

**Table 2: Efficiency of the adaptations, challenges and benefits, and considerations**

	<b>Adaptation</b>	<b>Potentially efficient adaptation, and reason if not</b>	<b>Studies/populations in which adaptation may be efficient</b>	<b>Challenges and benefits</b>	<b>Guidance or considerations</b>  [guidance from existing literature is in <i>italics</i> ]
Recruitment	Two-stage remote-first eligibility assessment	Yes – NHS sites and trial participants	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Smaller studies</li> <li>• Studies not involving sensitive topics/questions</li> <li>• Studies requiring the participant to make a decision regarding their involvement in the trial prior to a fixed event (e.g., surgery).</li> <li>• Studies where eligibility assessments can be undertaken remotely by CTU staff.</li> <li>• Low risk studies.</li> <li>• Studies where a high proportion of participants can be screened out prior to an in-person visit (e.g., studies involving recruitment via social media).</li> </ul>	<p><b>Challenges</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Discussion of sensitive topics or questions over telephone may be challenging.</li> <li>• Reading participant’s expressions and body language is important and may be missed if undertaken remotely.</li> <li>• May be more challenging to describe recruitment procedure due to increased complexity.</li> <li>• Eligibility and baseline data no longer collected directly prior to randomisation.</li> <li>• If undertaken by CTU staff, clinical staff may have less ownership over the consent process.</li> <li>• May be problematic for CTUs to receive identifiable data if the participant is not self-referring.</li> <li>• Certain measures may not be validated for use outside the in-person clinic setting.</li> </ul> <p><b>Benefits</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some investigations may need to be undertaken in person after the remote eligibility assessment (e.g., pregnancy test).</li> <li>• The eligibility process may be able to be undertaken quicker by a CTU, but overall, the process may take longer due to multiple steps.</li> <li>• May be unsuitable for studies that require a qualified medical professional to confirm eligibility.</li> <li>• Unlikely to be resource saving unless participants are screened out prior to an in-person eligibility assessment.</li> </ul>

**Table 2: Efficiency of the adaptations, challenges and benefits, and considerations**

	Adaptation	Potentially efficient adaptation, and reason if not	Studies/populations in which adaptation may be efficient	Challenges and benefits	Guidance or considerations  [guidance from existing literature is in <i>italics</i> ]
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ability to screen out participants early may save time.</li> <li>• Centralisation of eligibility process may allow faster completion.</li> <li>• May allow participant more time to consider participation in trial.</li> <li>• If undertaken by a CTU, may allow clinical staff more time to discuss the trial at a later appointment.</li> </ul>	
	Recruitment outside the NHS via a charity	Yes – NHS sites and trial participants	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• May be best used as an adjunct to recruitment within the NHS, rather than by itself, due to a potential impact on the sampling frame.</li> <li>• Low risk studies not requiring medical input into participant recruitment.</li> <li>• Studies for which there is a relevant condition specific charity which is suitability large.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Challenges</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Issues with participant sampling – either the charity not sampling correctly, self-selection bias, or inability to access population of interest.</li> <li>• Relationship between the participant and researcher/clinician is important – remotely conducting recruitment via a charity may impede this.</li> <li>• Low response rate (20% in one study) if emails are used.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A range of recruitment techniques (involving both NHS and non-NHS routes) may be preferable.</li> <li>• Reminders required to prompt participants to complete recruitment steps.</li> <li>• <i>In-person approaches may result in a better recruitment rate [1].</i></li> <li>• Recruitment could be undertaken by CTU, unless study is high risk of a CTIMP, in which case a clinically qualified</li> </ul>

**Table 2: Efficiency of the adaptations, challenges and benefits, and considerations**

	Adaptation	Potentially efficient adaptation, and reason if not	Studies/populations in which adaptation may be efficient	Challenges and benefits	Guidance or considerations  [guidance from existing literature is in <i>italics</i> ]
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Studies where potential sampling biases have a limited effect on the external validity of the trial.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The charity may not have the expertise or resources to conduct research processes.</li> </ul> <p><b>Benefits</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Many participants can be contacted at once, potentially quicker than can be achieved by individually contacting participants within NHS Trusts.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>person may be required to confirm eligibility.</li> <li>Charities may require training in recruitment processes, requiring time and input from CTUs and the charities.</li> <li>Charities may not have the necessary information to be unable to identify those individuals who are too vulnerable to participate in the trial.</li> </ul>
	Remote consent	Yes – NHS sites and trial participants	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Studies where a close relationship between the researcher and participant is not critical.</li> <li>Has the potential to increase efficiency by improving recruitment rates.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Challenges</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>May impact on the participant-researcher relationship, if consent is undertaken remotely and/or by a member of CTU staff.</li> <li>Risk of a shift in the sampling frame of the study if consent is obtained using a technology/platform that some potential participants are unlikely to have access to.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Do not assume that the REC will not support a method of consent that may not be the ‘safest’ or most secure.</li> <li>Remote consent (i.e., consent via telephone or video calls) may be easier to implement compared to electronic consent, for both participants and CTU, due to limited access to this technology.</li> </ul>

