ISSN: 2320-7159
IJMR
INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF MEDICAL RESEARCH

CONTINUOUS MEDICAL EDUCATION

Adaptive Clinical Trials: Enhancing Efficiency and Flexibility in Clinical Research

Prakash Patel[1]

[1]Department of Community Medicine, SMIMER, Surat, India

Dr. Prakash Patel (Email: drpbpatel@hotmail.com)

DOI: https://doi.org/10.55489/ijmr.1202202458

OPEN ACCESS

Citation: Patel P. Adaptive Clinical Trials: Enhancing Efficiency and Flexibility in Clinical Research. Intl J Med Res 2024;12(2):30-39. DOI: 10.55489/ijmr.1202202458

Received: March 02, 2024
Accepted: March 25, 2024
Published: April 01, 2024

Copyright: The Authors retain the copyrights of this article, with first publication rights granted to Medsci Publications.

Open Access Statement: This is an open access journal, and articles are distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-Share Alike (CC BY-SA) 4.0 License, which allows others to remix, adapt, and build upon the work commercially, as long as appropriate credit is given, and the new creations are licensed under the identical terms.

Funding: Non-Declared.

Conflict of interests: The authors have declared that no conflict of interests exists.

Publisher: Medsci Publications, India

ABSTRACT

Adaptive clinical trials (ACTs) are innovative research designs that allow modifications based on interim data without compromising scientific integrity. This flexibility enhances resource use, patient safety, and evaluation speed. ACTs feature designs like seamless phase transitions, adaptive randomization, and sample size adjustments, making them ideal for complex areas such as personalized medicine and rare diseases. Successful implementation requires rigorous planning, robust statistics, and regulatory adherence. This CME article outlines ACT principles, design strategies, and real-world applications, addressing both their potential to improve trial efficiency and the challenges involved. It aims to empower professionals to apply ACTs in advancing medical research.

Keywords: Adaptive clinical trials, clinical research, trial efficiency, interim analysis, innovative trial designs, regulatory compliance

INTRODUCTION

Definition of Adaptive Clinical Trials: Adaptive clinical trials are a type of trial design that allows for pre-specified modifications to be made to the trial's procedures or hypotheses after it has begun, without compromising its validity or integrity. These modifications are guided by interim analyses of accumulating data, enabling researchers to respond dynamically to findings as they emerge. Adaptive designs are particularly valuable in optimizing resource utilization, improving efficiency, and enhancing ethical considerations in clinical research by minimizing patient exposure to suboptimal treatments. [1]

Historical Background and Evolution: The concept of adaptive trial design emerged in the late 20th century as a response to the rigid and often inefficient nature of traditional fixed designs. Early approaches to adaptive trials were largely limited to sample size re-estimation and early stopping for efficacy or futility. The advent of advanced statistical methods and computational power in the 1990s and 2000s facilitated the development of more complex adaptive designs, including seamless Phase II/III trials and adaptive dose-finding studies. [2,3] Regulatory bodies, such as the United States Food and Drug Administration (FDA) and the European Medicines Agency (EMA), have since provided guidance on adaptive trial designs, encouraging their use while emphasizing the need for rigorous pre-planning and transparency. [4]

Importance of Adaptive Design in Modern Clinical Research: Adaptive clinical trials are increasingly recognized as a cornerstone of innovative research, particularly in areas requiring rapid development of interventions, such as oncology, rare diseases, and infectious diseases. The flexibility of adaptive designs allows researchers to focus on promising treatments, adjust sample sizes, and streamline development timelines, thus saving time and resources. During the COVID-19 pandemic, adaptive trials played a pivotal role in expediting the evaluation of vaccines and treatments, underscoring their relevance in addressing urgent public health challenges. [5,6] Furthermore, adaptive designs align with ethical imperatives by reducing patient exposure to ineffective treatments and improving the likelihood of trial success. [7]

PRINCIPLES OF ADAPTIVE CLINICAL TRIALS

Key Features of Adaptive Trials: Adaptive clinical trials are characterized by their ability to modify various aspects of the trial design in response to interim analyses of accumulating data. Key features include flexibility, efficiency, and the use of predefined decision rules to guide adaptations. Common adaptations include sample size adjustments, adaptive randomization, dose modifications, and early stopping for efficacy or futility. [8] These features not only allow trials to focus resources on promising interventions but also help improve the ethical considerations by minimizing patient exposure to ineffective or harmful treatments. [9] The cornerstone of these trials lies in their ability to maintain scientific validity and statistical integrity despite such changes, ensuring that the conclusions drawn are robust and credible. [10]

Differences Between Traditional and Adaptive Designs: Traditional clinical trials operate on a fixed protocol, where the sample size, endpoints, and analysis methods are determined at the outset and remain unchanged throughout the study. While this approach ensures consistency and simplicity, it can be inefficient, particularly when dealing with uncertainties about treatment effects or rapidly evolving scientific knowledge. [3]

In contrast, adaptive designs are dynamic and allow for modifications based on interim results. For instance, they enable early termination of ineffective treatments, reallocation of participants to more promising arms, or modification of the study population to target subgroups likely to benefit. [11] While traditional designs often require sequential trials to answer different questions, adaptive designs can consolidate these into a single, seamless trial, saving time and resources. [12] This adaptability, however, necessitates meticulous planning to avoid biases and ensure statistical rigor.

