governance, and economic dimensions, focusing on where practice has converged and where it continues to vary, and set out the practical considerations relevant to a service considering its adoption. We conclude that selective, context-specific use is best supported by the evidence currently available, rather than uniform adoption or avoidance.

Keywords: Master Protocols and Platform Trials; Translational medicine; Evidence synthesis; Clinical implementation; Health services research

Introduction

Master Protocols and Platform Trials has drawn growing attention in translational and clinical research, yet practice around it remains inconsistent across centres and healthcare systems.[1] The present review sets out the current evidence base for master protocols and platform trials, the principal sources of variation in how it is applied, and the practical gaps that most often separate published evidence from routine implementation.[2]

Interest in master protocols and platform trials has accelerated over the past decade as underlying methods have matured and become more widely accessible outside the small number of specialist centres where they were first described, which in turn has exposed how much variation exists in how different services define, apply, and report on it.[3]

We approach master protocols and platform trials from the standpoint of a laboratory or clinical service deciding whether and how to adopt it, rather than purely as a matter of academic interest, and we return throughout to the operational questions such a decision raises.[4]

Background and Rationale

The rationale for master protocols and platform trials rests on a body of preclinical and early clinical work that, taken as a whole, makes a plausible case for benefit, though the strength of that case varies considerably across the specific sub-questions that make up the field.[5]

Historical development of master protocols and platform trials has proceeded in stages, with early proof-of-concept work followed by a period of methodological refinement and, more recently, by a small number of larger studies attempting to establish clinical or operational utility rather than feasibility alone.[6]

Evidence Synthesis

Evidence relevant to master protocols and platform trials has accumulated unevenly: some elements are supported by multiple concordant studies, while others rest on a small number of single-centre reports whose generalisability is uncertain.[7][8] Where the evidence is strongest, professional guidelines have begun to converge on a consistent recommendation; where it is weaker, practice continues to vary by institution and by the preferences of individual clinicians or laboratory directors.[9]

A recurring theme across the literature on master protocols and platform trials is the gap between what is analytically or theoretically achievable and what has actually been shown to change patient-relevant outcomes in a rigorously designed study, and this gap shapes much of the discussion that follows.[10]

Meta-analytic pooling of the available studies on master protocols and platform trials is complicated by heterogeneity in population, comparator, and outcome definition, and several published pooled estimates should therefore be read as indicative rather than definitive until more harmonised data become available.[11][12]

Question	Current evidence	Practical implication
Strength of supporting evidence	Uneven across sub-questions	Weight recommendations by evidence tier
Consistency across centres	Variable adoption reported	Local validation before wider rollout
Outcome measures used	Mixed surrogate and clinical endpoints	Prefer studies with clinical endpoints
Resource / cost implications	Rarely reported in detail	Assess local cost-effectiveness separately

Table 1: Summary of key considerations for master protocols and platform trials.

Methodological Considerations Across Studies

Study design quality across the master protocols and platform trials literature is mixed: a minority of studies are prospective and adequately powered for their primary outcome, while a larger share are retrospective, single-centre, or both, which limits the confidence that can be placed in any single reported effect size.[13]

Outcome ascertainment for master protocols and platform trials also differs meaningfully between studies, and a study using a surrogate or composite endpoint is not directly comparable with one using a hard clinical endpoint, even when both are described in similar terms in their abstracts.[14]

Implementation Considerations

From an implementation standpoint, adopting master protocols and platform trials raises questions that go beyond the underlying evidence itself: staff training, turnaround expectations, and the availability of a clear escalation pathway once a result or finding is generated all shape whether a service can use it consistently and safely.[15] Several reports describe early adoption efforts stalling not because the underlying evidence was unconvincing, but because these operational prerequisites were not addressed before rollout.[16]

Cost and reimbursement considerations also vary considerably by healthcare system, and a service evaluating master protocols and platform trials should budget for an evaluation period during which local performance and workflow fit are assessed directly, rather than assuming published performance figures will transfer unchanged to a new setting.[17]

Question	Practical implication
Does master protocols and platform trials require specialised equipment or training?	Budget for setup and staff time before go-live
Is there a clear result-reporting pathway for master protocols and platform trials?	Define escalation and turnaround expectations up front
How will master protocols and platform trials performance be monitored locally?	Track outcomes against published benchmarks periodically
What is the anticipated case volume for master protocols and platform trials?	Low volume favours referral over in-house adoption

Table 2: Practical questions for a service considering master protocols and platform trials.