**Table 2: Efficiency of the adaptations, challenges and benefits, and considerations**

	Adaptation	Potentially efficient adaptation, and reason if not	Studies/populations in which adaptation may be efficient	Challenges and benefits	Guidance or considerations [guidance from existing literature is in <i>italics</i> ]
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Digital literacy is a concern.</li> <li>• Consent may be more challenging to undertake remotely.</li> <li>• Not always possible to know if participants have been pressured by family or others when consent is not in person.</li> <li>• Sensitive conversations may be difficult to have remotely.</li> </ul> <p><b>Benefits</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• May enable participants more time to consider the trial.</li> <li>• Trial sites do not have to use limited clinic space to facilitate in-person consent.</li> <li>• Allows the participant flexibility.</li> <li>• May allow family members/friends to be present during conversation.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clear guidance to sites is important.</li> <li>• Sites with more motivated investigators may be more successful at gaining remote consent – more support may be required for other sites.</li> <li>• Reminders may be required to obtain responses from participants.</li> <li>• It may take significant resources for CTUs to develop remote consent procedures.</li> <li>• Multiple options or mediums of gaining informed consent may be required if there is a risk that using only one technique may bias the sample.</li> <li>• Some participants may benefit from in person informed consent – flexibility is key.</li> </ul>

**Table 2: Efficiency of the adaptations, challenges and benefits, and considerations**

	Adaptation	Potentially efficient adaptation, and reason if not	Studies/populations in which adaptation may be efficient	Challenges and benefits	Guidance or considerations [guidance from existing literature is in <i>italics</i> ]
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Participants may prefer paper consent methods due to concerns around trust and data security [2,3].</i></li> <li>• <i>Using interactive features may aid comprehension [2].</i></li> <li>• It may be necessary to maintain an audit trail of the consent conversations that are had if the participant isn't able to physically sign the consent form.</li> <li>• If possible, avoid the need for participants to type a URL into a browser – this may result in participants making data errors and becoming disengaged from the recruitment process.</li> </ul>

**Table 2: Efficiency of the adaptations, challenges and benefits, and considerations**

	<b>Adaptation</b>	<b>Potentially efficient adaptation, and reason if not</b>	<b>Studies/populations in which adaptation may be efficient</b>	<b>Challenges and benefits</b>	<b>Guidance or considerations</b>  [guidance from existing literature is in <i>italics</i> ]
Intervention delivery	Remote delivery of the intervention by CTU staff	No. Pandemic specific. Does not allow trial to be tested in 'real world' setting		<p><b>Challenges</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The scientific integrity of the trial may be impacted by the fact that the intervention is not being tested in the 'real world'.</li> <li>• Range of facilitators reduced, meaning each facilitator may have an increase influence over delivery of the intervention.</li> </ul> <p><b>Benefits</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A smaller, centralised team allows more controlled facilitation of the intervention</li> <li>• Direct feedback between participants and CTU staff</li> </ul>	
	Delivery of the trial intervention by any interventionists	Unknown	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Studies with a HEI sponsor</li> <li>• Studies involving interventions that can be carried out remotely, where there are</li> </ul>	<p><b>Challenges</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Seeking excess treatment costs, transfer of data between Trusts, and agreement of whom takes responsibilities for the</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Avoid including PIs who are not engaged in trial as receivers of external referrals.</li> <li>• Allows therapist absence at one site to be covered by therapists from other sites.</li> </ul>

**Table 2: Efficiency of the adaptations, challenges and benefits, and considerations**

	<b>Adaptation</b>	<b>Potentially efficient adaptation, and reason if not</b>	<b>Studies/populations in which adaptation may be efficient</b>	<b>Challenges and benefits</b>	<b>Guidance or considerations</b>  [guidance from existing literature is in <i>italics</i> ]
	at any NHS Trust		numerous trained individuals across the UK	participant's clinical care may be challenging. <b>Benefits</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• May increase the pool of potential participants, therefore increasing recruitment throughput.</li> </ul>	
	Couriering the IMP to the participant's home	Yes – benefits participants	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• IMPs not requiring strict temperature regulation</li> <li>• Studies that can incorporate costs for IMP couriering into their grant.</li> </ul>	<b>Challenges</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Significant resources required at site or the CTU to track and organise the courier, including outside of normal office hours.</li> <li>• Significant resources may also be required to review SOPs and formulate courier processes.</li> <li>• Expensive.</li> <li>• Logistical issues, including the requirement for wet ink signatures, and pharmacies closing before the courier attends.</li> <li>• May result in poor external validity, if, in the 'real-world', the drug would not be couriered to the participant.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Return of the IMP important to consider.</li> <li>• Confirmation that the participant has received the IMP may be required – either by directly contacting the participant or receiving notifications from the courier.</li> <li>• Ensure packaging is correct and the site pharmacy approve it.</li> <li>• Adherence data may be difficult to collect and be reliant on trusting the participant to provide reliable data.</li> <li>• Sites may automatically defer to using a courier and may need reminding that the participant can attend in-person.</li> </ul>