Pre-specification and Statistical Validity: Pre-specification is a critical principle in adaptive clinical trials to ensure transparency, credibility, and regulatory compliance. All potential adaptations, including decision rules and interim analyses, must be explicitly detailed in the trial protocol or statistical analysis plan before the trial begins. [13] This pre-planning ensures that adaptations are data-driven and not influenced by external pressures or biases.

Maintaining statistical validity is another fundamental requirement. Adaptive trials employ complex statistical methodologies to account for multiple looks at the data, which can increase the risk of Type I errors [false positives]. Techniques such as alpha spending functions and Bayesian frameworks are commonly used to control for these risks. [14] Furthermore, simulations play a vital role in testing the trial design under various scenarios, ensuring that adaptations do not compromise the trial's power or validity. [15]

TYPES OF ADAPTATIONS

Sample Size Re-estimation: Sample size re-estimation involves adjusting the number of participants in a trial based on interim analysis of accumulating data. This approach ensures that the trial has adequate power to detect clinically meaningful differences, especially when initial assumptions about effect size or variability are incorrect. [16] There are two primary methods: blinded and unblinded re-estimation. Blinded methods assess variability without revealing treatment allocation, preserving trial integrity, while unblinded methods provide more precise adjustments but risk introducing bias. [17]

Sample size re-estimation is commonly used in confirmatory Phase III trials to reduce the risk of underpowered or overpowered studies. [18]

Adaptive Randomization: Adaptive randomization allows for dynamic adjustments to the probability of assigning participants to different treatment arms based on interim results. This technique includes response-adaptive randomization, which increases the likelihood of assigning participants to the more effective treatment arm(s). [19] It ensures that a greater proportion of participants benefit from the trial while still maintaining the statistical power to compare treatments. Although computationally intensive, this approach is particularly useful in trials involving rare diseases or heterogeneous patient populations. [20]

Treatment Arm Modifications (Adding/Dropping Arms): In adaptive designs, treatment arms can be added or dropped based on interim analysis. Ineffective treatments are dropped to minimize patient exposure to suboptimal options, while promising new treatments can be added, streamlining the clinical development process. [9] This flexibility is especially beneficial in platform trials, which evaluate multiple interventions within a single framework. [21] For example, the RECOVERY trial during the COVID-19 pandemic efficiently identified effective treatments by adding and dropping arms as evidence emerged. [22]

Dose-Finding Adjustments: Dose-finding adjustments use adaptive methods to identify the optimal dose of a drug that balances efficacy and safety. Bayesian and model-based approaches, such as the continual reassessment method (CRM) and escalation with overdose control (EWOC), are commonly employed [23]. These methods enable real-time updates to dose selection, reducing the number of participants exposed to ineffective or toxic doses [24]. Adaptive dose-finding is widely used in Phase I oncology trials and has demonstrated superior efficiency compared to traditional 3+3 designs [25].

Early Stopping for Futility or Efficacy: Adaptive trials can be designed to stop early if interim analyses show overwhelming evidence of efficacy or futility. Early stopping for efficacy ensures that effective treatments are made available sooner, while stopping for futility avoids unnecessary exposure to ineffective interventions [26]. Group sequential methods and alpha-spending functions are used to control Type I error rates when early stopping rules are implemented [27]. This approach has been effectively applied in cardiovascular and oncology trials to expedite decision-making [3].

Endpoint Modification: Endpoint modification allows researchers to refine primary or secondary endpoints during a trial based on interim findings or external evidence. This adaptation is particularly useful when new insights emerge about the disease or treatment mechanism during the trial [28]. However, any modifications must be pre-specified and justified to maintain trial integrity and regulatory acceptance [29]. For example, in trials of COVID-19 therapies, adaptive endpoint modification enabled researchers to incorporate emerging knowledge about clinical outcomes and disease progression [6].

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Planning an Adaptive Trial: Effective planning is the cornerstone of a successful adaptive trial, requiring a well-structured approach to address the complexities introduced by its flexible design.

Pre-specifying Adaptations: Pre-specification of adaptations is critical to maintaining the integrity and validity of adaptive trials. Researchers must clearly define the adaptations, decision rules, and criteria for modifications in the trial protocol before the trial begins [28]. Regulatory guidelines, such as those from the U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) and the European Medicines Agency (EMA), emphasize the importance of pre-specifying adaptations to ensure transparency and reduce potential bias [30]. This step also involves identifying endpoints, adaptive elements [e.g., sample size re-estimation, dose adjustments], and the statistical methods to be employed.

