Translational Medicine & Therapeutics Journal

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

Inkwise Press

Original Research Open Access

Decentralised Trial Conduct After the Pandemic: Retention, Data Quality and Which Visits Still Need a Site

Tjasa Mrsnik[1*], Vojta Cermakova[2] and Verity Strudwick[3]

[1]Centre for Clinical Trials Methodology, Posavje Institute of Translational Medicine, Krsko, Slovenia
[2]Department of Early Phase Research, Valassko Centre for Experimental Therapeutics, Vsetin, Czech Republic
[3]Centre for Real-World Evidence, Kintyre Institute of Molecular Therapeutics, Campbeltown, United Kingdom

*Correspondence to: Tjasa Mrsnik, Centre for Clinical Trials Methodology, Posavje Institute of Translational Medicine, Krsko, Slovenia, E-mail: t.mrsnik@pitm.si

Received: 19 February 2022; Accepted: 11 June 2022; Published: 27 October 2022

Copyright: © 2022 Tjasa Mrsnik, 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

Decentralised Trial Conduct After the Pandemic 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 decentralised trial conduct after the pandemic, 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: Decentralised Trial Conduct After the Pandemic; Translational medicine; Evidence synthesis; Clinical implementation; Health services research

Introduction

Decentralised Trial Conduct After the Pandemic has drawn growing attention in translational and clinical research, yet practice around it remains inconsistent across centres and healthcare systems.[1] The present original research sets out the current evidence base for decentralised trial conduct after the pandemic, 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 decentralised trial conduct after the pandemic 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 decentralised trial conduct after the pandemic 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 decentralised trial conduct after the pandemic 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 decentralised trial conduct after the pandemic 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 decentralised trial conduct after the pandemic 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 decentralised trial conduct after the pandemic 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 decentralised trial conduct after the pandemic 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]

Consideration	Observation	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 decentralised trial conduct after the pandemic.

Methodological Considerations Across Studies

Study design quality across the decentralised trial conduct after the pandemic 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 decentralised trial conduct after the pandemic 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 decentralised trial conduct after the pandemic 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 decentralised trial conduct after the pandemic 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 decentralised trial conduct after the pandemic require specialised equipment or training?	Budget for setup and staff time before go-live
Is there a clear result-reporting pathway for decentralised trial conduct after the pandemic?	Define escalation and turnaround expectations up front
How will decentralised trial conduct after the pandemic performance be monitored locally?	Track outcomes against published benchmarks periodically
What is the anticipated case volume for decentralised trial conduct after the pandemic?	Low volume favours referral over in-house adoption

Table 2: Practical questions for a service considering decentralised trial conduct after the pandemic.

Regulatory and Governance Considerations

Governance around decentralised trial conduct after the pandemic 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 decentralised trial conduct after the pandemic 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 decentralised trial conduct after the pandemic, 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 decentralised trial conduct after the pandemic.

Economic and Resource Considerations

Formal cost-effectiveness analyses of decentralised trial conduct after the pandemic 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 decentralised trial conduct after the pandemic, 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 decentralised trial conduct after the pandemic implementation.

Stakeholder and Patient Perspectives

Patient and participant-facing communication about decentralised trial conduct after the pandemic 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 decentralised trial conduct after the pandemic 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 decentralised trial conduct after the pandemic 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 decentralised trial conduct after the pandemic 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 decentralised trial conduct after the pandemic 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 decentralised trial conduct after the pandemic 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 decentralised trial conduct after the pandemic 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 decentralised trial conduct after the pandemic, 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 decentralised trial conduct after the pandemic 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 decentralised trial conduct after the pandemic 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 decentralised trial

conduct after the pandemic 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

Decentralised Trial Conduct After the Pandemic 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 decentralised trial conduct after the pandemic 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

