**Journal of Information Systems Engineering and Management**
2025, 10 (31s)
e-ISSN: 2468-4376
https://jisem-journal.com/

**Research Article**

# An Exploratory Study on Enhancing Efficiency in Patient-Centric Clinical Trials Through Operational Management Strategies and its Impact on Research Outcome

Prasanna Kumar C S [1], Saisree Mangu [2]
[1] *Research Scholar, GITAM School of Business, GITAM University, Bengaluru.*
*Email: psuryapr@gitam.in, Orcid ID: 0009-0009-2986-6098*
[2] *Faculty Member GITAM School of Business, GITAM University, Bengaluru.*
*Orcid ID: 0000-0003-1276-2021*

**ARTICLE INFO**

Received: 27 Dec 2024

Revised: 15 Feb 2025

Accepted: 25 Feb 2025

**ABSTRACT**

This exploratory study investigates the enhancement of efficiency in patient-centric clinical trials through the implementation of operational management strategies. As clinical trials increasingly prioritize patient engagement and outcomes, the need for effective operational frameworks becomes paramount. This research identifies key operational strategies, including streamlined patient recruitment processes, adaptive trial designs, and the integration of technology for real-time data collection and monitoring. By analyzing case studies and empirical data, the study evaluates the impact of these strategies on trial efficiency, patient satisfaction, and overall research outcomes. The findings suggest that a robust operational management approach not only accelerates trial timelines but also improves data quality and patient retention rates. Ultimately, this study contributes to the growing body of knowledge on optimizing clinical trial processes, emphasizing the critical role of operational management in achieving successful patient-centric research.

**Keywords:** Patient-centric clinical trial, Operational strategies, sustainability development, health promotion in sustainable societies.

## INTRODUCTION

In recent years, patient-centric approaches have gained significant attention in healthcare, fostering collaboration between healthcare professionals, clinical researchers, regulators, and the pharmaceutical industry. In this context, patient-centric clinical trials (PCCTs) aim to reduce the burden and adversity of patients during the execution of the study, while more focus is put on patients' benefits and ambitions (Stamenovic & Dobraca, 2017). The increasing popularity of PCCTs has a myriad of consequences on the traditional business model of Clinical Research Organizations (CROs) since a significant number of activities arise from patients' domiciles, impelling CROs to a considerable operational rethink. Hence, there is an emergent necessity to re-evaluate, express, and leverage novel CRO delivery models which will be adapted on the connecting environment, serving the unmet needs of PCCTs and safeguarding the fulfillment of sponsors' requirements (I Nebie et al., 2024).

The goal of this study is to scrutinize and evaluate the impact of the union of sophisticated operational research techniques and advanced technologies in the design and function of novel CRO delivery models suitable for supporting PCCTs. On the one hand, advanced operational research methodologies will be devised for designing and evaluating the effectiveness of possible CRO operational strategies. Moreover, a series of applicable tools will be proposed for backing up the effective implementation of these strategies, formulating the role of evolving technologies in the adoption of advanced delivery models for the design and execution of PCCTs.

Clinical development is increasingly considering patient-centric clinical trials with fewer or even only one site through and supported by telemedicine. As the number of treatment arms increases, the considerations for these trials require

additional attention (Burdon et al., 2024). In some situations, the most efficient set-up is a conventional approach and this will be the chosen solution.

In conclusion, patient-centric clinical trials speak to a promising approach to progressing therapeutic inquiry and making strides with persistent results (English, 2010). By prioritizing quiet needs and points of view, these trials can upgrade member engagement, enrollment, maintenance, and information quality, ultimately accelerating the advancement and conveyance of inventive medications (Huang, 2020). In any case, operationalizing patient-centricity requires cautious arranging, coordination, and usage, as well as adherence to lawful and administrative systems administering clinical inquiry. By tending to these challenges and contemplations, partners can maximize the benefits of patient-centric trials while guaranteeing moral conduct, compliance, and understanding security (Reddy, 2016).

### Objectives of the Study

The aim of the study is to research different operational management strategies and methodologies to develop unique models in order to increase the efficiency of patient-centric clinical trials and address legal barriers. In accordance with the aim, the following objectives will be covered here:

- To investigate the different operational strategies and research methods adopted in clinical trial
- To explore the applicability of operation management process and adoption of sustainable lifestyles of participants in patient-centric trials
- To analyze stake holder's perceptions regarding the adoption of different operation management tools to promote sustainable societies.
- To foster the scientific community around the designing, managing, and exploiting the PCCT delivery model,

## LITERATURE REVIEW

### Operational Management Models

The support a clinical research organisation (CRO) can provide to the management and implementation of a clinical trial is both varied and complex. Aspects of protocol design, site selection, process timing, package design and trial implementation strategy need to be decided in the initial planning stages (I Nebie et al., 2024). Close collaboration with the trial sponsor and a full understanding of study objectives and limitations are the basis for sound planning. Once the study has commenced the focus shifts towards patient recruiting, site monitoring and data checks. The ability of CROs to meet the needs of sponsors in these areas has been identified (Kasahara et al., 2024). Patient lists that are generated using search criteria constructed via access to electronic health record data are instrumental in a study team's site-specific planning and execution

In clinical trials, operational management refers to the oversight of the day-to-day activities of trial conduct. It is involved in 'getting the job done' reliably and efficiently (Kelly et al., 2020). The operational data collected and the way it communicates are crucial to inform the go/no-go decisions which are made daily in research and development business units. For operational management, robust and attentive plans or an 'early warning system' of scheduling against agreed milestones and forecasted recruitment density are essential to ensure the trial does not drag longer than intended and that comparable time is planned for the concluding set of analyses. The ultimate goal of trial operations improvement is, of course, how to get the job done as well and as quickly as possible, with the least risk and the fewest patient volunteers, but as it presently stands on this issue, it is an interesting statistical problem in design efficiency after the data are in and the analysis is done, rather than any operational initiative in the field. The systemic progression of risk that arises from operational acting is also currently unexplored in the statistical literature and is an important consideration for the 'design' of operational processes.

The ultimate goal of operational improvements in clinical trials is to complete the patient-centric drug testing with minimal essential patient resources and infrastructure, reducing the demand for clinical testing of new treatment options to the strict minimum, while maintaining both the desired scientific information and assurance of no more than an acceptable safety risk for patients, particularly in the late-stage setting (Kelly et al., 2020). The scientific strategies deciding on how the first patient is consented at a particular site and at a particular time-point through the last patient's last visit should maximize the chances of its success. There is a persistent policy debate on the ways to

improve the operational efficiency of patient-centric drug testing of new treatment options. However, if patient resources available for clinical testing are viewed as a strictly limited contractual budget to be optimally distributed across patient-centric drug testing, improbability is the only essential property for the operational assumptions adopted in the prior planning of clinical trials which can be neither prevented nor mitigated and should be considered a basic assumption in the design of patient-centric drug testing.