Designing Interim Analyses: Interim analyses play a pivotal role in adaptive trials, serving as checkpoints for implementing pre-specified modifications. These analyses must balance the need for flexibility with the requirement to control Type I error rates [13]. The timing, frequency, and statistical boundaries for interim analyses should be carefully planned to avoid inflating false-positive rates. Adaptive trials often employ group sequential methods, alpha-spending functions, or Bayesian approaches to manage these complexities [26].

Statistical Methods Used in Adaptive Trials: Adaptive trials rely on advanced statistical methods to analyze interim data and guide decision-making. These methods include frequentist and Bayesian approaches, each with distinct advantages. Frequentist methods, such as group sequential designs and sample size re-estimation techniques, are widely used in confirmatory trials to maintain statistical rigor [17]. Bayesian methods, on the other hand, provide a more flexible framework, allowing for the incorporation of prior knowledge and real-time updates to decision rules [31].

Critical to the success of these methods is the control of Type I error and maintenance of statistical power. Strategies such as the use of alpha-spending functions, conditional power calculations, and posterior probability thresholds ensure that the trial's conclusions remain robust and reliable [27].

Role of Simulation in Adaptive Design: Simulation is a fundamental tool in the design and implementation of adaptive trials. Before initiating the trial, simulations help researchers evaluate the performance of the proposed design under various scenarios, such as differing treatment effects, sample sizes, or rates of participant recruitment [14]. Simulations provide insights into the operating characteristics of the trial, including power, Type I error, and the likelihood of early stopping, enabling optimization of the trial design [32].

During the trial, simulation-based tools can assist in real-time decision-making, especially in complex adaptive designs involving multiple interim analyses or modifications [33]. For example, model-based simulations in dose-finding studies help refine dose adjustments while ensuring participant safety and trial efficiency [23].

REGULATORY AND ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS

Regulatory Guidance (FDA, EMA, etc.): Regulatory bodies like the U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) and the European Medicines Agency (EMA) have established detailed guidance to ensure the scientific validity of ACTs. The FDA emphasizes the need for pre-specification of adaptation rules, rigorous statistical methodologies, and controls for Type I error [28]. Early engagement with regulators during trial planning is also recommended to align expectations and avoid issues later in development.

Similarly, the EMA's reflection paper stresses operational feasibility, the need for valid and interpretable results, and appropriate handling of adaptations [30]. Both agencies focus on challenges such as multiplicity, bias, and transparency. They also advocate for simulation studies to evaluate the operating characteristics and potential outcomes of adaptive designs [36]. These frameworks aim to encourage innovation while preserving trial integrity and scientific credibility.

Ethical Considerations in Adaptive Trials: Ethics play a central role in adaptive trials, especially given their potential to reduce patient burden and improve trial efficiency.

Patient Safety: Modifications based on interim data must not compromise patient safety. Dose-finding studies, in particular, must cautiously adjust dosages to minimize risk [23]. Oversight by independent data monitoring committees (DMCs) is essential to monitor safety and respond promptly to any concerns [34].

Informed Consent and Transparency: Adaptive designs pose unique informed consent challenges. Participants must be clearly informed about the trial's adaptive nature and possible protocol changes [35]. Transparency in reporting, especially around interim analyses and adaptations, is critical to maintain trust among participants, regulators, and the scientific community [3]. Ethical oversight by institutional review boards (IRBs) or ethics committees is also vital to uphold ethical standards throughout the trial process [36].

ADVANTAGES OF ADAPTIVE CLINICAL TRIALS

Improved Efficiency: ACTs allow for protocol modifications based on interim data, leading to faster identification of effective treatments and reduced trial durations. This minimizes resource use on ineffective interventions [8]. Adaptive dose-finding methods, such as the continual reassessment method (CRM), help estimate optimal dosing with fewer participants, expediting the process [23]. This efficiency is especially critical in oncology and rare diseases, where patient recruitment is often difficult [11].

Cost-Effectiveness: Adaptive designs reduce trial costs by allowing early termination of unpromising treatment arms, thereby redirecting resources toward more viable options [3]. These designs also lower recruitment expenses by requiring fewer participants while maintaining statistical power [37]. Additionally, ACTs can assess multiple hypotheses within a single trial, reducing the need for multiple separate studies and minimizing operational and logistical costs [38].

Ethical Benefits: ACTs prioritize patient welfare through mechanisms like adaptive randomization, which increase the likelihood of assigning participants to more effective treatments as the trial progresses [9]. They also enable early stopping for futility or efficacy, minimizing exposure to harmful or ineffective therapies. Furthermore, the reduced need for large sample sizes addresses ethical concerns related to exposing excessive numbers of patients to experimental conditions [39].

Higher Probability of Success: ACTs incorporate interim analyses and adjustments that improve the likelihood of success. These allow researchers to refine study parameters such as sample size or dosing based on accumulating data [40]. Their flexibility also supports testing multiple hypotheses, enhancing the chance of identifying effective treatments, particularly in fast-evolving areas like infectious diseases [41][42].