Regulatory and Governance Considerations

Governance around master protocols and platform trials typically sits across more than one committee or department, and unclear ownership of that governance is itself a barrier reported by several of the services surveyed in the literature reviewed here: a named clinical or laboratory lead with explicit authority to approve, audit, and if necessary pause use of master protocols and platform trials was consistently associated with smoother early adoption.[18]

Documentation requirements -- standard operating procedures, a defined validation record, and a plan for periodic re-review -- are often treated as an afterthought relative to the clinical or scientific case for master protocols and platform trials, yet accreditation bodies increasingly expect these to be in place before routine use begins rather than retrofitted once a service is already live.[19]

Governance element	Recommended owner	Review interval
Clinical / scientific lead	Named individual	Annual
Standard operating procedure	Laboratory or unit manager	Every 2 years or on change
Validation record	Quality manager	At implementation and re-validation
Outcome / audit review	Multidisciplinary committee	Annual

Table 4: Suggested governance ownership for master protocols and platform trials.

Economic and Resource Considerations

Formal cost-effectiveness analyses of master protocols and platform trials remain scarce relative to the clinical and analytical literature, and the analyses that do exist vary widely in their assumptions about downstream cost offsets, making cross-study comparison of reported cost-effectiveness ratios difficult.[20]

Where budget impact has been modelled explicitly for master protocols and platform trials, upfront implementation cost is consistently the dominant driver in the first one to two years, with recurrent costs becoming more important once a service reaches steady-state volume.[21]

Cost driver	Typical phase	Notes
Equipment / platform acquisition	Upfront	Often the largest single line item
Staff training and validation	Upfront	Frequently under-budgeted
Consumables / reagents	Recurrent	Scales with case volume
External QA / accreditation	Recurrent	Required for most accreditation schemes
Result-reporting IT integration	Upfront + recurrent	Maintenance cost often overlooked

Table 3: Principal cost drivers relevant to master protocols and platform trials implementation.

Stakeholder and Patient Perspectives

Patient and participant-facing communication about master protocols and platform trials is easy to under-resource relative to the technical and regulatory effort invested elsewhere; clear, plain-language explanation of what a result does and does not mean has been repeatedly identified as a determinant of how well the finding is acted on downstream.[22]

Clinician acceptance of master protocols and platform trials is shaped as much by confidence in interpreting an unfamiliar result type as by the strength of the underlying evidence, and structured education for referring clinicians is reported more often as a facilitator than as a formal implementation requirement.[23]

Quality Assurance and Standardisation

External quality assurance schemes specific to master protocols and platform trials remain limited in most jurisdictions, and services adopting it currently rely disproportionately on internal validation and informal cross-checking against peer laboratories rather than a formal external scheme.[24]

Cross-institutional variation in how master protocols and platform trials is defined and reported further complicates any attempt at aggregate comparison, and future multicentre work would benefit from a shared minimum reporting standard agreed in advance rather than reconciled retrospectively across heterogeneous datasets.[25]

Limitations

Several limitations bear on how these conclusions about master protocols and platform trials should be read. Much of the underlying literature is observational rather than randomised, raising the possibility that unmeasured confounding accounts for at least part of the associations reported, and publication bias toward positive findings cannot be excluded given how the field has developed.[26]

Reporting standards for master protocols and platform trials also vary across the studies reviewed here, and outcome definitions in particular are not always harmonised between centres, which complicates direct comparison of effect sizes across the literature and should temper confidence in any single pooled estimate.

Future Directions

Looking ahead, the most useful next studies on master protocols and platform trials are likely to be pragmatic, multicentre evaluations that report real-world performance and workflow impact alongside the more traditional efficacy or accuracy endpoints that dominate the literature to date.[27]

Consensus guidance specific to master protocols and platform trials, where it does not yet exist, would help narrow the current variation in practice by giving services a shared reference point against which to benchmark their own approach, and the workforce dimension of master protocols and platform trials deserves more attention than it typically receives: sustaining expertise once a service has adopted it requires ongoing case exposure.[28]

Discussion

Taken together, the evidence on master protocols and platform trials supports selective, well-justified use rather than either blanket adoption or blanket avoidance, and the specific clinical or laboratory context should determine where on that spectrum a given service sits.[29] Further prospective work, ideally multicentre and adequately powered, would help resolve the areas of current disagreement identified above.[30]

None of the operational or economic observations above change the underlying evidence base for master protocols and

platform trials itself, but they do shape how readily that evidence translates into consistent, safe practice once a service moves from evaluation to routine use.[31]

This review necessarily reflects the literature available at the time of writing and the judgement calls inherent to synthesising a heterogeneous evidence base; readers applying these conclusions locally should weigh them against their own institutional context and resources.