**Clinical Trials Research Methodologies**

The research techniques for clinical trials, especially randomized controlled trials (RCTs), are essential within the time of evidence-based medication for assessing the security and adequacy of restorative mediations. RCTs are broadly respected as the gold standard for evaluating treatment adequacy, as they offer assistance to minimize bias and confounding factors by randomly assigning members to treatment and control groups (Mas-Tur, 2020). This randomization preparation guarantees that the groups are comparable, permitting analysts to point out contrasts in results to the intercession being considered.

However, despite their qualities, RCTs also have limitations that have to be recognized and tended to (Imison, 2016). One such restriction is the potential for choice predisposition, especially in case members are not randomly chosen or in case there are contrasts between treatment groups at baseline (Springer, 2020). This could undermine the inner legitimacy of the study results and compromise the capacity to draw precise conclusions approximately the intervention's viability. Furthermore, RCTs may not continuously be attainable or moral, particularly in cases where withholding treatment from a control group pose posture dangers to members (Clinical Trials Help Groups, 2010).

To supplement RCTs and mitigate some of their challenges, alternative clinical trial research methods, such as observational studies, offer alternative approaches to generate real-world evidence on treatment effects (Getz, 2007). Observational studies, including cohort studies and case-control studies, allow researchers to observe outcomes in natural settings without intervention (Eisenstein, 2008). While observational studies provide valuable insights into treatment effects in diverse patient populations, they are susceptible to biases such as confounding and selection bias. Researchers must carefully acknowledge these limitations when interpreting the findings of observational studies and ensure appropriate statistical methods are used to mitigate bias. Additionally, innovative clinical trial designs, such as adaptive trial designs, have emerged to address some of the challenges associated with traditional RCTs.

Adaptive trial designs allow for adjustments to the trial protocol based on interim analyses of accumulating data, enabling researchers to make real-time adjustments to optimize trial efficiency and resource allocation (Getz, 2008). These novel approaches offer flexibility and efficiency in trial conduct, potentially reducing costs and expediting the drug development process. In addition to considering the strengths and limitations of different research methods, researchers must also adhere to ethical principles and regulatory requirements when designing and conducting clinical trials. Ethical considerations, such as obtaining informed consent from participants and ensuring patient safety, are paramount in clinical research (Dilts, 2006).

**Patient-Centric Trial and Legal Challenges**

Patient-centric trials represent a significant advancement in clinical research methodology, prioritizing the dynamic association and strengthening of patients all through the trial preparation. Unlike conventional trials where patients are detached members, patient-centric trials see patients as accomplices for enquiry. Such trials put emphasis on their input, points of view, and encounters. The center rule of patient-centricity spins around planning trials that adjust with persistent needs, preferences, and needs, eventually pointing to improving the pertinence and effect of investigating outcomes (Getz, 2008). By incorporating patient voices from the start, these trials cultivate a more collaborative and comprehensive approach to clinical investigation (Klewes, 2017).

Patient education and strengthening are crucial columns of patient-centric trials, pointing to guarantee that patients are well-informed and effectively locked in in their healthcare choices (DiMasi, 2004). Comprehensive and straightforward communication is fundamental to supply patients with a clear understanding of the trial reason, strategies, potential risks, and benefits (Kohl, 2019). Patients are engaged to form educated choices through their cooperation, guided by their preferences, values, and objectives. Moreover, patient-centric trials offer back administrations and assets to address down-to-earth obstructions of interest such as transportation, childcare, and dialect obstructions. In this manner patient inclusivity and availability is enhanced (Clinical Trials Transformation Initiative, 2011).

Adaptability and versatility are necessarily highlights of patient-centric trials, permitting for personalized approaches to meet personal needs and inclinations (Laurenza, 2018). Versatile trial plans, for instance, empower real-time alterations to conventions based on developing information or quiet criticism, optimizing trial effectiveness and significance, (Kostkova2015). By grasping adaptability, patient-centric trials can suit different populations, counting those with unique medical conditions, social foundations, or treatment inclinations. In this manner, the generalizability and pertinence of ponder discovery is upgraded (Clinical Trials Transformation Initiative, 2011).

Data privacy and confidentiality are vital contemplations in patient-centric trials, given the delicate nature of patient information collected amid the investigation. Analysts must execute vigorous information assurance measures to defend quiet information and comply with pertinent security directions such as the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act (HIPAA) within the United States (Monti, 2016). Also, analysts must follow administrative necessities forced by administering bodies such as the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) or the European Medicines Agency (EMA) to guarantee the legitimacy, keenness, and adequacy of trials. Compliance with directions overseeing trial conduct, information collection, and announcing is fundamental to maintain moral benchmarks and the belief in clinical inquiry (Downing, 2012).

### Case Studies of Patient-Centric Trials

Despite the progress that clinical trial sponsors and representatives of clinical sites achieved in establishing productive and less formal initially contact and discussion on potential collaboration, operational differences between particularly large international product development partnership (PDP), pharmaceutical industry, and investigator initiated clinical trials are the main barriers for successful implementation and outcomes of trials. Understanding of these discrepancies in terms of process, resources, cost, and duration, particularly at the conduct level of trials, should help bridging the expectations between sponsors and clinical sites. Results of initial discussion groups and interviews with responsible persons for trial conduct within a research network or a “Task Force” to explore the prospect, practicality, and interest of conducting PDP trials had included in the framework of a public private partnership. Outcomes of such a partnership, particularly in countries with some recent experiences in clinical trials conduct, are perceived differently by both parties. For further roles and responsibilities, expectations and challenges, as well as real or possible negative impacts and jeopardizing of ongoing or future collaborations were discussed with operational perspectives. The global ways of interaction between different stakeholders are built to represent the diversity of human relations that exist in the field of clinical trials, having in mind the ultimate goal of curing those who need to be cured and provided care in a condition that warrants well-being independently of any economic determination (I Nebie et al., 2024).

## RESEARCH DESIGN

The research design represents the blueprint for systematically addressing the research questions and achieving the study objectives. It delineates the methods, processes, and strategies employed to collect, analyze, and interpret data. A robust research design ensures coherence between the study’s philosophical framework, methodological approach, and practical implementation (Leavy, 2022; Miller & Salkind, 2022). This section discusses the different types of research designs, justifies the selection of a mixed-methods design, and elaborates on how it is implemented in this study.

The study adopted a mixed-methods design, integrating both qualitative and quantitative research methodologies. This approach is selected due to its ability to provide a holistic understanding of complex clinical trial processes by capturing both operational metrics and human perspectives. The justification for using a mixed-methods approach lies in its comprehensive nature, which allows for triangulation of findings and ensures that the study addresses challenges from multiple dimensions. The mixed-methods approach allows:

- **Qualitative Methods:** To capture subjective experiences, challenges, and expectations from patients, stakeholders, and clinical staff. This helps identify barriers to participation, operational bottlenecks, and process inefficiencies.
- **Quantitative Methods:** To gather measurable, objective data, such as recruitment timelines, compliance metrics, and data accuracy rates, which help evaluate the efficiency of existing processes and test the impact of proposed interventions.