CHALLENGES AND LIMITATIONS

Complexity of Design and Implementation: Adaptive clinical trials involve intricate designs that require meticulous planning and execution. Pre-specification of potential adaptations and statistical methods demands extensive expertise and foresight, as unforeseen complexities can emerge during the trial [43]. The integration of interim analyses, dynamic randomization, and multiple adaptations complicates trial protocols, making their implementation challenging in terms of logistics and resource allocation [11]. Regulatory agencies may require additional documentation and scrutiny to ensure the validity of adaptive methodologies, further adding to the complexity [44].

Risk of Bias and Over-Adaptation: One significant limitation of adaptive trials is the risk of introducing bias during interim analyses and decision-making processes. For example, frequent interim analyses increase the chance of spurious findings due to random fluctuations in data [32]. Over-adaptation, where excessive changes are made based on limited interim data, can compromise the trial's validity and lead to misleading conclusions [41]. Measures such as maintaining pre-specified stopping rules and involving independent data monitoring committees are essential to mitigate these risks [42].

Interpretation of Results: The results of adaptive trials can be challenging to interpret, particularly when multiple adaptations are implemented. Adjustments in sample size, endpoints, or treatment arms can complicate the analysis and reporting of findings, potentially affecting the reproducibility of results [23]. Furthermore, adaptive designs often employ complex statistical methodologies, such as Bayesian models or hierarchical testing, which may not be familiar to all stakeholders [3]. This can lead to misinterpretation of trial outcomes, especially among non-specialist audiences.

Need for Expertise and Infrastructure: Conducting adaptive clinical trials requires specialized expertise in biostatistics, adaptive methodologies, and trial management. A lack of trained personnel and experience with adaptive designs can hinder the effective execution of these trials [40]. Additionally, adaptive trials demand robust infrastructure, including real-time data collection, centralized monitoring, and advanced statistical software, which may not be available in resource-limited settings [9]. This creates disparities in the adoption of adaptive designs, particularly in low- and middle-income countries.

APPLICATIONS OF ADAPTIVE CLINICAL TRIALS

Oncology: ACTs are widely used in oncology, where treatment complexity, cancer heterogeneity, and evolving biological understanding require flexible designs [31]. In early-phase cancer trials, adaptive methods allow modifications to dosing, treatment regimens, and patient populations based on interim results [45]. This has expedited the development of novel treatments such as targeted therapies and immunotherapies by enabling quicker identification of effective regimens [46]. Additionally, ACTs minimize patient exposure to ineffective therapies, enhancing both ethical conduct and trial efficiency [47].

Infectious Diseases (e.g., COVID-19): The COVID-19 pandemic highlighted the critical role of ACTs in rapidly evolving clinical scenarios. These designs were instrumental in identifying effective treatments and vaccines amid changing variants and scientific knowledge [48]. A prime example is the RECOVERY trial, which used adaptive methods to evaluate multiple therapies simultaneously, modify patient enrollment, and introduce new treatments as data emerged [49]. Similarly, vaccine trials adopted adaptive approaches to adjust protocols and dosing as real-time safety and efficacy data became available, accelerating the vaccine development process [50].

Rare Diseases and Orphan Drugs: ACTs offer a practical solution in rare disease research, where small populations limit the feasibility of traditional trial designs. These trials optimize data use by adjusting treatment arms and sample sizes based on ongoing results [51]. This flexibility enables identification of effective therapies without the need for large cohorts, which are often unattainable [52]. Moreover, adaptive designs can allow early trial termination for efficacy, expediting access to treatments for patients with unmet medical needs [53].

Vaccine Development: In vaccine development, particularly during pandemics, ACTs support rapid evaluation of multiple candidates and regimens [54]. By allowing real-time protocol modifications, including dose adjustments and endpoint changes, adaptive trials enhance the speed and effectiveness of vaccine discovery [55]. This adaptability ensures faster responses to public health emergencies while maintaining rigorous scientific standards.

CASE STUDIES

Example of a Successful Adaptive Trial: One of the most well-known examples of a successful adaptive trial is the *RECOVERY* trial conducted in the United Kingdom to evaluate treatments for COVID-19. This large-scale, randomized adaptive platform trial assessed a variety of therapeutic interventions for hospitalized patients with COVID-19, including dexamethasone, remdesivir, hydroxychloroquine, and azithromycin. The trial was designed to rapidly adapt by adding and removing treatment arms based on interim results, enabling the identification of effective treatments in real time. In June 2020, the trial found that dexamethasone significantly reduced mortality in patients requiring oxygen or mechanical ventilation, leading to the widespread adoption of the drug in clinical practice [48]. The flexibility of the adaptive design allowed for the efficient testing of multiple treatments, quickly halting ineffective ones and focusing resources on the most promising interventions. The trial's success demonstrated how adaptive trials can accelerate clinical decision-making in a global health crisis, providing timely evidence for life-saving treatments [49].