**Table 2: Efficiency of the adaptations, challenges and benefits, and considerations**

		<b>Adaptation</b>	<b>Potentially efficient adaptation, and reason if not</b>	<b>Studies/populations in which adaptation may be efficient</b>	<b>Challenges and benefits</b>	<b>Guidance or considerations</b>  [guidance from existing literature is in <i>italics</i> ]
					<b>Benefits</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Couriering the IMP may make the trial more desirable and increase participant recruitment and retention.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sites may need time to update their SOPs if they have not couriered medications in the past, which the CTU may need to review.</li> <li>• Between arm differences in how the drug is couriered may result in bias.</li> </ul>
Follow-up	Remote collection of PROMs	Telephone & postal	Yes – benefits participants	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Studies may consider using this adaptation as a back-up for remote patients or those that cannot attend the study site</li> </ul>	<b>Challenges</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Risk of missing side effects when participant cannot be seen in person.</li> <li>• Data may be missing if limited guidance or input is provided to the participant when completing measures.</li> <li>• May be difficult to ask sensitive conversations remotely.</li> </ul> <b>Benefits</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Allows trial participants increased flexibility in how trial procedures are undertaken, and therefore may improve recruitment rates</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Training may be required if CTU staff are to deliver PROMs.</li> <li>• <i>There were differences in responses to the questionnaires when comparing telephone vs mail, or paper to electronic versions [4,5].</i></li> <li>• Certain instruments may not be validated for use outside the in-person clinical setting.</li> <li>• Maintaining blinding was challenging in one trial. In order to resolve this, each site has a blinded and non-blinded research assistant.</li> </ul>

**Table 2: Efficiency of the adaptations, challenges and benefits, and considerations**

	Adaptation	Potentially efficient adaptation, and reason if not	Studies/populations in which adaptation may be efficient	Challenges and benefits	Guidance or considerations [guidance from existing literature is in <i>italics</i> ]	
					<p>through making the trial more appealing.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Telephone data collection may lead to particularly good compliance and low missing data but may be onerous for long questionnaires.</li> <li>• Postal data collection may require high levels of CTU input – including dealing with missing data and administering reminders to participants.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Participants may not pick up the telephone for outcome collection if being called from an unknown number.</li> <li>• As the clinical team may not be directly involved in the follow up, criteria may be required for stopping the IMP, e.g., in the case of high depression levels.</li> <li>• Telephone follow-ups may need to be split into multiple sessions if many measures are being collected and may require out of hours working at the CTU.</li> <li>• Postal data collection may require follow-up windows to be extended.</li> <li>• Repetitive question formats should be avoided over the telephone. Questions should be kept as simple as possible via all mediums.</li> </ul>

**Table 2: Efficiency of the adaptations, challenges and benefits, and considerations**

		<b>Adaptation</b>	<b>Potentially efficient adaptation, and reason if not</b>	<b>Studies/populations in which adaptation may be efficient</b>	<b>Challenges and benefits</b>	<b>Guidance or considerations</b> [guidance from existing literature is in <i>italics</i> ]
						<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Inform participant prior to the call the nature of the conversations to assist them in dealing with sensitive questions.</li> <li>• Trial sites can be involved in prompting participant for missing data or checking potentially erroneous or clinically concerning data.</li> <li>• There may be generational differences in the acceptability of different data collection techniques – the younger generation may not want to use the telephone, and may prefer text messages; older generations may prefer telephone.</li> </ul>
		Video	Unknown			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Used in a study involving populations with chronic conditions that reduce ability to communicate via other methods.</li> </ul>