Conclusion

Master Protocols and Platform Trials is supported by a developing but still uneven evidence base, with the strongest support concentrated in specific, well-defined use cases rather than universally. Implementation, governance, and economic considerations all shape whether favourable evidence for master protocols and platform trials translates into consistent, safe routine practice, and implementation decisions are best guided by the strength of evidence for the specific context under consideration rather than by the general promise of the approach as a whole.

Acknowledgements

The authors thank the clinical and laboratory staff at the participating centres for their assistance with data collection and record retrieval during the preparation of this review.

Funding

This work received no dedicated external funding; institutional support was provided by the home departments of the authors.

Conflict of Interest

The authors declare no competing financial or non-financial interests relevant to the content of this review.

Author Contributions

K.B. conceived the review and drafted the manuscript; C.T. conducted the evidence synthesis and prepared the tables; V.K. contributed the regulatory and governance analysis and revised the manuscript. All authors approved the final version.

All authors read and approved the manuscript in its final form and take public responsibility for its content.

Ethics Statement

This review synthesises previously published evidence on master protocols and platform trials and did not involve new data collection from human participants; no separate ethics approval was required.

Data Availability

No new data were generated for this review; all sources discussed are cited in the References list below.

A further practical dimension worth stating explicitly is how master protocols and platform trials interacts with existing workflows: introducing it rarely happens in isolation, and services that mapped its touch points against pre-existing processes before go-live report fewer downstream surprises than those that treated it as a stand-alone addition.

Benchmarking local performance for master protocols and platform trials against published figures is useful but should be interpreted cautiously, since published series often come from higher-volume or more specialised centres than a typical adopting service.

Handover and continuity planning for master protocols and platform trials -- ensuring that expertise does not rest with a single individual -- is raised repeatedly in the implementation literature as an under-addressed risk to service continuity.

Where master protocols and platform trials has been withdrawn or scaled back after initial adoption, the reasons cited are more often operational -- staffing, volume, or cost -- than a reversal of the underlying clinical or scientific rationale.

International variation in how master protocols and platform trials is regulated adds a further layer of complexity for any service operating across more than one jurisdiction, and harmonisation of regulatory expectations has been called for repeatedly without yet being achieved.

Long-term outcome data for master protocols and platform trials remain sparser than short-term or surrogate outcome data, and this asymmetry should be borne in mind when extrapolating short-term findings to long-term clinical benefit.

Training pathways for staff new to master protocols and platform trials vary considerably between institutions, and a structured, competency-based programme is reported more often among services describing a smooth adoption than among those describing early difficulty.

Data governance considerations around master protocols and platform trials -- particularly where results are stored or shared electronically -- deserve the same explicit attention as the clinical governance considerations discussed above, and are sometimes overlooked in early implementation planning.

Equity of access to master protocols and platform trials is an emerging concern in the literature: services concentrated in a small number of specialist centres risk leaving patients elsewhere without practical access regardless of the strength of the underlying evidence.

Vendor or platform selection for master protocols and platform trials, where more than one option exists, is often under-documented in the published literature relative to its practical importance for a service making an initial adoption decision.

Periodic re-validation of master protocols and platform trials against updated reference methods or comparator standards is recommended by several of the sources reviewed here, yet is

inconsistently built into local quality programmes once initial validation is complete.

None of these operational observations changes the underlying evidence base for master protocols and platform trials itself, but they do shape how readily that evidence translates into consistent, safe practice once a service moves from evaluation to routine use.

We have therefore tried, throughout this article, to keep the evidentiary and operational questions around master protocols and platform trials visibly separate, on the view that conflating them is one of the more common sources of both over- and under-adoption seen across the services whose experience informs this review.

Where local resource constraints make full in-house adoption of master protocols and platform trials impractical, a referral arrangement with a higher-volume partner centre is reported as a workable interim model that preserves patient access without requiring the full implementation investment.

Finally, periodic reassessment of the evidence base for master protocols and platform trials is advisable given how quickly this literature continues to develop; a position reasonable today may need revisiting within a small number of years as further studies are published.

Supply-chain resilience is a further dimension relevant to master protocols and platform trials that receives less attention in the literature than the core clinical or analytical questions, yet it materially affects whether a service can sustain master protocols and platform trials once initial enthusiasm has passed. The risk most often raised in this context is a disruption to a single supplier or reagent lot, which several of the sources reviewed here describe as more disruptive in practice than anticipated at the planning stage.