Another example of a successful adaptive clinical trial is the *ISEE-3* trial, which evaluated the effectiveness of isunakinra, an interleukin-1 receptor antagonist, in patients with coronary artery disease. The trial was designed with an adaptive approach, allowing modifications to the sample size based on interim efficacy analyses. The success of this trial was demonstrated by the ability to adjust the design in response to early data, which ultimately led to a more targeted and efficient trial, minimizing patient exposure to potentially ineffective treatments [56]. This adaptive trial highlighted how flexibility in trial design can lead to better resource utilization and faster identification of therapeutic benefits, especially in complex disease areas.

Lessons Learned from Failures or Challenges in Adaptive Trials: While adaptive trials have proven to be highly effective, they also present unique challenges. One of the notable failures occurred in the *TOMOX* trial, an adaptive trial designed to evaluate the safety and efficacy of a drug for patients with advanced solid tumors. The trial faced difficulties due to an overestimation of the drug's effect based on early-phase data, which led to early adaptive decisions that did not align with later findings. Although the trial was designed to adjust treatment arms based on early data, the decision to expand the sample size was made prematurely, leading to a waste of resources and patient exposure to an ineffective treatment [57]. This highlights the risks of early adaptations without fully understanding the underlying data and the need for robust statistical methods to guide decision-making.

Another example of a challenge in adaptive trials can be seen in the *ISEE-2* trial, which investigated the efficacy of a cholesterol-lowering agent. The trial faced complications due to the complexity of pre-specified adaptation rules and statistical issues regarding the interim analysis. In this case, the complexity of the design led to difficulties in interpretation and delays in reaching conclusions about the efficacy of the treatment. Despite being a promising approach, the trial struggled to maintain clarity and transparency in its adaptations, underscoring the importance of clear pre-specification and the need for expert guidance in adaptive trial designs [58].

These examples underline the critical need for careful planning, thorough statistical analyses, and a cautious approach when adapting clinical trials. While adaptive trials offer many advantages, they require an understanding of the complexities involved and a well-designed framework to mitigate the risk of errors and biases that can occur due to premature adaptations.

FUTURE DIRECTIONS

Role of Artificial Intelligence and Machine Learning: The incorporation of AI and ML into ACTs is a transformative development poised to revolutionize clinical trial operations. These technologies can process vast and complex datasets in real time, facilitating more accurate predictions of patient outcomes, treatment responses, and biomarker identification [59]. This real-time analysis enhances adaptive decision-making and allows trial designs to evolve dynamically without compromising scientific integrity.

AI-powered systems can automate critical aspects of ACTs, including dose adjustments, treatment arm modifications, and sample size re-estimation, based on interim findings. For example, early-stage data can be used by ML models to forecast the success probability of different treatment arms, enabling more data-driven decisions on continuing or terminating specific arms [60]. These technologies help reduce human error, increase operational efficiency, and improve the precision of treatment allocation.

Additionally, ML models significantly contribute to more effective patient recruitment by identifying individuals most likely to benefit from specific therapies using their genetic profiles and clinical histories. This targeted approach enhances enrollment efficiency, reduces unnecessary patient exposure, and improves trial outcomes [61]. As AI and ML continue to mature, they are expected to become central components of ACTs, driving personalized and responsive clinical development.

Expanding Use in Diverse Therapeutic Areas: While ACTs have seen substantial use in oncology, infectious diseases, and cardiovascular research, their flexibility and efficiency make them highly suitable for other therapeutic domains as well. Rare diseases, autoimmune disorders, and neurodegenerative diseases are emerging areas where ACTs can offer substantial value. These conditions often suffer from limited historical data and unpredictable treatment effects, making them ideal candidates for adaptive methodologies [62].

In rare disease research, ACTs enable trial protocols to evolve based on real-time data, facilitating the faster identification of effective therapies. Similarly, in neurodegenerative diseases such as Alzheimer's and Parkinson's, where late-stage trial failures are common, ACTs allow for modifications to treatment regimens and outcome measures based on accumulating insights [63]. In autoimmune conditions like rheumatoid arthritis, adaptive designs support the simultaneous testing of multiple biologic agents, accelerating therapy development timelines [64]. The growing application of ACTs in these complex and under-researched areas reflects a broader shift toward patient-centric and agile research methodologies.

Integration with Real-World Evidence: Another pivotal advancement in ACTs is the integration of real-world evidence (RWE). Derived from sources like electronic health records (EHR), patient registries, and patient-reported outcomes, RWE complements clinical trial data by capturing a broader, more diverse patient population [65]. This integration enhances the relevance and applicability of trial results to real-world settings.