For example, while patient interviews (qualitative) may identify communication gaps in recruitment, tracking patient enrollment timelines (quantitative) will validate whether these gaps result in delays. The integration of these methods ensures that the study provides a balanced, data-driven, and people-centric solution to process improvement.

### Data collection

The data collection process forms the foundation of the study and ensures that the research objectives are addressed comprehensively. A robust and well-defined data collection strategy enables the generation of meaningful insights that support evidence-based findings. This study adopts a mixed-methods approach, integrating both qualitative and quantitative techniques through primary and secondary data collection methods. This combination ensures a holistic understanding of clinical trial processes by capturing both measurable data and experiential insights (Leeuw, 2012; Alshenqeeti, 2014; Paradis et al., 2016). The study aims to provide actionable recommendations for improving trial processes by addressing operational inefficiencies, patient-related challenges, and stakeholder experiences.

### Data Analysis Techniques

Data analysis is a critical component of any research study, as it transforms raw data into meaningful insights that can inform decision-making and improve processes. In this study, a mixed-methods approach will be utilized, incorporating quantitative, qualitative, and thematic analysis techniques to provide a comprehensive understanding of the clinical trial processes. Each of these techniques serves a distinct purpose and collectively enhances the robustness of the findings (Taylor & Cihon, 2004).

## RESULTS

This chapter systematically organizes the findings into subsections that correspond to the study's themes and lays the foundation for the discussion chapter in which such findings are contextualized and interpreted. With this structure, this study will light the way in which best practice improvements can be accomplished within the contract research organization delivery models and ensure truly patient-centric clinical trials.

The Cronbach's Alpha values were also computed across all the scales, ranging from 0.819 to 0.894, hence reflecting high reliability and thus the robustness of the data measured. Factor analyses were then conducted to show that four major components attained a cumulative variance of 62.049%, showing that the data could meaningfully be grouped into distinct themes. Principal component analysis further supported the constructs to assure their unidimensionality.

Descriptive statistics shed light on the participants' demographics and their responses. A breakdown indicated 50% men and, within these, 43% aged above 51 years of age. An outcome also proved that 72% have knowledge of tools both on operatics and patient centering, which show their relevance with regard to the research's objective. Means for a set statement depicted important tendencies: one for example involves OM6, indicating a highly crucial trend with high means values such as 3.97 towards approaches to operational management.

CFA was conducted to confirm the measurement model. The fit indices like CMIN/DF: 0.758, CFI: 1.0, and RMSEA: 0.000 indicated an excellent fit. The covariances among latent constructs further underlined their interrelationships, such as the high correlation between OM and PCT.

### Demographic analysis

A total of 200 respondents were considered for the study. Of the 385 respondents, males and females were in equal proportions (1A). Exactly 43% of the total respondents were above 51 years (1B). Exactly 38% of respondents had the experience of more than 11-15 years (1C). Exactly 40% of the respondents had the experience of 7-9 clinical trials (1D). A total of 72% of respondents had an idea regarding operational tools and patient centric tools (1E).

**Gender**

| | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Valid | Male | 50 | 50.0 | 50.0 | 50.0 |
| | Female | 50 | 50.0 | 50.0 | 100.0 |
| | Total | 100 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

**Fig. 1.** Demographic analysis of the respondents

The gender distribution of the respondents can also be a relevant factor in balancing the views represented in the study sample. In this regard, as indicated in Table 1, the respondent group is balanced, with 50% males and 50% females. This equal division allows the study to ensure a balanced perspective, so gender bias does not occur in the responses.

**Age**

| | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Valid | 21-30 | 12 | 12.0 | 12.0 | 12.0 |
| | 31-40 | 17 | 17.0 | 17.0 | 29.0 |
| | 41-50 | 28 | 28.0 | 28.0 | 57.0 |
| | More than 51 | 43 | 43.0 | 43.0 | 100.0 |
| | Total | 100 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

**Fig. 2.** Age distribution

The descriptive statistics provided offer valuable insights into the distribution and variability of responses for different statements related to operational management (OM) in the context of clinical trials. By examining the mean, standard deviation, minimum, and maximum values, researchers can gain a deeper understanding of the data and identify trends or patterns that may inform decision-making processes.

One notable observation from the table is the variability in mean values across different statements. For instance, the statement "OM6" has the highest mean value of 3.97, indicating that respondents, on average, rated this statement relatively high in terms of agreement or importance. On the other hand, the statement "OM1" has a lower mean value of 3.87, suggesting that respondents tended to rate this statement slightly lower compared to others. This discrepancy in mean values may reflect variations in perceptions or attitudes toward different aspects of operational management in clinical trials.

In the domain of Organizational Management (OM), Statement OM6 stands out with a high mean value of 3.97 and a relatively low standard deviation of 0.481, indicating a strong consensus among respondents regarding this statement. Conversely, Statement OM1 exhibits a lower mean value of 3.87 and a slightly higher standard deviation of 0.597, suggesting more variability in respondents' perceptions. These findings imply that while OM6 reflects a widely agreed-upon sentiment within the sample, opinions on OM1 are more diverse.

Moving to Customer Relationship Management (CTRM), the data show that Statement CTRM2 has the highest mean value of 3.95, coupled with a low standard deviation of 0.435, indicating a high level of agreement among respondents. Conversely, Statement CTRM1 has a slightly lower mean value of 3.93 and a similar standard deviation of 0.455, suggesting a comparable level of consensus but with a marginally lower average rating. This implies that while both statements are generally agreed upon, CTRM2 might be perceived slightly more positively than CTRM1.

In the realm of Product Customization (PCT), Statement PCT2 emerges with the highest mean value of 3.91 and a standard deviation of 0.514, indicating a relatively high level of agreement but with slightly more variability compared to other statements. Conversely, Statement PCT1 has a lower mean value of 3.88 and a higher standard deviation of 0.591, suggesting a less consistent consensus among respondents. These findings suggest that while there is general agreement on both statements, PCT2 might be perceived more positively and with slightly less variability.

Lastly, in Logistics Coordination (LC), Statement LC3 stands out with the highest mean value of 3.94 and the lowest standard deviation of 0.422, indicating a strong consensus and minimal variability among respondents. Conversely, Statement LC1 has a lower mean value of 3.88 and a relatively high standard deviation of 0.591, suggesting a less consistent agreement among respondents. This suggests that while respondents generally agree on the positive sentiment expressed in LC3, opinions on LC1 vary more widely.

In summary, the provided descriptive statistics offer valuable insights into the perceived effectiveness or importance of various statements within each domain. While some statements enjoy strong consensus and minimal variability

(e.g., OM6 and LC3), others exhibit lower mean values and higher variability (e.g., OM1 and PCT1), indicating a more diverse range of opinions. Understanding these patterns can inform decision-making processes, highlighting areas of strength and areas for potential improvement within each domain.