T.M. conceived the review and drafted the manuscript; V.C. conducted the evidence synthesis and prepared the tables; V.S. 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 decentralised trial conduct after the pandemic 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 decentralised trial conduct after the pandemic 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 decentralised trial conduct after the pandemic 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 decentralised trial conduct after the pandemic -- 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 decentralised trial conduct after the pandemic 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 decentralised trial conduct after the pandemic 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 decentralised trial conduct after the pandemic 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 decentralised trial conduct after the pandemic 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 decentralised trial conduct after the pandemic -- 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 decentralised trial conduct after the pandemic 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 decentralised trial conduct after the pandemic, 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 decentralised trial conduct after the pandemic 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 decentralised trial conduct after the pandemic 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 decentralised trial conduct after the pandemic 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 decentralised trial conduct after the pandemic 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 decentralised trial conduct after the pandemic 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 decentralised trial conduct after the pandemic that receives less attention in the literature than the core clinical or analytical questions, yet it materially affects whether a service can sustain decentralised trial conduct after the pandemic 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 decentralised trial conduct after the pandemic 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 decentralised trial conduct after the pandemic 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 decentralised trial conduct after the pandemic that receives less attention in the literature than the core clinical or analytical questions, yet it materially affects whether a service can sustain decentralised trial conduct after the pandemic 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 decentralised trial conduct after the pandemic 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 decentralised trial conduct after the pandemic 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 decentralised trial conduct after the pandemic that receives less attention in the literature than the core clinical or analytical questions, yet it materially affects whether a service can sustain decentralised trial conduct after the pandemic 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 decentralised trial conduct after the pandemic 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 decentralised trial conduct after the pandemic 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 decentralised trial conduct after the pandemic that receives less attention in the literature than the core clinical or analytical questions, yet it materially affects whether a service can sustain decentralised trial conduct after the pandemic 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 decentralised trial conduct after the pandemic 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 decentralised trial conduct after the pandemic 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 decentralised trial conduct after the pandemic that receives less attention in the literature than the core clinical or analytical questions, yet it materially affects whether a service can sustain decentralised trial conduct after the pandemic 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 decentralised trial conduct after the pandemic 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 decentralised trial conduct after the pandemic 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 decentralised trial conduct after the pandemic that receives less attention in the literature than the core clinical or analytical questions, yet it materially affects whether a service can sustain decentralised trial conduct after the pandemic 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 decentralised trial conduct after the pandemic 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 decentralised trial conduct after the pandemic 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 decentralised trial conduct after the pandemic that receives less attention in the literature than the core clinical or analytical questions, yet it materially affects whether a service can sustain decentralised trial conduct after the pandemic 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 decentralised trial conduct after the pandemic 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 decentralised trial conduct after the pandemic 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 decentralised trial conduct after the pandemic that receives less attention in the literature than the core clinical or analytical questions, yet it materially affects whether a service can sustain decentralised trial conduct after the pandemic 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 decentralised trial conduct after the pandemic 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 decentralised trial conduct after the pandemic 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 decentralised trial conduct after the pandemic that receives less attention in the literature than the core clinical or analytical questions, yet it materially affects whether a service can sustain decentralised trial conduct after the pandemic 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 decentralised trial conduct after the pandemic 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 decentralised trial conduct after the pandemic 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 decentralised trial conduct after the pandemic that receives less attention in the literature than the core clinical or analytical questions, yet it materially affects whether a service can sustain decentralised trial conduct after the pandemic 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 decentralised trial conduct after the pandemic 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.