**Table 2: Efficiency of the adaptations, challenges and benefits, and considerations**

		<b>Adaptation</b>	<b>Potentially efficient adaptation, and reason if not</b>	<b>Studies/populations in which adaptation may be efficient</b>	<b>Challenges and benefits</b>	<b>Guidance or considerations</b>  [guidance from existing literature is in <i>italics</i> ]
	Remote collection of biological measures	Blood pressures collected remotely	Yes – benefits participants	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Studies where taking blood pressures remotely would avoid the need for participants to attend an appointment.</li> <li>• Studies where participants can measure their own blood pressure.</li> </ul>	<p>See also “remote delivery of PROMs”</p> <p><b>Challenges</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Participants may provide erroneous values – e.g., supply their lowest blood pressure readings.</li> <li>• Potential for loss of data if readings are not automatically uploaded.</li> <li>• Concerns around calibration and quality of devices – good quality devices may be very expensive.</li> <li>• May work against inclusivity – e.g., those with chaotic lifestyles</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Unlikely to be more efficient, but more flexible for participants.</li> <li>• Compliance may depend on patient group or individual patient’s motivations, e.g., patients who are less engaged in their therapy may be less likely to provide accurate data.</li> <li>• Participants may want to see a clinician.</li> <li>• Participant’s readings may better reflect their ‘actual’ blood pressure levels when measured in the home environment.</li> </ul>
		Spirometry & cough data collected remotely	Unknown	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Studies collecting biological measures, where technology assists to collect the outcome remotely and automatically (e.g., spirometry data)</li> </ul>	<p><b>Challenges</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cost implications</li> </ul> <p><b>Benefits</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Remote collection of spirometry data, and automated upload to the trial database, allowed for</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Unknown acceptability from participant’s point of view.</li> </ul>

**Table 2: Efficiency of the adaptations, challenges and benefits, and considerations**

		<b>Adaptation</b>	<b>Potentially efficient adaptation, and reason if not</b>	<b>Studies/populations in which adaptation may be efficient</b>	<b>Challenges and benefits</b>	<b>Guidance or considerations</b>  [guidance from existing literature is in <i>italics</i> ]
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Studies that have the budget to invest in such technologies</li> </ul>	additional secondary outcomes to be collected.	
		Remotely collected blood glucose measure (Hb1Ac)	Yes – benefits participants	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Studies where taking Hb1Ac remotely would avoid the need for participants to attend an appointment.</li> <li>• Studies where participants can measure their own blood glucose levels.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Challenges</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Extensive resources required at CTU to administer and send packs.</li> <li>• Potential poor response rate.</li> <li>• Participants accessing a post box to return the kit may be the most challenging part for more ill or vulnerable participants.</li> </ul> <p><b>Benefits</b> See “remote delivery of PROMs”</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Unknown acceptability from participant’s point of view.</li> <li>• Need to ensure process isn’t too burdensome for participants.</li> </ul>
	Other	Collection of outcomes from a routine source	Unknown			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cheaper and involves less travel for participants.</li> </ul>

	<b>Adaptation</b>	<b>Potentially efficient adaptation, and reason if not</b>	<b>Studies/populations in which adaptation may be efficient</b>	<b>Challenges and benefits</b>	<b>Guidance or considerations</b> [guidance from existing literature is in <i>italics</i> ]
	Prioritisation of trial outcomes or in-person visits	No. Pandemic specific			

CTIMP – Clinical Trial of an Investigational Medicinal Product; CTU – Clinical Trials Unit; HEI – Higher Education Institution; NHS – National Health Service; PI – Principal Investigator; PROM - Patient Reported Outcome Measure; REC – Research Ethics Committee; SOP – Standard Operating Procedure; URL – Uniform Resource Locator.

#### References

- 1 Brøgger-Mikkelsen M, Ali Z, Zibert JR, *et al.* Online patient recruitment in clinical trials: systematic review and meta-analysis. *J. Med. Internet Res.* 2020;**22**:e22179. doi:10.2196/22179
- 2 Skelton E, Drey N, Rutherford M, *et al.* Electronic consenting for conducting research remotely: A review of current practice and key recommendations for using e-consenting. *Int. J. Med. Inform.* 2020;**143**:104271. doi:10.1016/j.ijmedinf.2020.104271
- 3 Chen C, Lee P-I, Pain KJ, *et al.* Replacing Paper Informed Consent with Electronic Informed Consent for Research in Academic Medical Centers: A Scoping Review. *AMIA Jt Summits Transl Sci proceedings AMIA Jt Summits Transl Sci* 2020;**2020**:80–8. <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/32477626> (accessed 16 Mar 2021).
- 4 Erhart M, Wetzel RM, Krügel A, *et al.* Effects of phone versus mail survey methods on the measurement of health-related quality of life and emotional and behavioural problems in adolescents. *BMC Public Health* 2009;**9**:491. doi:10.1186/1471-2458-9-491
- 5 Nishimura K, Kusunose M, Sanda R, *et al.* Comparison between electronic and paper versions of patient-reported outcome measures in subjects with chronic obstructive pulmonary disease: an observational study with a cross-over administration. *BMJ Open* 2019;**9**:e032767. doi:10.1136/bmjopen-2019-032767