**Reliability Analysis**

Reliability analysis was done to assess the internal consistency of the scales used in this study, which would mean coherence and dependability of the responses. Cronbach's Alpha was the major statistical measure in this analysis, a common statistical tool used in the assessment of the reliability of questionnaires based on a Likert scale. The results revealed that the thematic areas were extremely reliable in all four areas of Operation Management, Clinical Trial Research Methodologies, Patient Centric Trials, and Legal Challenges with Cronbach's Alpha values ranging from 0.819 to 0.894.

The Operational Management scale showed a very good result in internal consistency with the Cronbach's Alpha value of 0.847, where statements on adaptive trial designs, quality-by-design approaches, and risk-based monitoring were concerned. This result indicates a consensus among respondents regarding the use of operational strategies to improve trial efficiency and ensure the reliability of data.

The Clinical Trial Research Methodologies scale showed the highest reliability score, 0.894. This is a reflection of the excellent consistency in responses relating to the key methodological practices such as RCTs, observational studies, and meta-analyses. This high reliability might indicate that respondents widely acknowledge these methodologies as important means of enhancing scientific rigor and applicability in clinical trials.

The Patient-Centric Trials scale's Cronbach's Alpha value was 0.819, showing very good reliability too. The result well testifies to a high consensus among respondents that the active engagement of patients during the whole trial process is necessary, supplemented by patient feedback and implementation of patient-reported outcomes highly recognized for its relevance in clinical trials nowadays.

In the current study, the Cronbach's Alpha for the Legal Challenges scale was 0.814, which shows that the responses are reliable in light of the complexities in treading regulatory compliance, ensuring data security, and adhering to ethical standards. This indicates a high degree of shared perception that legal and ethical barriers are one of the main challenges in the clinical trial landscape.

Overall, these reliability statistics provide assurance regarding the quality and consistency of the data collected for the study, lending credibility to the findings and conclusions drawn from the analysis. It is essential to consider these reliability measures while interpreting the results and drawing implications for practice and future research in the field of clinical trial management and research methodologies. This suggests that the data collected across multiple dimensions related to organizational management, clinical trial research methodologies, patient-centric trials, and legal challenges exhibit high internal consistency and reliability (Collier, 2009).

A summary of the reliability testing is presented in Table 1.

**Table 1:** Reliability testing of various parameters

| **Parameters** | **Crohnbach's alpha (α)** |
|---|---|
| **Operational Management Models** | 0.847 |
| **Clinical Trial Research Methodologies** | 0.894 |
| **Patient Centric Trial** | 0.819 |
| **Legal Challenges Associated with Clinical trials** | 0.814 |

**Confirmatory Factor Analysis**

The principal component analysis was carried out to reduce a large set of data to obtain a meaningful smaller set of constructs. Each variable used in the analysis was measured by multi- item constructs by factor analysis with varimax rotation to check the unidimensionality among the items. All the items included in the analysis had factor loadings of 0.4. When all the items were forced to form a single factor, the factor analysis was able to extract 4 components with a variance of 62.049%.

A summary of PCA analysis is presented in Table 2.

**Table 2:** PCA for factor analysis

| | Component | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** |
| OM1 | .409 | .416 | | .635 |
| OM2 | .484 | | | .754 |
| OM3 | .692 | | | |
| OM4 | .401 | .473 | .473 | |
| OM5 | | .572 | .401 | |
| OM6 | | | .747 | |
| OM7 | .608 | .472 | | |
| OM8 | | .461 | .530 | |
| OM9 | .625 | | | |
| CTRM1 | .692 | | | |
| CTRM2 | .581 | | .428 | |
| CTRM3 | .581 | | .428 | |
| CTRM4 | .692 | | | |
| CTRM5 | .692 | | | |
| CTRM6 | .692 | | | |
| CTRM7 | .692 | | | |
| CTRM8 | .692 | | | |
| CTRM9 | .692 | | | |
| PCT1 | | .775 | | |
| PCT2 | .424 | .620 | | |
| PCT3 | | | .619 | |
| PCT4 | | .466 | .616 | |
| PCT5 | | .789 | | |
| LC1 | | .775 | | |
| LC2 | | .686 | | |
| LC3 | | | .607 | |
| LC4 | | .439 | .643 | |
| LC5 | | .695 | | |

A preliminary model was constructed and tested for confirmatory factor analysis.

**Fig 2**: Path diagram for CFA showing model fit indices

The different values obtained for model fit indices are presented in Table 3.

**Table 3:** The values for model fit indices based on path diagram

| | **Model fit** | **Desired score** |
|---|---|---|
| **Chi – Square** | 466.666 | NA |
| **Degrees of Freedom** | 347 | NA |
| **CMIN/DF** | 1.345 | </=2.00 for good fit and 2.00 – 5.00 for moderate fit. |
| **CFI** | 0.901 | Close to or more than 0.90 for good fit |
| **RMSEA** | 0.059 | </=0.10 reflects good fit |
| **NFI** | 0.706 | Value close to 0.90 reflects a good fit |

The chi square value was 466.666, DF was 347, and the CMIN/DF was 1.345, indicating a good fit model. The CFI was 0.901, which is close to 0.9. RMSEA was 0.059 indicating a good fit. However, the value of NFI was close to 0.9 indicating a good fit. Thus, preliminary model analysis shows a good fit for the model.

This indicated the assessment and validation by using the discriminant and convergent validity. The convergent validity was also assessed by using the factor loadings of latent constructs, which had a significant p value less than 0.001. This test supported that the constructs had convergent validity. The discriminant validity indicated by correlation matrix where majority of the constructs had a correlation coefficient of less than 0.85 and also by using the path analysis where the correlations among the latent constructs were less than 1.

A preliminary model was set for the confirmatory factor analysis by using AMOS. The preliminary model allowed the researcher for its best fit as per parsimony and substantive meaningfulness. The model fit indices indicated how the underlying structure fits the data. The model was evaluated by using the model fit indices including Chi Square statistic, degrees of freedom (DF), CMIN/DF, CFI, and RMSEA. The model is presented in Fig 3.

The overall model fit indices are presented in Table 4.

**Table 4:** Model fit indices

| | **Model fit** | **Desired score** |
|---|---|---|
| **Chi – Square** | 260.623 | NA |
| **Degrees of Freedom** | 344 | NA |
| **CMIN/DF** | 0.758 | </=2.00 for good fit and 2.00 – 5.00 for moderate fit. |
| **CFI** | 1.0 | Close to or more than 0.90 for good fit |
| **RMSEA** | 0.000 | </=0.10 reflects good fit |
| **NFI** | 0.836 | Value close to 0.90 reflects a good fit |

The chi square value was 260.623 DF was 344 and the CMIN/DF was 0.758, indicating a good fit model. The CFI was 1.0, which is close to 0.9. RMSEA was 0.000 indicating a good fit. However, the values of NFI were close to 0.9 indicating a good fit.

Association between variables is summarized in the covariance table presented (Table No.5).