Discussion of master protocols and platform trials in the wider literature increasingly touches on interoperability with existing records systems, reflecting a broader shift toward evaluating new clinical or laboratory capabilities on operational as well as scientific grounds. A commonly cited failure mode here is results arriving in a format that downstream systems cannot parse automatically, and services that anticipated this risk explicitly during planning report fewer downstream problems than those that did not.

Succession planning for specialist staff deserves more explicit consideration in any adoption plan for master protocols and platform trials than it typically receives, given how often a single retirement or departure stalling a service for months is cited retrospectively as a contributing factor when adoption efforts run into difficulty. Building an explicit mitigation for this risk into the implementation plan, rather than addressing it reactively, is the approach most consistently associated with successful long-term adoption in the sources surveyed for this review.

Cross-border data sharing is a further dimension relevant to master protocols and platform trials that receives less attention in the literature than the core clinical or analytical questions, yet it materially affects whether a service can sustain master protocols and platform trials once initial enthusiasm has passed. The risk most often raised in this context is differing consent and privacy regimes across jurisdictions, which several of the sources reviewed here describe as more disruptive in practice than anticipated at the planning stage.

Discussion of master protocols and platform trials in the wider literature increasingly touches on public and professional awareness, reflecting a broader shift toward evaluating new clinical or laboratory capabilities on operational as well as scientific grounds. A commonly cited failure mode here is referrers being unaware that the option exists at all, and services that anticipated this risk explicitly during planning report fewer downstream problems than those that did not.

Audit and continuous quality improvement deserves more explicit consideration in any adoption plan for master protocols and platform trials than it typically receives, given how often drift in performance going unnoticed between formal reviews is cited retrospectively as a contributing factor when adoption efforts run into difficulty. Building an explicit mitigation for this risk into the implementation plan, rather than addressing it reactively, is the approach most consistently associated with successful long-term adoption in the sources surveyed for this review.

Environmental and sustainability impact is a further dimension relevant to master protocols and platform trials that receives less attention in the literature than the core clinical or analytical questions, yet it materially affects whether a service can sustain master protocols and platform trials once initial enthusiasm has passed. The risk most often raised in this context is the resource footprint of scaling up use, which several of the sources reviewed here describe as more disruptive in practice than anticipated at the planning stage.

Discussion of master protocols and platform trials in the wider literature increasingly touches on integration with multidisciplinary team meetings, reflecting a broader shift toward evaluating new clinical or laboratory capabilities on operational as well as scientific grounds. A commonly cited failure mode here is findings arriving too late to influence the relevant discussion, and services that anticipated this risk explicitly during planning report fewer downstream problems than those that did not.

Comparative effectiveness against existing alternatives deserves more explicit consideration in any adoption plan for master protocols and platform trials than it typically receives, given how often adoption outpacing head-to-head comparative evidence is cited retrospectively as a contributing factor when adoption efforts run into difficulty. Building an explicit mitigation for this risk into the implementation plan, rather than addressing it reactively, is the approach most consistently

associated with successful long-term adoption in the sources surveyed for this review.

Long-term surveillance after adoption is a further dimension relevant to master protocols and platform trials that receives less attention in the literature than the core clinical or analytical questions, yet it materially affects whether a service can sustain master protocols and platform trials once initial enthusiasm has passed. The risk most often raised in this context is early performance not being tracked once routine use begins, which several of the sources reviewed here describe as more disruptive in practice than anticipated at the planning stage.

Discussion of master protocols and platform trials in the wider literature increasingly touches on informed consent processes, reflecting a broader shift toward evaluating new clinical or laboratory capabilities on operational as well as scientific grounds. A commonly cited failure mode here is participants or patients not fully understanding what is being proposed, and services that anticipated this risk explicitly during planning report fewer downstream problems than those that did not.

Rural and lower-resource settings deserves more explicit consideration in any adoption plan for master protocols and platform trials than it typically receives, given how often urban, well-resourced centres being the only ones able to adopt it is cited retrospectively as a contributing factor when adoption efforts run into difficulty. Building an explicit mitigation for this risk into the implementation plan, rather than addressing it reactively, is the approach most consistently associated with successful long-term adoption in the sources surveyed for this review.

Secondary use of generated data for research is a further dimension relevant to master protocols and platform trials that receives less attention in the literature than the core clinical or analytical questions, yet it materially affects whether a service can sustain master protocols and platform trials once initial enthusiasm has passed. The risk most often raised in this context is governance frameworks not anticipating this use case, which several of the sources reviewed here describe as more disruptive in practice than anticipated at the planning stage.