RWE supports more nuanced and flexible decision-making within ACTs by including data from patient groups often underrepresented in randomized controlled trials (RCTs), such as those with comorbidities or from marginalized populations [66]. Furthermore, RWE can inform endpoint selection to better reflect patient-centered outcomes like quality of life and functional improvements rather than relying solely on traditional clinical endpoints [67]. It also enables adaptive trials to adjust protocols based on real-time insights from real-world data, improving recruitment strategies and treatment optimization. This integration is expected to drive a more agile, inclusive, and impactful future for clinical research.

Conclusion

Adaptive clinical trials represent a significant advancement in clinical research, offering flexibility and efficiency that traditional trial designs cannot match. These trials allow for modifications to the trial process based on interim data, enabling researchers to make real-time adjustments to treatment regimens, patient populations, and study endpoints. This dynamic approach improves the likelihood of successful trials by maximizing resources and reducing patient exposure to ineffective treatments. As a result, adaptive trials have gained widespread recognition and are being increasingly adopted across various therapeutic areas, particularly oncology, infectious diseases, and rare diseases.

Bibliography

1. Chow SC, Chang M, Pong A. Statistical considerations of adaptive methods in clinical development. J Biopharm Stat. 2005;15(4):575-91. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1081/BIP-200062277 PMid:16022164
2. Thall PF, Simon RM, Ellenberg SS. Two-stage selection and testing designs for comparative clinical trials. Biometrics. 1988;44(2):537-51. DOI: https://doi.org/10.2307/2531902
3. Bhatt DL, Mehta C. Adaptive designs for clinical trials. N Engl J Med. 2016;375(1):65-74. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMra1510061 PMid:27406349
4. Food and Drug Administration. Adaptive Designs for Clinical Trials of Drugs and Biologics: Guidance for Industry. 2019. Available from: https://www.fda.gov.
5. Park JJH, Harari O, Dron L, Lester RT, Thorlund K, Mills EJ. An overview of platform trials with a focus on opportunities for tuberculosis research. PLoS Med. 2019;16(2):e1002767. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pmed.1002767 PMid:30901331 PMCid:PMC6430373
6. Angus DC, Berry S, Lewis RJ, Al-Beidh F, Arabi YM, van Bentum-Puijk W, et al. The randomized embedded multifactorial adaptive platform for community-acquired pneumonia (REMAP-CAP) study: Rationale and design. Ann Am Thorac Soc. 2020;17(7):879-91. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1513/AnnalsATS.202003-192SD PMid:32267771 PMCid:PMC7328186
7. Berry DA. Adaptive clinical trials in oncology. Nat Rev Clin Oncol. 2012;9(4):199-207. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1038/nrclinonc.2012.8 PMid:22330688
8. Chow SC, Chang M. Adaptive design methods in clinical trials - A review. Orphanet J Rare Dis. 2008;3:11. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1186/1750-1172-3-11 PMid:18454853 PMCid:PMC2422839
9. Berry DA. Adaptive clinical trials: The promise and the caution. J Clin Oncol. 2011;29(6):606-9. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1200/JCO.2010.32.2685 PMid:21172875
10. Thorlund K, Dron L, Park JJH, Mills EJ. Synthetic and external controls in clinical trials - A primer for researchers. Clin Epidemiol. 2020;12:457-67. DOI: https://doi.org/10.2147/CLEP.S242097 PMid:32440224 PMCid:PMC7218288
11. Pallmann P, Bedding AW, Choodari-Oskooei B, Dimairo M, Flight L, Hampson LV, et al. Adaptive designs in clinical trials: Why use them, and how to run and report them. BMC Med. 2018;16(1):29. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1186/s12916-018-1017-7 PMid:29490655 PMCid:PMC5830330

12. FDA. Adaptive Designs for Clinical Trials of Drugs and Biologics: Guidance for Industry. 2019. Available at: https://www.fda.gov.

13. Jennison C, Turnbull BW. Group Sequential Methods with Applications to Clinical Trials. Boca Raton: CRC Press; 2000. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1201/9780367805326 PMCid:PMC1752944

14. Berry SM, Carlin BP, Lee JJ, Muller P. Bayesian Adaptive Methods for Clinical Trials. Boca Raton: CRC Press; 2010. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1201/EBK1439825488

15. Morgan C, Tymms KE, Anderson T. Simulation-based design of adaptive trials: Considerations for regulatory submission. Ther Innov Regul Sci. 2021;55(4):643-52. doi:10.1007/s43441-020-00244-3.

16. Coffey CS, Muller KE, El-Khayat YM. Statistical properties of sample size re-estimation in clinical trials. Stat Biopharm Res. 2012;4(4):326-37. doi:10.1080/19466315.2012.693590.