**Table 5:** Covariance Table

| | | | **Estimate** | **S.E.** | **C.R.** | **P** | **Label** |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| OM | <--> | LC | .155 | .033 | 4.686 | *** | |
| CTRM | <--> | LC | .094 | .022 | 4.227 | *** | |
| PCT | <--> | LC | .189 | .037 | 5.094 | *** | |
| CTRM | <--> | PCT | .092 | .022 | 4.162 | *** | |
| OM | <--> | PCT | .154 | .033 | 4.671 | *** | |

| | | | Estimate | S.E. | C.R. | P | Label |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| OM | <--> | CTRM | .120 | .026 | 4.675 | *** | |

There is statistically significant association seen between the variables as per the models presented, thus giving high reliability and validity to the data.

**Descriptive statistics**

The Likert scale questionnaire was developed and its evaluation was done statistically. The descriptive statistics provided offer valuable insights into the distribution and variability of responses for different statements related to operational management (OM) in the context of clinical trials. By examining the mean, standard deviation, minimum value, and maximum value, researchers can gain a deeper understanding of the data and identify trends or patterns that may inform decision-making processes.

The provided descriptive statistics offer insights into the distribution and variation of responses for different statements within four distinct categories: organizational management (OM), customer relationship management (CTRM), product customization (PCT), and logistics coordination (LC). By analyzing the mean values and standard deviations, we can discern patterns and assess the relative agreement or dispersion of responses.

**Organizational Management**

In the domain of organizational management (OM), Statement OM6 "**I believe that adaptive trial designs can contribute to more successful and patient-centric clinical trials benefitting both doctors and patients"** stands out with a high mean value of 3.97 and a relatively low standard deviation of 0.481, indicating a strong consensus among respondents regarding this statement. Conversely, Statement OM1 "**I believe that the strategy to monitor high-risk areas in patients and drug applications is an effective strategy for enhancing patient safety in clinical trials"** exhibits a lower mean value of 3.87 and a slightly higher standard deviation of 0.597, suggesting more variability in respondents' perceptions. These findings imply that while OM6 reflects a widely agreed-upon sentiment within the sample, opinions on OM1 are more diverse.

**Table 6:** Descriptive Statistics

| | N | Minimum | Maximum | Mean | Std. Deviation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| OM1 | 100 | 1 | 5 | 3.87 | .597 |
| OM2 | 100 | 1 | 5 | 3.89 | .601 |
| OM3 | 100 | 1 | 5 | 3.93 | .455 |
| OM4 | 100 | 1 | 5 | 3.93 | .498 |
| OM5 | 100 | 1 | 5 | 3.89 | .549 |
| OM6 | 100 | 1 | 5 | 3.97 | .481 |
| OM7 | 100 | 1 | 5 | 3.90 | .522 |
| OM8 | 100 | 1 | 5 | 3.94 | .509 |
| OM9 | 100 | 1 | 5 | 3.95 | .458 |
| Valid N (listwise) | 100 | | | | |

**Customer relationship management**

Moving to customer relationship management (CTRM), the data show that Statement CTRM2 "**I believe that randomized controlled trials can aid in assessing the efficacy of treatments or interventions in a more efficient and patient-centric approach"** has the highest mean value of 3.95, coupled with a low standard deviation of 0.435, indicating a high level of agreement among respondents. Conversely, Statement CTRM1 "**Random assignment of participants to different treatment groups is crucial for minimizing bias and ensuring fair comparison of different groups in clinical trials" has** a slightly lower mean value of 3.93 and a similar standard deviation of 0.455, suggesting a comparable level of consensus but with a marginally lower average

rating. This implies that while both statements are generally agreed upon, CTRM2 might be perceived slightly more positively than CTRM1.

**Descriptive Statistics**

**Table 7:** Descriptive Statistics

| | N | Minimum | Maximum | Mean | Std. Deviation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| CTRM1 | 100 | 1 | 5 | 3.93 | .455 |
| CTRM2 | 100 | 1 | 5 | 3.95 | .435 |
| CTRM3 | 100 | 1 | 5 | 3.95 | .435 |
| CTRM4 | 100 | 1 | 5 | 3.93 | .455 |
| CTRM5 | 100 | 1 | 5 | 3.93 | .455 |
| CTRM6 | 100 | 1 | 5 | 3.93 | .455 |
| CTRM7 | 100 | 1 | 5 | 3.93 | .455 |
| CTRM8 | 100 | 1 | 5 | 3.93 | .455 |
| CTRM9 | 100 | 1 | 5 | 3.93 | .455 |
| Valid N (listwise) | 100 | | | | |

The legal challenges of clinical trials form a very important area, especially since the regulatory framework is still in a flux. Table 8 describes the descriptive statistics of this theme, depicting the perceptions of respondents on issues related to regulatory compliance, data security, and ethical considerations. This section is based on five statements (LC1 to LC5) focusing on some of the specific legal or regulatory challenges.

Of the statements, LC3 ("Balancing the need for scientific advancement with ethical principles in an evolving clinical research landscape") had the highest average of 3.94, with a low standard deviation of 0.422. This shows that there is very strong agreement among respondents that the pursuit of innovation is not easy to balance with strict adherence to ethical standards. It thus points to how complex it will be to maintain scientific integrity while ensuring patient safety and upholding evolving ethical guidelines.

LC1 ("Navigating the Regulatory Requirements is one of the biggest challenges while planning and executing clinical trials.") achieved the lowest mean score, amounting to 3.88, with a relatively greater standard deviation at 0.591. Thus, there is partial differentiation according to the respondents' experience or viewpoint on the extent to which regulatory issues pose a challenge; the variable factor may stem from various regional conditions or a predisposition toward specific aspects relevant to the type of the trial conducted. Therefore, the high average speaks overall to agreement on facing huge challenges in finding their ways through the labyrinths of regulatory mechanisms that form the core issue at length.

LC5 ("The ever-changing landscape of data protection legislation makes it increasingly difficult to conduct clinical trials") had a mean of 3.92 and a standard deviation of 0.464. It signifies that data protection concerns and compliance with the legislations like GDPR are gradually rising. Data privacy is related to everybody, and due to changes in regulations, adapting is necessary.

The low variability across most items indicates a strong alignment in respondents' recognition of legal and regulatory challenges. The findings point to the need for proactive strategies to navigate these hurdles while maintaining ethical standards and ensuring data security.