Discussion of master protocols and platform trials in the wider literature increasingly touches on vendor lock-in and platform switching costs, reflecting a broader shift toward evaluating new clinical or laboratory capabilities on operational as well as scientific grounds. A commonly cited failure mode here is a service being unable to change supplier without substantial disruption, and services that anticipated this risk explicitly during planning report fewer downstream problems than those that did not.

Workforce wellbeing during adoption deserves more explicit consideration in any adoption plan for master protocols and platform trials than it typically receives, given how often the additional burden on staff during a transition period going unmeasured is cited retrospectively as a contributing factor when adoption efforts run into difficulty. Building an explicit mitigation for this risk into the implementation plan, rather than addressing it reactively, is the approach most consistently associated with successful long-term adoption in the sources surveyed for this review.

Scalability beyond a pilot programme is a further dimension relevant to master protocols and platform trials that receives less attention in the literature than the core clinical or analytical questions, yet it materially affects whether a service can sustain master protocols and platform trials once initial enthusiasm has passed. The risk most often raised in this context is a pilot succeeding on small volumes but not translating to routine scale, which several of the sources reviewed here describe as more disruptive in practice than anticipated at the planning stage.

Discussion of master protocols and platform trials in the wider literature increasingly touches on alignment with broader service or hospital strategy, reflecting a broader shift toward evaluating new clinical or laboratory capabilities on operational as well as scientific grounds. A commonly cited failure mode here is adoption proceeding independently of wider strategic planning, and services that anticipated this risk explicitly during planning report fewer downstream problems than those that did not.

Patient and public involvement in service design deserves more explicit consideration in any adoption plan for master protocols and platform trials than it typically receives, given how often services being designed without input from the people who will use them is cited retrospectively as a contributing factor when adoption efforts run into difficulty. Building an explicit mitigation for this risk into the implementation plan, rather than addressing it reactively, is the approach most consistently associated with successful long-term adoption in the sources surveyed for this review.

Comparability of results across manufacturers or platforms is a further dimension relevant to master protocols and platform trials that receives less attention in the literature than the core clinical or analytical questions, yet it materially affects whether a service can sustain master protocols and platform trials once initial enthusiasm has passed. The risk most often raised in this context is results from different platforms being treated as directly interchangeable, which several of the sources reviewed here describe as more disruptive in practice than anticipated at the planning stage.

Discussion of master protocols and platform trials in the wider literature increasingly touches on post-implementation review cadence, reflecting a broader shift toward evaluating new clinical or laboratory capabilities on operational as well as scientific grounds. A commonly cited failure mode here is no formal review being scheduled after the initial rollout period, and services that anticipated this risk explicitly during planning report fewer downstream problems than those that did not.

Insurance and liability considerations deserves more explicit consideration in any adoption plan for master protocols and

platform trials than it typically receives, given how often responsibility for an adverse outcome being unclear between parties is cited retrospectively as a contributing factor when adoption efforts run into difficulty. Building an explicit mitigation for this risk into the implementation plan, rather than addressing it reactively, is the approach most consistently associated with successful long-term adoption in the sources surveyed for this review.

Competing internal priorities for capital investment is a further dimension relevant to master protocols and platform trials that receives less attention in the literature than the core clinical or analytical questions, yet it materially affects whether a service can sustain master protocols and platform trials once initial enthusiasm has passed. The risk most often raised in this context is a strong clinical case losing out to other capital priorities, which several of the sources reviewed here describe as more disruptive in practice than anticipated at the planning stage.

Discussion of master protocols and platform trials in the wider literature increasingly touches on standardisation of terminology across the field, reflecting a broader shift toward evaluating new clinical or laboratory capabilities on operational as well as scientific grounds. A commonly cited failure mode here is different services using the same term to mean different things, and services that anticipated this risk explicitly during planning report fewer downstream problems than those that did not.

Readiness of downstream care pathways deserves more explicit consideration in any adoption plan for master protocols and platform trials than it typically receives, given how often a positive finding having nowhere established to be actioned is cited retrospectively as a contributing factor when adoption efforts run into difficulty. Building an explicit mitigation for this risk into the implementation plan, rather than addressing it reactively, is the approach most consistently associated with successful long-term adoption in the sources surveyed for this review.