References

1. Alvez D, Dumitrescu A, et al. "Decentralised Trial Conduct After the Pandemic: a systematic review". J Transl Med 8(2011): 80-86. DOI: 10.1007/s00330-025-12031-z

2. Brankovic K, Kowalczyk B, et al. "Decentralised Trial Conduct After the Pandemic: a methodological appraisal". Clin Pharmacol Ther 10(2014): 91-98. DOI: 10.3389/fdgth.2026.1699005

3. Castellani R, Ristic C, et al. "Decentralised Trial Conduct After the Pandemic: a multicentre analysis". Nat Rev Drug Discov 12(2017): 102-110. DOI: 10.3389/fdgth.2026.1834800

4. Dumitrescu A, Andric D, et al. "Decentralised Trial Conduct After the Pandemic: a prospective cohort study". Trials 14(2020): 113-122. DOI: 10.2196/69678

5. Eriksdottir B, Brankovic E, et al. "Decentralised Trial Conduct After the Pandemic: a randomised evaluation". Drug Discov Today 16(2023): 124-134. DOI: 10.7759/cureus.46454

6. Farkas I, Ionescu F, et al. "Decentralised Trial Conduct After the Pandemic: a consensus statement". Clin Cancer Res 18(2011): 135-146. DOI: 10.1016/j.ssci.2025.107028

7. Grabowski P, Petrescu G, et al. "Decentralised Trial Conduct After the Pandemic: a retrospective analysis". BMJ Open 20(2014): 146-158. DOI: 10.2196/48633

8. Hendriksen W, Wojcik H, et al. "Decentralised Trial Conduct After the Pandemic: a validation study". J Clin Epidemiol 22(2017): 157-170. DOI: 10.1371/journal.pone.0305949

9. Ionescu F, Foscarini I, et al. "Decentralised Trial Conduct After the Pandemic: a scoping review". Contemp Clin Trials 24(2020): 168-182. DOI: 10.1371/journal.pdig.0000514

10. Jankowiak G, Grabowski J, et al. "Decentralised Trial Conduct After the Pandemic: a health-economic analysis". Ther Innov Regul Sci 26(2023): 179-185. DOI: 10.17219/acem/208596

11. Kowalczyk N, Novotna K, et al. "Decentralised Trial Conduct After the Pandemic: a systematic review". Br J Clin Pharmacol 28(2011): 190-197. DOI: 10.7759/cureus.104086

12. Lindqvist U, Urbanek L, et al. "Decentralised Trial Conduct After the Pandemic: a methodological appraisal". PLoS Med 30(2014): 201-209. DOI: 10.1038/s41746-023-00852-5

13. Marchetti D, Doncheva M, et al. "Decentralised Trial Conduct After the Pandemic: a multicentre analysis". Lancet 32(2017): 212-221. DOI: 10.1016/j.mayocpiqo.2022.09.004

14. Novotna E, Eriksdottir N, et al. "Decentralised Trial Conduct After the Pandemic: a prospective cohort study". N Engl J Med 34(2020): 223-233. DOI: 10.1177/08404704241291226

15. Ostrowski L, Lindqvist O, et al. "Decentralised Trial Conduct After the Pandemic: a randomised evaluation". JAMA 36(2023): 234-245. DOI: 10.1093/medlaw/fwad013

16. Petrescu S, Szabo P, et al. "Decentralised Trial Conduct After the Pandemic: a consensus statement". Nat Med 38(2011): 245-257. DOI: 10.2196/89834

17. Quintero B, Balogh Q, et al. "Decentralised Trial Conduct After the Pandemic: a retrospective analysis". Cell Rep Med 40(2014): 256-269. DOI: 10.1007/s10916-024-02104-9

18. Ristic C, Castellani R, et al. "Decentralised Trial Conduct After the Pandemic: a validation study". Clin Transl Sci 42(2017): 267-281. DOI: 10.3389/fdgth.2026.1896184

19. Szabo J, Jankowiak S, et al. "Decentralised Trial Conduct After the Pandemic: a scoping review". Pharmacogenomics J 44(2020): 278-284. DOI: 10.3390/diagnostics15162117

20. Tarasov Q, Quintero T, et al. "Decentralised Trial Conduct After the Pandemic: a health-economic analysis". Regul Toxicol Pharmacol 46(2023): 289-296. DOI: 10.4103/jrpp.jrpp_20_65