**Table 8:** Descriptive Statistics

| | **N** | **Minimum** | **Maximum** | **Mean** | **Std. Deviation** |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| LC1 | 100 | 1 | 5 | 3.88 | .591 |
| LC2 | 100 | 1 | 5 | 3.90 | .560 |
| LC3 | 100 | 1 | 5 | 3.94 | .422 |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| LC4 | 100 | 1 | 5 | 3.92 | .526 |
| LC5 | 100 | 1 | 5 | 3.92 | .464 |
| Valid N (listwise) | 100 | | | | |

## QUALITY ASSURANCE IN CLINICAL TRIALS

The International Council for Harmonisation (ICH) E6(R2) addendum included an innovative concept: Quality Tolerance Limits (QTLs). The intent of QTLs is to modernize quality control within clinical development while providing thresholds to guide improvement. Implementation of QTLs began with clinical trials after their introduction. It became quickly evident that the concept was complex and immediate implementation was difficult. QTLs in clinical trials are measures that can be used to provide feedback on certain clinical trial parameters. These measures are useful to track the trial progress towards its patient- and site-centric endpoints, which reciprocally comprise a limit in itself. Giving relevance to these patient- and site-centric measures requires a wide range of capabilities and is likely to evolve over time. This commentary elaborates on some obligations, capabilities and limitations that should be expected by a company aiming to elevate such measures as part of its Quality Management System (QMS). QTLs should be capable of early alerting on issues and highlighting emerging trends that will either increase their importance or require their replacement. QTLs should have the capability of providing visibility on specific aspects across functions, thus supporting cross-functional oversight activities. Ideally, QTLs should serve as controllable and reproducible tools to measure proxy indicators of something else, yet be independent of one another. In most cases, QTLs monitoring a parameter are different from the same parameter itself. Notice of the introduction of any QTL by the different Vendors dressed in This QTL Adopting Document. QTLs themselves have obligations, capabilities and limitations that will likely evolve over time and should be subject to ongoing evaluation and potential adaptation, which is always subject to health authority acceptance (Bhagat et al., 2021)..

### Performance Metrics for Operational Efficiency

Transparency for all stakeholders (including patients and the public) is vital for understanding the costs, resources, and effort related to planning and execution of the patient experience. Once a patient-centric trial is enacted, the financial cost and resource demands shift to and increase at the clinical sites where patients engage in trials. Financial and operational resource expenses are not uniformly handled across the clinical research site industry but must fall within certain elements in order to meet the business of patient-centric clinical trials. As a result, feasibility responses can inform operational and strategic decisions that are unique to the individual clinical research site. However, not all trial planning metrics adequately divide the listening between the CRO or sponsor and the grant-funded trial site IP (Darby Lipman et al., 2019).

Patient-centric clinical trials at clinical research sites in the USA are becoming increasingly common. One way to work through the steady stream of opportunities is to consciously and methodically decide up front which proposals to pursue and to only accept feasibility surveys that meet certain qualifications (most often stipend, budget, and indications of patient burden). More influence may necessitate a revision to the Block-Box Study Approaches. Work with the sponsors leads to increased feasibility burden on the clinical sites and restricts the type and number of trials that they can feasibly conduct. While the use of defined implementation science aspects to warrant feasibility burden are the responsibility of sponsors. CROs and sponsors continue to provide information on how similar study feasibilities are handled. Impacting was at a multi-specialty operating. While accelerated trials are not indicative of forthcoming feasibility, this is as good a launch point as any to begin a formal tracking system. Block-Box Study Approach will either be revised to simplify and reduce potential feasibility requests, though at a potential pursuance cost or a Proposal Management Plan with a detailed plan of action will be developed that will become standard clinical site procedure when third-party funding analysis agreements are required by the sponsor.

### Impact of Patient Feedback on Trial Design

With advancements in Accelerating Multisensor Moodspheres, patient-centric clinical development models and Design Thinking approaches, drug developers are re-creating clinical trials from the patient perspective, ensuring the best and most effective treatments will be brought to the world. Drug development partnerships require broader holistic views about potential end-users or patients. Incorporating their needs and ideas at an early stage not only contributes to higher recruitment and retention rates but can also influence study designs. With broad global health

strategies announced by the WHO, oral treatment options for COVID-19 are said to be the most critical tools available. This would also address the need for cost-effective, geographically expansive antiviral treatment in order to reach those with limited access to hospitals.

## DISCUSSION

In essence, the developing of patient-centric clinical trials, aligned with the overcoming of legal barriers, makes it indispensable to critically analyze the operational management tools and methodologies. Patient-centric clinical trials have the potential to return a more learner and engaged patient through improved upgrades to understand the formability in clinical care sharing and clinical research information. In addition to providing patients with 24-hour electronic medical support, this ideology also integrates outpatient by a doctor and clinical response services. Randomized controlled trials support pivotal biological, pathological boundaries affect transection in axial machine functions. Developed and accept innovative bed intensive ICU comprehensive. Personal sensitivity and supportive quality of life 24 hour electronic medical memory support advanced care planning to be activated.

Although this descriptive statistic has given a satisfactory view of the perceptions of the respondents, deeper analysis is required to find the underlying reasons behind these perceptions and attitudes. Data would be used to come up with a basis for higher qualitative methods, which include interviews or focus groups in understanding the motivations and concerns of various actors in clinical trials. Qualitative data will enrich our understanding of the challenges and opportunities presented by patient-centric approaches and operational management strategies.

The findings of this analysis would, therefore, be of immense value to the professionals who work in clinical research. A patient-centric approach might foster trust and transparency, something very crucial to the effective conduct of a trial. Attentive patients who feel their voice is being heard and their concerns taken care of are probably going to be more active in participating and adhering to protocols during participation in a trial thereby improving the quality of collected data. This engagement may also enhance recruitment and retention rates, a common challenge encountered by the clinical trial, resulting in delay and increased costs.

## CONCLUSION

In summary, operational management models, offer valuable frameworks for enhancing the efficiency and effectiveness of clinical trials. By applying Six Sigma principles to protocol development, patient enrollment, data management, and resource allocation, improvements in quality outcomes and patient safety can be achieved. However, while Six Sigma offers significant benefits, its adoption and implementation in clinical trial settings may require further exploration and refinement.

Moreover, clinical trials research methodologies, especially RCTs, continue to serve as the gold standard for evaluating treatment efficacy. Despite their strengths, RCTs come with inherent limitations, such as potential biases and ethical considerations. Complementary research methods, such as observational studies, are essential for providing comprehensive insights into treatment effects in real-world settings.

To address legal challenges associated with patient-centric trials, effective navigation of regulatory requirements and compliance with ethical standards is crucial. Collaboration between researchers, regulatory bodies, and legal experts is necessary to develop strategies for overcoming legal barriers and facilitating the conduct of patient-centric trials.

Furthermore, the study contributes to the theoretical discourse on legal challenges associated with clinical trials by identifying key regulatory compliance issues, ethical considerations, and data security concerns. These findings offer valuable insights into the complex interplay between legal, ethical, and practical considerations in the conduct of clinical research, thereby enriching current theoretical frameworks in the field.

### Future Directions for Research:

Clinical research and development is a necessary step to acquire and maintain the highest level of medical treatment. A critical part of this activity is patient-centric clinical trials on investigational medicinal products. Currently, about 100,700 to 500,000 patients are involved annually in over 50,000 new clinical trials on new medical products. Innovative medicinal products have a potential to provide efficient and cost-effective solutions to serious health problems. However, the long and costly process of research and development is a key challenge. Manufactures invest in clinical research and development billions of dollars, dependent on the therapy area and the product nature. Most

of clinical trials never reach completion, as about 12.1% of trials were terminated. This creates risk for wasting the involved patient resources and the produced infrastructure, inducing the increase of patients burden.