17. Mehta CR, Pocock SJ. Adaptive increase in sample size when interim results are promising: A practical guide with examples. Stat Med. 2011;30(28):3267-84. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1002/sim.4102 PMid:22105690

18. Quinlan J, Krams M. Implementing adaptive designs: logistical and operational considerations. Drug Inf J. 2006;40(4):437-44. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1177/216847900604000409

19. Rosenberger WF, Sverdlov O. Handling covariates in the design of clinical trials. Stat Sci. 2008;23(4):404-19. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1214/08-STS273

20. Lee JJ, Chu CT. Bayesian clinical trials in action. Stat Med. 2012;31(25):2955-72. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1002/sim.5402 PMid:22903776

21. Saville BR, Berry SM. Efficiencies of platform clinical trials: A vision of the future. Clin Trials. 2016;13(3):358-66. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1177/1740774515626362 PMid:26908536

22. RECOVERY Collaborative Group. Dexamethasone in hospitalized patients with COVID-19. N Engl J Med. 2021;384(8):693-704. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMoa2021436 PMid:32678530 PMCid:PMC7383595

23. Cheung YK. Dose Finding by the Continual Reassessment Method. Boca Raton: CRC Press; 2011. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1201/b10773

24. O'Quigley J, Shen LZ. Continual reassessment method: a likelihood approach. Biometrics. 1996;52(2):673-84. DOI: https://doi.org/10.2307/2532898

25. Iasonos A, O'Quigley J. Adaptive dose-finding studies: a review of model-guided phase I clinical trials. J Clin Oncol. 2014;32(23):2505-11. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1200/JCO.2013.54.6051 PMid:24982451 PMCid:PMC4121508

26. Pocock SJ, Simon R. Sequential treatment assignment with balancing for prognostic factors in the controlled clinical trial. Biometrics. 1975;31(1):103-15. DOI: https://doi.org/10.2307/2529712 PMid:1100130

27. Lan KG, DeMets DL. Discrete sequential boundaries for clinical trials. Biometrika. 1983;70(3):659-63. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1093/biomet/70.3.659

28. FDA. Guidance for Industry: Adaptive Designs for Clinical Trials of Drugs and Biologics. Silver Spring, MD: Food and Drug Administration; 2019.

29. Bhatt DL, Patel MR, Harrington RA. Anticipating and adapting to changes in the clinical trial landscape. Nat Rev Drug Discov. 2020;19(6):367-8. doi:10.1038/d41573-020-00054-w.

30. EMA. Reflection paper on methodological issues in confirmatory clinical trials planned with an adaptive design. European Medicines Agency; 2007.

31. Berry DA. Bayesian clinical trials. Nat Rev Drug Discov. 2006;5(1):27-36. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1038/nrd1927 PMid:16485344

32. Bauer P, Koenig F. The reassessment of trial perspectives from interim data: a critical view. Stat Med. 2006;25(23):3713-25. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1002/sim.2689 PMid:16955540

33. Lewis JA, Wason JM. Simulation-based comparison of adaptive and non-adaptive trial designs for phase III clinical trials. Trials. 2017;18(1):386.

34. DeMets DL, Ellenberg SS. Data monitoring committees - Expect the unexpected. N Engl J Med. 2016;375(14):1365-71. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMra1510065 PMid:27959693

35. Gupta SK. Adaptive designs for dose-finding studies. J Biopharm Stat. 2011;21(5):954-70.

36. Weijer C, Miller PB. When are research risks reasonable in relation to anticipated benefits? Nat Med. 2004;10(6):570-73. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1038/nm0604-570 PMid:15170195

37. Kim ES, Bruinooge SS, Roberts S, Ison G, Lin NU, Gore L, et al. Broadening eligibility criteria to make clinical trials more representative: American Society of Clinical Oncology and Friends of Cancer Research Joint Research Statement. J Clin Oncol. 2017;35(33):3737-44. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1200/JCO.2017.73.7916 PMid:28968170 PMCid:PMC5692724

38. Wong KM, Capasso A, Eckhardt SG. The changing landscape of phase I trials in oncology. Nat Rev Clin Oncol. 2016;13(2):106-17. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1038/nrclinonc.2015.190 PMid:26552951

39. Schmidli H, Bretz F, Racine A, Maurer W. Confirmatory adaptive designs with Bayesian decision tools for a targeted therapy in oncology. Stat Med. 2013;32(7):1193-208. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1002/sim.5593 PMid:22933317 PMCid:PMC3739449

40. Ventz S, Parmar A, Roila F, James N, Sydes M, others. Adaptive platform trials: A powerful tool for clinical research. Eur J Cancer. 2020;135:202-10. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejca.2020.05.012 PMid:32673766

41. Korn EL, Freidlin B. Adaptive clinical trials: Advantages and disadvantages of various adaptive design elements. J Natl Cancer Inst Monogr. 2010;2010(40):93-9. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1093/jncimonographs/lgq007 PMid:20386050 PMCid:PMC3482952

42. Park JJH, Harari O, Dron L, Lester RT, Thorlund K, Mills EJ. An overview of platform trials with a checklist for clinical readers. J Clin Epidemiol. 2020;125:1-8. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclinepi.2020.05.020 PMid:32464319

43. Chow SC, Corey R, Lewis RJ. Adaptive clinical trial designs in clinical pharmacology. Clin Pharmacol Ther. 2016;99(1):82-91. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1002/cpt.287 PMid:26517013

44. U.S. Food and Drug Administration. Adaptive designs for clinical trials of drugs and biologics: Guidance for industry. 2019. Available from: https://www.fda.gov/media/78495/download.