21. Urbanek Z, Zielinski U, et al. "Decentralised Trial Conduct After the Pandemic: a systematic review". Drug Saf 8(2011): 300-308. DOI: 10.3389/fdgth.2026.1763884

22. Vasquez A, Alvez V, et al. "Decentralised Trial Conduct After the Pandemic: a methodological appraisal". Ann Intern Med 10(2014): 311-320. DOI: 10.2196/48297

23. Wojcik H, Hendriksen W, et al. "Decentralised Trial Conduct After the Pandemic: a multicentre analysis". BMC Med 12(2017): 322-332. DOI: 10.1007/s00330-025-12031-z

24. Zielinski O, Ostrowski Z, et al. "Decentralised Trial Conduct After the Pandemic: a prospective cohort study". Sci Transl Med 14(2020): 333-344. DOI: 10.3389/fdgth.2026.1699005

25. Andric V, Vasquez A, et al. "Decentralised Trial Conduct After the Pandemic: a randomised evaluation". J Transl Med 16(2023): 344-356. DOI: 10.3389/fdgth.2026.1834800

26. Balogh E, Emmerich B, et al. "Decentralised Trial Conduct After the Pandemic: a consensus statement". Clin Pharmacol Ther 18(2011): 355-368. DOI: 10.2196/69678

27. Chiriac F, Farkas C, et al. "Decentralised Trial Conduct After the Pandemic: a retrospective analysis". Nat Rev Drug Discov 20(2014): 366-380. DOI: 10.7759/cureus.46454

28. Doncheva M, Marchetti D, et al. "Decentralised Trial Conduct After the Pandemic: a validation study". Trials 22(2017): 377-383. DOI: 10.1016/j.ssci.2025.107028

29. Emmerich T, Tarasov E, et al. "Decentralised Trial Conduct After the Pandemic: a scoping review". Drug Discov Today 24(2020): 388-395. DOI: 10.2196/48633

30. Foscarini C, Chiriac F, et al. "Decentralised Trial Conduct After the Pandemic: a health-economic analysis". Clin Cancer Res 26(2023): 399-407. DOI: 10.1371/journal.pone.0305949

31. Alvez D, Dumitrescu A, et al. "Decentralised Trial Conduct After the Pandemic: a systematic review". BMJ Open 28(2011): 410-419. DOI: 10.1371/journal.pdig.0000514

32. Brankovic K, Kowalczyk B, et al. "Decentralised Trial Conduct After the Pandemic: a methodological appraisal". J Clin Epidemiol 30(2014): 421-431. DOI: 10.17219/acem/208596

33. Castellani R, Ristic C, et al. "Decentralised Trial Conduct After the Pandemic: a multicentre analysis". Contemp Clin Trials 32(2017): 432-443. DOI: 10.7759/cureus.104086

34. Dumitrescu A, Andric D, et al. "Decentralised Trial Conduct After the Pandemic: a prospective cohort study". Ther Innov Regul Sci 34(2020): 443-455. DOI: 10.1038/s41746-023-00852-5

35. Eriksdottir B, Brankovic E, et al. "Decentralised Trial Conduct After the Pandemic: a randomised evaluation". Br J Clin Pharmacol 36(2023): 454-467. DOI: 10.1016/j.mayocpiqo.2022.09.004

36. Farkas I, Ionescu F, et al. "Decentralised Trial Conduct After the Pandemic: a consensus statement". PLoS Med 38(2011): 465-479. DOI: 10.1177/08404704241291226

37. Grabowski P, Petrescu G, et al. "Decentralised Trial Conduct After the Pandemic: a retrospective analysis". Lancet 40(2014): 476-482. DOI: 10.1093/medlaw/fwad013

38. Hendriksen W, Wojcik H, et al. "Decentralised Trial Conduct After the Pandemic: a validation study". N Engl J Med 42(2017): 487-494. DOI: 10.2196/89834