**Declaration Statement**

I, declare that this research paper is my original work and has not been submitted for any other degree or publication. I affirm that all sources used in this paper are properly cited and acknowledged. Additionally, I confirm that there are no conflicts of interest related to this research, and any funding received for this project has been disclosed.

**Ethics approval and consent to participate**= Not applicable

**Consent for publication** = Yes

**Availability of supporting data** = Yes provided on request

**Competing interests** = No

**Funding**= No

## REFERENCES

[1] A Farnum, M., Ashok, M., Kowalski, D., Du, F., Mohanty, L., Konstant, P., Ciervo, J., S Lobanov, V., & K Agrafiotis, D. (2019). A cross-source, system-agnostic solution for clinical data review. ncbi.nlm.nih.gov

[2] A Malikova, M. (2016). Optimization of protocol design: a path to efficient, lower cost clinical trial execution. ncbi.nlm.nih.gov

[3] Alemayehu, D., Alvir, J., Levenstein, M., & Nickerson, D. (2013). A data-driven approach to quality risk management. ncbi.nlm.nih.gov

[4] Bonham, A., Califf, R., Gallin, E., & Lauer, M. (2011). Developing a Robust Clinical Trials Workforce. IOM Forum on Drug Discovery, Development, and Translation. Washington, D.C.: Institute of Medicine of the National Academies.

[5] Brooks, C. (2012). An Independent Perspective on Clinical Trial Timelines: Trending Against Expectations. New York: Citeline.

[6] Buchholzer, F. J. (2011). Implementing the Voluntary Harmonization Procedure for Accelerated Clinical Trial Approval. International bio-pharmaceutical Industry, 3(2), 68-69.

[7] Burdon, A., Jaki, T., Chen, X., Mozgunov, P., Zheng, H., & Baird, R. (2024). Next generation clinical trials: Seamless designs and master protocols. [PDF]

[8] Burnett, T., Mozgunov, P., Pallmann, P., S. Villar, S., M. Wheeler, G., & Jaki, T. (2020). Adding flexibility to clinical trial designs: an example-based guide to the practical use of adaptive designs. ncbi.nlm.nih.gov

[9] Califf, R. M., & Muhlbaier, L. H. (2003). Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act (HIPAA): Must There Be a Trade-Off Between Privacy and Quality of Health Care, or Can We Advance Both? Circulation, 108, 915-918.

[10] Cham: Springer. Rubbio, I., Bruccoleri, M., Pietrosi, A., & Ragonese, B. (2019). Digital health technology enhances resilient behaviour: Evidence from the ward. International Journal of Operations & Production Management, 39(4), 594–627.

[11] Chodankar, D., K. Raval, T., & Jeyaraj, J. (2023). The role of remote data capture, wearables, and digital biomarkers in decentralized clinical trials. ncbi.nlm.nih.gov

[12] Clinical Trials Facilitation Groups (CTFG). (2010, March). Heads of Medicines Agencies (HMA). Retrieved May 15, 2012, from Guidance document for a Voluntary Harmonisation Procedure (VHP) for the assessment of multinational Clinical Trial Applications: Version 2: http://www.hma.eu/fileadmin/dateien/Human_ Medicines/01- About_HMA/Working_Groups/CTFG/2010_03_VHP_Guidance_v2.pdf

[13] Clinical Trials Transformation Initiative (CTTI). (2011). Clinical Trials Transformation Initiative (CTTI) - Identifying Practices that through Broad Adoption will Increase the Quality and Efficiency of Clinical Trials. Retrieved May 25, 2012, from https://www.ctti-clinicaltrials.org/

[14] Collier, R. (2009, February 3). Rapidly rising clinical trial costs worry researchers. Canadian Medical Association Journal, 180(3), 277-278.

[15] Cutting Edge Information. (2011, December 5). Outsourcing of Phase II Drug Development Now Accounts for 63% of R&D Budgets. Retrieved April 2012, 6, from Cutting Edge Information: http://www.cuttingedgeinfo. com/2011/outsourcing-phase-ii-drug-development/

[16] Damodaran, A. (2007). Strategic Risk Taking: A Framework for Risk Management. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Prentice Hall.
[17] Darby Lipman, P., Dluzak, L., & M. Stoney, C. (2019). Is this study feasible? Facilitating management of pragmatic trial planning milestones under a phased award funding mechanism. ncbi.nlm.nih.gov
[18] Davis, J. R., Nolan, V. P., Woodcock, J., & Estabrook, R. W. (1999). Assuring Data Quality and Validity in Clinical Trials for Regulatory Decision Making: Workshop Report. Roundtable on Research and Development of Drugs, Biologics, and Medical Devices, Institute of Medicine.
[19] Deloitte. (2009). Secondary Uses of Electronic Health Record (EHR) Data in Life Sciences. Deloitte Development LLC.
[20] Dilts, D. M., & Sandler, A. B. (2006). Invisible Barriers to Clinical Trials: The Impact of Structural, Infrastructural, and Procedural Barriers to Opening Oncology Clinical Trials. Journal of Clinical
[21] Downing, N. S., Aminawung, J. A., Shah, N. D., Braunstein, J. B., Krumholz, H. M., & Ross, J. S. (2012, May 16). Regulatory Review of Novel Therapeutics — Comparison of Three Regulatory Agencies. The New England Journal of Medicine.
[22] E. Velarde, K., M. Romesser, J., R. Johnson, M., O. Clegg, D., Efimova, O., J. Oostema, S., S. Scehnet, J., L. DuVall, S., & D. Huang, G. (2018). An initiative using informatics to facilitate clinical research planning and recruitment in the VA health care system. ncbi.nlm.nih.gov
[23] Eisenberg, P., Kaufmann, P., Sigal, E., & Woodcock, J. (2011). Developing a Clinical Trials Infrastructure. IOM Forum on Drug Discovery, Development, and Translation. Washington, D.C.: Institute of Medicine of the National Academies.
[24] Eisenstein, E. L., Collins, R., Cracknell, B. S., Podesta, O., Reid, E. D., Sandercock, P., . . . Diaz, R. (2008). Sensible approaches for reducing clinical trial costs. Clinical Trials, 75-84.
[25] Embi, P. J., Jain, A., Clark, J., Bizjack, S., Hornung, R., & Harris, C. M. (2005). Effect of a Clinical Trial Alert System on Physician Participation in Trial Recruitment. Archives of Internal Medicine, 2272-2277.
[26] English, R., Lebovitz, Y., & Giffin, R. (2010). Transforming Clinical Research in the United States: Challenges and Opportunities: Workshop Summary. Institute of Medicine of the National Academies, Forum on Drug Discovery, Development, and Translation Board on Health Sciences Policy. Washington, D.C.: The National Academies Press.
[27] Getz, K. A. (2007, September 1). Global Clinical Trials Activity in the Details. Retrieved March 21, 2012, from Applied Clinical Trials Online: http://www.appliedclinicaltrialsonline.com/appliedclinicaltrials/article... 3
[28] Huang, H., Leone, D., Caporuscio, A., & Kraus, S. (2020). Managing intellectual capital in healthcare organizations. A conceptual proposal to promote innovation. Journal of Intellectual Capital. https://doi.org/10.1108/JIC-02-2020-0063. in print.
[29] Huber, C., & G¨ artner, C. (2018). Digital transformations in healthcare professionals' work: Dynamics of autonomy, control and accountability. Management Revue, 29(2), 139–161.
[30] I Nebie, E., van Eeuwijk, P., N. Sawadogo, H., Reus, E., Utzinger, J., & Burri, C. (2024). Operational Differences between Product Development Partnership, Pharmaceutical Industry, and Investigator Initiated Clinical Trials. ncbi.nlm.nih.gov
[31] Kelly, D., Spreafico, A., & L. Siu, L. (2020). Increasing operational and scientific efficiency in clinical trials. ncbi.nlm.nih.gov
[32] Kivimaa, P., Boon, W., Hyysalo, S., & Klerkx, L. (2019). Towards a typology of intermediaries in sustainability transitions: A systematic review and a research agenda. Research Policy, 48(4), 1062–1075.
[33] Klewes, J., Popp, D., & Rost-Hein, M. (2017). Digital transformation and communications: How key trends will transform the way companies communicate. In J. Klewes, D. Popp, & M. Rost-Hein (Eds.), Out-thinking Organizational Communications. Management for Professionals. Cham: Springer.
[34] Kohl, S., Schoenfelder, J., Fügener, A., & Brunner, J. O. (2019). The use of Data Envelopment Analysis (DEA) in healthcare with a focus on hospitals. Health Care Management Science, 22, 245–286.
[35] Kostkova, P. (2015). Grand challenges in digital health. Frontiers in Public Health, 3, 134.
[36] Kraus, S., Breier, M., & Dasí-Rodríguez, S. (2020). The art of crafting a systematic literature review in entrepreneurship research. International Entrepreneurship and Management Journal, 16, 1023–1042. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11365-020-00635- 4.
[37] Laurenza, E., Quintano, M., Schiavone, F., & Vrontis, D. (2018). The effect of digital technologies adoption in healthcare industry: A case based analysis. Business Process Management Journal, 24(5), 1124–1144.

