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Multiple Committees

- Administrative Operational Group
  - Subcommittee of Study Group
  - Oversaw day-to-day operations
  - Met weekly since start of studies

- Steering Committee
  - 11 members
  - Membership from federal government, subject matter experts from professional organizations and patient representatives
  - Review study design, questionnaire content, accumulated data and related presentations/manuscripts
  - Met quarterly to finalize both protocols (EMMES or teleconference)
  - Met biannually during data collection and close-out of both studies
Subcontractors

- The RAND Corporation
  - Cognitive Interviews

- Steve Reise
  - Psychometric Statistician

- Study Coordinator
  - PROWL–1 site

- PROWL–2 Clinical Sites

- Western IRB
  - PROWL–2 sites
Agreement Execution

- Federal Inter-Agency Agreements
  - Navy and FDA
  - FDA and NEI

- Steering Committee Agreements
  - Conflict of Interest forms
  - Confidential Disclosure Agreements
Study Conduct

- Questionnaire Development

  - Platform selection – electronic data capture (EDC) vs. commercial survey software

  - Content Development – Appropriate domains

  - Cognitive Interviews – Provide feedback on questionnaire (e.g., remove or revise questions); provided feedback on embedded pictures (halos, glare, starbursts and double image)
Study Conduct

- Site Selection
  - PROWL-1
    - Navy
  - PROWL-2
    - Request for Proposal
    - Ranking System to choose 5 sites
      - General clinical trials/studies experience
      - Recruitment and retention capability
      - Facilities
    - 5 Sites
      - 20/20 Institute (Indiana)
      - Durrie Vision (Kansas)
      - Johns Hopkins University (Maryland)
      - Stanford University (California)
      - Vance Thompson (South Dakota)
Study Conduct

- Data Collection
  - No paper forms – all data collected via EDC

- Challenges
  - Patient-reported outcomes data collection
    - Questionnaire completion – userID and passwords
    - No access to subject protected health information
    - Sealed envelopes
    - Forgotten passwords
  - Follow-up
    - Site follow-up with subjects
    - Daily automatic e-mails
Study Conduct

- Enrollment Challenges
  - PROWL–1
    - Deployment
    - Female Enrichment
  - PROWL–2
    - High Myopes and Hyperopes
Study Conduct

- Monitoring
  - Site Initiation Visits

- Interim and Close–out Monitoring
  - Remote (risk–based) Monitoring
  - FDA Guidance – Oversight of Clinical Investigations – A Risk–Based Approach to Monitoring (final August 2013)*
    - Monitor data quality – Data Quality Reports
    - Missing data, protocol deviations, data trends
    - Site characteristics – performance measures
    - Randomly selected percentage of subjects to review during close–out
      - Skype – informed consent review
      - DocuBank – source document review

Conclusion

- These studies were a testament to a collaborative and creative effort made by many to ensure the studies were completed in the most efficient manner.