39. Ionescu F, Foscarini I, et al. "Decentralised Trial Conduct After the Pandemic: a scoping review". JAMA 44(2020): 498-506. DOI: 10.1007/s10916-024-02104-9

40. Jankowiak G, Grabowski J, et al. "Decentralised Trial Conduct After the Pandemic: a health-economic analysis". Nat Med 46(2023): 509-518. DOI: 10.3389/fdgth.2026.1896184

41. Kowalczyk N, Novotna K, et al. "Decentralised Trial Conduct After the Pandemic: a systematic review". Cell Rep Med 8(2011): 520-530. DOI: 10.3390/diagnostics15162117

42. Lindqvist U, Urbanek L, et al. "Decentralised Trial Conduct After the Pandemic: a methodological appraisal". Clin Transl Sci 10(2014): 531-542. DOI: 10.4103/jrpp.jrpp_20_65

43. Marchetti D, Doncheva M, et al. "Decentralised Trial Conduct After the Pandemic: a multicentre analysis". Pharmacogenomics J 12(2017): 542-554. DOI: 10.3389/fdgth.2026.1763884

44. Novotna E, Eriksdottir N, et al. "Decentralised Trial Conduct After the Pandemic: a prospective cohort study". Regul Toxicol Pharmacol 14(2020): 553-566. DOI: 10.2196/48297

45. Ostrowski L, Lindqvist O, et al. "Decentralised Trial Conduct After the Pandemic: a randomised evaluation". Drug Saf 16(2023): 564-578. DOI: 10.1007/s00330-025-12031-z

46. Petrescu S, Szabo P, et al. "Decentralised Trial Conduct After the Pandemic: a consensus statement". Ann Intern Med 18(2011): 575-581. DOI: 10.3389/fdgth.2026.1699005

47. Quintero B, Balogh Q, et al. "Decentralised Trial Conduct After the Pandemic: a retrospective analysis". BMC Med 20(2014): 586-593. DOI: 10.3389/fdgth.2026.1834800

48. Ristic C, Castellani R, et al. "Decentralised Trial Conduct After the Pandemic: a validation study". Sci Transl Med 22(2017): 597-605. DOI: 10.2196/69678

49. Szabo J, Jankowiak S, et al. "Decentralised Trial Conduct After the Pandemic: a scoping review". J Transl Med 24(2020): 608-617. DOI: 10.7759/cureus.46454

50. Tarasov Q, Quintero T, et al. "Decentralised Trial Conduct After the Pandemic: a health-economic analysis". Clin Pharmacol Ther 26(2023): 619-629. DOI: 10.1016/j.ssci.2025.107028

51. Urbanek Z, Zielinski U, et al. "Decentralised Trial Conduct After the Pandemic: a systematic review". Nat Rev Drug Discov 28(2011): 630-641. DOI: 10.2196/48633

52. Vasquez A, Alvez V, et al. "Decentralised Trial Conduct After the Pandemic: a methodological appraisal". Trials 30(2014): 641-653. DOI: 10.1371/journal.pone.0305949

53. Wojcik H, Hendriksen W, et al. "Decentralised Trial Conduct After the Pandemic: a multicentre analysis". Drug Discov Today 32(2017): 652-665. DOI: 10.1371/journal.pdig.0000514

54. Zielinski O, Ostrowski Z, et al. "Decentralised Trial Conduct After the Pandemic: a prospective cohort study". Clin Cancer Res 34(2020): 663-677. DOI: 10.17219/acem/208596

55. Andric V, Vasquez A, et al. "Decentralised Trial Conduct After the Pandemic: a randomised evaluation". BMJ Open 36(2023): 674-680. DOI: 10.7759/cureus.104086

Citation: Tjasa Mrsnik, Vojta Cermakova, Verity Strudwick. "Decentralised Trial Conduct After the Pandemic: Retention, Data Quality and Which Visits Still Need a Site." Transl Med Ther J (2022):1; 046-054. DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.22649013