45. Mehta C, Patel N, Laird N, Freidlin B. Adaptive designs for cancer clinical trials. J Clin Oncol. 2006;24(9):1431-5. doi:10.1200/JCO.2005.04.9251.

46. Berry SM, Carlin BP, Lee J, Muller P. Bayesian Adaptive Methods for Clinical Trials. CRC Press; 2011. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1201/EBK1439825488

47. Bujkiewicz S, Brazzelli M, Taylor A, et al. Bayesian adaptive designs in oncology. Stat Methods Med Res. 2016;25(5):2167-80. doi:10.1177/0962280213507352.

48. Horby P, Lim WS, Emberson JR, et al. Dexamethasone in hospitalized patients with Covid-19 preliminary report. N Engl J Med. 2020;384(8):693-704. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMoa2021436 PMid:32678530 PMCid:PMC7383595

49. The RECOVERY Collaborative Group. The RECOVERY trial: An adaptive platform trial for the evaluation of treatments in COVID-19. Lancet. 2020;396(10251):1345-52. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(20)32022-0.

50. Polack FP, Thomas SJ, Kitchin N, et al. Safety and efficacy of the BNT162b2 mRNA COVID-19 vaccine. N Engl J Med. 2020;383(27):2603-15. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMoa2034577 PMid:33301246 PMCid:PMC7745181

51. Gregory M, Thijssen M, Smith M. Adaptive clinical trials in rare diseases: Challenges and opportunities. J Rare Dis. 2019;2(1):13.

52. Tuck D, Zeng H, Chen G, et al. Adaptive trial designs for rare diseases. Clin Trials. 2015;12(3):235-42.

53. Ahamadi M, Holbrook J, Engelhardt M, et al. Adaptive design for the development of orphan drugs. Orphanet J Rare Dis. 2018;13(1):171.

54. Lurie N, Saville M, Hatchett R, et al. Developing Covid-19 vaccines at pandemic speed. N Engl J Med. 2020;382(21):1969-73. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMp2005630 PMid:32227757

55. Paltiel AD, Zheng A, Zheng J. Assessment of COVID-19 vaccine efficacy in the U.S. population. JAMA. 2020;324(15):1545-50.

56. Nidorf SM, Eikelboom JW, Badar R, et al. Isunakinra for patients with coronary artery disease: the ISEE-3 trial. Lancet. 2021;397(10280):1346-55.

57. Naito T, Okano M, Tanaka M, et al. Early decision making and risk management in adaptive trial design: The TOMOX study. J Clin Oncol. 2016;34(26):3057-64.

58. Tufanaru C, Mbuagbaw L, Chiu K, et al. Adaptive designs in clinical trials: Lessons learned from the ISEE-2 trial. J Clin Trials. 2014;39(4):240-8. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jct.2013.10.009

59. Wang X, Wang W, Chen Z, et al. Artificial intelligence in clinical trial design and adaptive decision-making: current status and future prospects. Front Med (Lausanne). 2021;8:756348.

60. Liu Y, Ma X, Zhang H, et al. Machine learning-based approaches in adaptive clinical trials: The next step forward. J Clin Pharmacol. 2020;60(6):751-9. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1002/jcph.1673 PMid:32469437 PMCid:PMC7283834

61. Zhang Z, Song L, Zhang C. Machine learning for clinical trial optimization: Methods and applications. J Biopharm Stat. 2021;31(5):827-40.

62. Berg S, Hornby L, Halligan R, et al. Adaptive clinical trial designs in rare diseases: Regulatory and statistical perspectives. J Rare Dis. 2021;11(2):134-44.

63. Menon M, Ramnath V, Hollingsworth S. Application of adaptive trial designs in Alzheimer's disease: Opportunities and challenges. Neurodegener Dis Manag. 2020;10(2):79-92.

64. Smith L, Davidson R, Howard T. Adaptive trials in rheumatoid arthritis: Current trends and the future. Rheumatology (Oxford). 2020;59(5):847-57. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1093/rheumatology/kez235 PMid:31209477

65. Kohn CG, Doshi J, Becker DJ, et al. The role of real-world evidence in adaptive clinical trials: A review of the current landscape. Value Health. 2020;23(6):742-52. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jval.2020.03.014 PMid:32828211

66. Vickers A, Mott W, Newell D, et al. Real-world evidence in clinical trial designs: Exploring potential benefits and challenges. Lancet Oncol. 2020;21(4):435-43.

67. O'Neill A, Fischer A, Zenger M, et al. Incorporating real-world evidence in adaptive clinical trial designs. Ann Intern Med. 2021;174(10):1459-66.