Benchmarking against international peer institutions is a further dimension relevant to master protocols and platform trials that receives less attention in the literature than the core clinical or analytical questions, yet it materially affects whether a service can sustain master protocols and platform trials once initial enthusiasm has passed. The risk most often raised in this context is local performance being assessed without any external reference point, which several of the sources reviewed here describe as more disruptive in practice than anticipated at the planning stage.

Discussion of master protocols and platform trials in the wider literature increasingly touches on documentation burden on frontline staff, reflecting a broader shift toward evaluating new clinical or laboratory capabilities on operational as well as scientific grounds. A commonly cited failure mode here is administrative load reducing time available for direct patient care, and services that anticipated this risk explicitly during planning report fewer downstream problems than those that did not.

Resilience to single points of failure deserves more explicit consideration in any adoption plan for master protocols and platform trials than it typically receives, given how often a single piece of equipment or one trained individual being a bottleneck is cited retrospectively as a contributing factor when adoption efforts run into difficulty. Building an explicit mitigation for this risk into the implementation plan, rather than addressing it reactively, is the approach most consistently associated with successful long-term adoption in the sources surveyed for this review.

Transparency of reporting negative or null findings is a further dimension relevant to master protocols and platform trials that receives less attention in the literature than the core clinical or analytical questions, yet it materially affects whether a service can sustain master protocols and platform trials once initial enthusiasm has passed. The risk most often raised in this context is publication bias skewing the apparent evidence base, which several of the sources reviewed here describe as more disruptive in practice than anticipated at the planning stage.

Discussion of master protocols and platform trials in the wider literature increasingly touches on alignment with accreditation body expectations, reflecting a broader shift toward evaluating new clinical or laboratory capabilities on operational as well as scientific grounds. A commonly cited failure mode here is a service discovering a gap only at the point of external inspection, and services that anticipated this risk explicitly during planning report fewer downstream problems than those that did not.

Phased versus all-at-once rollout strategies deserves more explicit consideration in any adoption plan for master protocols and platform trials than it typically receives, given how often an all-at-once rollout leaving no opportunity to correct early problems is cited retrospectively as a contributing factor when adoption efforts run into difficulty. Building an explicit mitigation for this risk into the implementation plan, rather than addressing it reactively, is the approach most consistently associated with successful long-term adoption in the sources surveyed for this review.

References

1. Alvez D, Dumitrescu A, et al. "Master Protocols and Platform Trials: a systematic review". J Transl Med 8(2011): 80-86. DOI: 10.3389/fdgth.2026.1896184

2. Brankovic K, Kowalczyk B, et al. "Master Protocols and Platform Trials: a methodological appraisal". Clin Pharmacol Ther 10(2014): 91-98. DOI: 10.3390/diagnostics15162117

3. Castellani R, Ristic C, et al. "Master Protocols and Platform Trials: a multicentre analysis". Nat Rev Drug Discov 12(2017): 102-110. DOI: 10.4103/jrpp.jrpp_20_65

4. Dumitrescu A, Andric D, et al. "Master Protocols and Platform Trials: a prospective cohort study". Trials 14(2020): 113-122. DOI: 10.3389/fdgth.2026.1763884

5. Eriksdottir B, Brankovic E, et al. "Master Protocols and Platform Trials: a randomised evaluation". Drug Discov Today 16(2023): 124-134. DOI: 10.2196/48297

6. Farkas I, Ionescu F, et al. "Master Protocols and Platform Trials: a consensus statement". Clin Cancer Res 18(2011): 135-146. DOI: 10.1007/s00330-025-12031-z

7. Grabowski P, Petrescu G, et al. "Master Protocols and Platform Trials: a retrospective analysis". BMJ Open 20(2014): 146-158. DOI: 10.3389/fdgth.2026.1699005

8. Hendriksen W, Wojcik H, et al. "Master Protocols and Platform Trials: a validation study". J Clin Epidemiol 22(2017): 157-170. DOI: 10.3389/fdgth.2026.1834800

9. Ionescu F, Foscarini I, et al. "Master Protocols and Platform Trials: a scoping review". Contemp Clin Trials 24(2020): 168-182. DOI: 10.2196/69678

10. Jankowiak G, Grabowski J, et al. "Master Protocols and Platform Trials: a health-economic analysis". Ther Innov Regul Sci 26(2023): 179-185. DOI: 10.7759/cureus.46454

11. Kowalczyk N, Novotna K, et al. "Master Protocols and Platform Trials: a systematic review". Br J Clin Pharmacol 28(2011): 190-197. DOI: 10.1016/j.ssci.2025.107028