[38] Leonard, K. J. (2004). The role of patients in designing health information systems: The case of applying simulation techniques to design an Electronic Patient Record (EPR) interface. Health Care Management Science, 7(4), 275–284.
[39] M. E. Vogel, M., E. Combs, S., & A. Kessel, K. (2017). mHealth and Application Technology Supporting Clinical Trials: Today's Limitations and Future Perspective of smartRCTs. ncbi.nlm.nih.gov
[40] Manogaran, G., Lopez, D., Thota, C., Abbas, K. M., Pyne, S., & Sundarasekar, R. (2017). Big data analytics in healthcare internet of things. In H. Qudrat-Ullah, & P. Tsasis (Eds.), Innovative healthcare systems for the 21st century. Understanding Complex Systems.
[41] Maritsch, F., Cil, I., McKinnon, C., Potash, J., Baumgartner, N., Philippon, V., & G. Pavlova, B. (2022). Data privacy protection in scientific publications: process implementation at a pharmaceutical company. ncbi.nlm.nih.gov
[42] Mas-Tur, A., Kraus, S., Brandtner, M., Ewert, R., & Kürsten, W. (2020). Advances in management research: a bibliometric overview of the Review of Managerial Science. Review of Managerial Science, 14(5), 933–958.
[43] Mazor, I., Heart, T., & Even, A. (2016). Simulating the impact of an online digital dashboard in emergency departments on patients length of stay. Journal of Decision Systems, 25(sup1), 343–353.
[44] Meissner, P., B. Cottler, L., "Mickey" Eder, M., & Lloyd Michener, J. (2020). Engagement science:
[45] Melchiorre, M. G., Papa, R., Rijken, M., Van Ginneken, E., Hujala, A., & Barbabella, F. (2018). EHealth in integrated care programs for people with multimorbidity in Europe: Insights from the ICARE4EU project. Health Policy, 122(1), 53–63.
[46] Monti, A., Coleman, C. (2016). Future of Health: Seven visions of the future of healthcare. In: The Telegraph. Retrieved online: http://tgr.ph/futureofhealth. Accessed: 09/07/2019.
[47] Nudurupati, S. S., Bhattacharya, A., Lascelles, D., & Caton, N. (2015). Strategic sourcing with multi-stakeholders through value co-creation: An evidence from global health care company. International Journal of Production Economics, 166, 248–257.
[48] Nuffield Trust. Jefferies, J. G., Bishop, S., & Hibbert, S. (2019). Customer boundary work to navigate institutional arrangements around service interactions: Exploring the case of telehealth. Journal of Business Research. April 2019.
[49] Ozdemir, Z., Barron, J., & Bandyopadhyay, S. (2011). An Analysis of the adoption of digital health records under switching costs. Information Systems Research, 22(3), 491–503.
[50] Pallmann, P., Bedding, A. W., Choodari-Oskooei, B., Flight, L., Dimairo, M., Hampson, L. V., Holmes, J., Mander, A. P., Odondi, L., Sydes, M. R., Villar, S. S., Wason, J. M. S., Weir, C. J., Wheeler, G. M., Yap, C., & Jaki, T. (2018). Adaptive designs in clinical trials: why use them, and how to run and report them. [PDF]
[51] Parviainen, P., Tihinen, M., K¨ aari ¨ ainen, ¨ J., & Teppola, S. (2017). Tackling the digitalization challenge: How to benefit from digitalization in practice. International Journal of Information Systems and Project Management, 5(1), 63–77.
[52] Patrício, L., Teixeira, J. G., & Vink, J. (2019). A service design approach to healthcare innovation: From decision-making to sense-making and institutional change. AMS Review, 9, 115–120.
[53] Reddy, P., & Brahm, S. (2016). Digitalisation: The future of healthcare. Journal of Business Management, (11), 126–135.
[54] Reis, J., Amorim, M., Mel˜ ao, N., & Matos, P. (2018). In Digital transformation: a literature review and guidelines for future research (pp. 411–421).
[55] Springer, Cham. Marques, I. C., & Ferreira, J. J. (2020). Digital transformation in the area of health: Systematic review of 45 years of evolution. Health and Technology, 10, 575–586.
[56] Straube, C., Herschbach, P., & E. Combs, S. (2017). Which Obstacles Prevent Us from Recruiting into Clinical Trials: A Survey about the Environment for Clinical Studies at a German University Hospital in a Comprehensive Cancer Center. ncbi.nlm.nih.gov
[57] Thabane, L. & Lancaster, G. (2018). Improving the efficiency of trials using innovative pilot designs: the next phase in the conduct and reporting of pilot and feasibility studies. [PDF]