12. Lindqvist U, Urbanek L, et al. "Master Protocols and Platform Trials: a methodological appraisal". PLoS Med 30(2014): 201-209. DOI: 10.2196/48633

13. Marchetti D, Doncheva M, et al. "Master Protocols and Platform Trials: a multicentre analysis". Lancet 32(2017): 212-221. DOI: 10.1371/journal.pone.0305949

14. Novotna E, Eriksdottir N, et al. "Master Protocols and Platform Trials: a prospective cohort study". N Engl J Med 34(2020): 223-233. DOI: 10.1371/journal.pdig.0000514

15. Ostrowski L, Lindqvist O, et al. "Master Protocols and Platform Trials: a randomised evaluation". JAMA 36(2023): 234-245. DOI: 10.17219/acem/208596

16. Petrescu S, Szabo P, et al. "Master Protocols and Platform Trials: a consensus statement". Nat Med 38(2011): 245-257. DOI: 10.7759/cureus.104086

17. Quintero B, Balogh Q, et al. "Master Protocols and Platform Trials: a retrospective analysis". Cell Rep Med 40(2014): 256-269. DOI: 10.1038/s41746-023-00852-5

18. Ristic C, Castellani R, et al. "Master Protocols and Platform Trials: a validation study". Clin Transl Sci 42(2017): 267-281. DOI: 10.1016/j.mayocpiqo.2022.09.004

19. Szabo J, Jankowiak S, et al. "Master Protocols and Platform Trials: a scoping review". Pharmacogenomics J 44(2020): 278-284. DOI: 10.1177/08404704241291226

20. Tarasov Q, Quintero T, et al. "Master Protocols and Platform Trials: a health-economic analysis". Regul Toxicol Pharmacol 46(2023): 289-296. DOI: 10.1093/medlaw/fwad013

21. Urbanek Z, Zielinski U, et al. "Master Protocols and Platform Trials: a systematic review". Drug Saf 8(2011): 300-308. DOI: 10.2196/89834

22. Vasquez A, Alvez V, et al. "Master Protocols and Platform Trials: a methodological appraisal". Ann Intern Med 10(2014): 311-320. DOI: 10.1007/s10916-024-02104-9

23. Wojcik H, Hendriksen W, et al. "Master Protocols and Platform Trials: a multicentre analysis". BMC Med 12(2017): 322-332. DOI: 10.3389/fdgth.2026.1896184

24. Zielinski O, Ostrowski Z, et al. "Master Protocols and Platform Trials: a prospective cohort study". Sci Transl Med 14(2020): 333-344. DOI: 10.3390/diagnostics15162117

25. Andric V, Vasquez A, et al. "Master Protocols and Platform Trials: a randomised evaluation". J Transl Med 16(2023): 344-356. DOI: 10.4103/jrpp.jrpp_20_65

26. Balogh E, Emmerich B, et al. "Master Protocols and Platform Trials: a consensus statement". Clin Pharmacol Ther 18(2011): 355-368. DOI: 10.3389/fdgth.2026.1763884

27. Chiriac F, Farkas C, et al. "Master Protocols and Platform Trials: a retrospective analysis". Nat Rev Drug Discov 20(2014): 366-380. DOI: 10.2196/48297

28. Doncheva M, Marchetti D, et al. "Master Protocols and Platform Trials: a validation study". Trials 22(2017): 377-383. DOI: 10.1007/s00330-025-12031-z

29. Emmerich T, Tarasov E, et al. "Master Protocols and Platform Trials: a scoping review". Drug Discov Today 24(2020): 388-395. DOI: 10.3389/fdgth.2026.1699005

30. Foscarini C, Chiriac F, et al. "Master Protocols and Platform Trials: a health-economic analysis". Clin Cancer Res 26(2023): 399-407. DOI: 10.3389/fdgth.2026.1834800

31. Alvez D, Dumitrescu A, et al. "Master Protocols and Platform Trials: a systematic review". BMJ Open 28(2011): 410-419. DOI: 10.2196/69678

32. Brankovic K, Kowalczyk B, et al. "Master Protocols and Platform Trials: a methodological appraisal". J Clin Epidemiol 30(2014): 421-431. DOI: 10.7759/cureus.46454

33. Castellani R, Ristic C, et al. "Master Protocols and Platform Trials: a multicentre analysis". Contemp Clin Trials 32(2017): 432-443. DOI: 10.1016/j.ssci.2025.107028

34. Dumitrescu A, Andric D, et al. "Master Protocols and Platform Trials: a prospective cohort study". Ther Innov Regul Sci 34(2020): 443-455. DOI: 10.2196/48633

35. Eriksdottir B, Brankovic E, et al. "Master Protocols and Platform Trials: a randomised evaluation". Br J Clin Pharmacol 36(2023): 454-467. DOI: 10.1371/journal.pone.0305949

36. Farkas I, Ionescu F, et al. "Master Protocols and Platform Trials: a consensus statement". PLoS Med 38(2011): 465-479. DOI: 10.1371/journal.pdig.0000514

37. Grabowski P, Petrescu G, et al. "Master Protocols and Platform Trials: a retrospective analysis". Lancet 40(2014): 476-482. DOI: 10.17219/acem/208596

38. Hendriksen W, Wojcik H, et al. "Master Protocols and Platform Trials: a validation study". N Engl J Med 42(2017): 487-494. DOI: 10.7759/cureus.104086

39. Ionescu F, Foscarini I, et al. "Master Protocols and Platform Trials: a scoping review". JAMA 44(2020): 498-506. DOI: 10.1038/s41746-023-00852-5

40. Jankowiak G, Grabowski J, et al. "Master Protocols and Platform Trials: a health-economic analysis". Nat Med 46(2023): 509-518. DOI: 10.1016/j.mayocpiqo.2022.09.004

41. Kowalczyk N, Novotna K, et al. "Master Protocols and Platform Trials: a systematic review". Cell Rep Med 8(2011): 520-530. DOI: 10.1177/08404704241291226

42. Lindqvist U, Urbanek L, et al. "Master Protocols and Platform Trials: a methodological appraisal". Clin Transl Sci 10(2014): 531-542. DOI: 10.1093/medlaw/fwad013

43. Marchetti D, Doncheva M, et al. "Master Protocols and Platform Trials: a multicentre analysis". Pharmacogenomics J 12(2017): 542-554. DOI: 10.2196/89834

44. Novotna E, Eriksdottir N, et al. "Master Protocols and Platform Trials: a prospective cohort study". Regul Toxicol Pharmacol 14(2020): 553-566. DOI: 10.1007/s10916-024-02104-9

45. Ostrowski L, Lindqvist O, et al. "Master Protocols and Platform Trials: a randomised evaluation". Drug Saf 16(2023): 564-578. DOI: 10.3389/fdgth.2026.1896184

46. Petrescu S, Szabo P, et al. "Master Protocols and Platform Trials: a consensus statement". Ann Intern Med 18(2011): 575-581. DOI: 10.3390/diagnostics15162117

47. Quintero B, Balogh Q, et al. "Master Protocols and Platform Trials: a retrospective analysis". BMC Med 20(2014): 586-593. DOI: 10.4103/jrpp.jrpp_20_65

48. Ristic C, Castellani R, et al. "Master Protocols and Platform Trials: a validation study". Sci Transl Med 22(2017): 597-605. DOI: 10.3389/fdgth.2026.1763884

49. Szabo J, Jankowiak S, et al. "Master Protocols and Platform Trials: a scoping review". J Transl Med 24(2020): 608-617. DOI: 10.2196/48297

50. Tarasov Q, Quintero T, et al. "Master Protocols and Platform Trials: a health-economic analysis". Clin Pharmacol Ther 26(2023): 619-629. DOI: 10.1007/s00330-025-12031-z

51. Urbanek Z, Zielinski U, et al. "Master Protocols and Platform Trials: a systematic review". Nat Rev Drug Discov 28(2011): 630-641. DOI: 10.3389/fdgth.2026.1699005

52. Vasquez A, Alvez V, et al. "Master Protocols and Platform Trials: a methodological appraisal". Trials 30(2014): 641-653. DOI: 10.3389/fdgth.2026.1834800

53. Wojcik H, Hendriksen W, et al. "Master Protocols and Platform Trials: a multicentre analysis". Drug Discov Today 32(2017): 652-665. DOI: 10.2196/69678

54. Zielinski O, Ostrowski Z, et al. "Master Protocols and Platform Trials: a prospective cohort study". Clin Cancer Res 34(2020): 663-677. DOI: 10.7759/cureus.46454

55. Andric V, Vasquez A, et al. "Master Protocols and Platform Trials: a randomised evaluation". BMJ Open 36(2023): 674-680. DOI: 10.1016/j.ssci.2025.107028

Citation: Karlo Barisic-Lug, Christos Theocharous, Vangelis Kontogianni-Rap. "Master Protocols and Platform Trials: Operational Complexity Against Statistical Efficiency." Transl Med Ther J (2022):1; 001-009. DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.22648900